

Chapter II

Literature Review

A. English in Academic Settings (Global and Indonesian Context)

English plays a significant role in supporting students to survive in their academic life. Tarone (2005:1) and Laborda (2011:103) identify that Asian higher education students learn English primarily for “academic and professional purposes.” Furthermore, Johnson (2009) states that “by the 21st-century, English had become the main world language of literature, periodical publications, science, advertising, pop music, cinema, and technology.”

In Indonesia, higher education students need English proficiency to survive in their study and profession as well as social lives. *Program Pascasarjana* (magister program) Universitas Gadjah Mada (<http://www.pasca.ugm.ac.id/v2.1/program/S2>) and Institut Pertanian Bogor (<http://www.pasca.ipb.ac.id/>), for example, set minimum TOEFL score 450 as one of the requirements for postgraduate (S2 program) students. The Ministry of National Education requires new employees to have minimum TOEFL score 450 (<http://www.lowongancpns.org/>). In social lives, higher education students need to have sound proficiency in English to communicate with global society.

Understanding the importance of English for Indonesian higher education students, the government sets a policy to include General

English as a compulsory course under *Matakuliah Pengembangan Kepribadian* (MPK) or Personality Development Course component of Indonesian higher education curriculum (MoNE, 2000). MPK aims at facilitating students to be competitive Indonesian intellectuals (MoNE, 2000:2).

B. Higher Education Students Learning Needs

SmartBean (2009:2) and Rotherham and Willingham (2009:16) come in agreement that current global development led by rapid advances in ICT has incurred a demand for people to have sound mastery of “21st-century skills” to help them survive in life. They cover several skills (SmartBean, 2009:3). The first skills are information and communication skills, such as media, information and ICT literacy. The second skills are thinking and problem-solving skills, such as critical and systems thinking, problem identification, formulation and solution, creativity and intellectual curiosity. The last skills are interpersonal and self-directional skills. They include flexibility and adaptability, initiative and self-direction, social and cross-cultural skills, productivity and accountability, and leadership and responsibility. As for the learning contents, SmartBean (2009:3) suggests to focus on building or developing “global awareness, financial, economic and business literacy, civic literacy, and health literacy” in students.

C. Mata Kuliah Umum Bahasa Inggris (MKU BING)

MKU BING is a sub-component of Personality Development Course or *Matakuliah Pengembangan Kepribadian* (MPK) that aims at facilitating students to be competitive Indonesian intellectual (MoNE, 2000). MKU BING is a two-credit compulsory course for undergraduate (S1 program) students in all universities in Indonesia. With reference to this decree, UNJ develops its own MKU BING.

MKU BING aims at developing students' reading skills with respect to their fields of study (BPA, 2008:62). It also plays significant roles in UNJ. First, it supports university vision and mission; "being a world class university" and "building future leader" (RENSTRA, 2006:24-25). UNJ has to prepare its students to have sound English proficiency to compete in global world. Second, it facilitates students to achieve minimum standard of English proficiency by the end of S1 program, i.e. TOEFL score > 425 (BPA, 2008:47).

Unit Pelaksana Teknis Mata Kuliah Umum (UPT MKU) is assigned to organize MKU BING. Unfortunately, no sufficient attention can be observed as there is no syllabus, document, and regulation related to the teaching and learning tools of MKU BING.

Faculty of Technology UNJ has set academic, professional, and social competency to be achieved by its students at the end of S1 program. First, the students are expected to be able to communicate (spoken and written) in global community by using ICT. Second, they are expected to

have global knowledge. In terms of professional competency, there are two issues. First, the students are expected to be academic and professional manpower with reference to their field of study. Second, they are expected to be prospective technology-literate teachers. MKU BING needs to facilitate these.

D. “Reading” Teaching and Learning Activities

Brown (2000:165) defines teaching and learning activities as an interaction that covers “collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other.” According to Harmer (2002:56), the cores of teaching are students’ needs and experience. In other words, students are the center, and all materials and activities must be relevant to their needs and experience.

In terms of purposes, teaching and learning activities aim at engaging learners in the learning process to achieve goals (Richards, 2005:69). They also facilitate learners’ needs and meet the expected standards of the course taught (Mayes & Freitas, 2004:13, and Zahorik, 1976:50). To achieve the purposes, teaching and learning activities must cover some elements. Mayes and Freitas (2004:33) suggest six elements of teaching and learning activities; they are the purpose, structure, and context of the activity, tools and objects used in the activity and roles for the participants in the activity.

Teaching and learning activities can be implemented at classroom or outside the classroom, for example at home by using electronic media (Richard, 2008:6). As for the classroom management, Johnson (2012:3) suggests the teacher to create different context for a particular learning situations and to develop “social and moral growth”.

The focus of this study includes types of reading texts, reading tasks and reading skills. Types of reading texts include journal articles, newspaper articles, works of fiction, entire reference of text books, selected chapters of books, photocopied notes, workbook or laboratory instructions and computer-presented reading materials. These types of reading texts are relevant with Needs Analysis findings (Sulastini, 2011). It is stated that types of materials students expect to read are academic readings and non-academic readings from various sources.

Reading activities include understanding the main points of texts, reading a text quickly in order to establish a general idea of the content (skimming), reading a text slowly and carefully in order to understand the details of the text, looking through a text in order to locate specific information (scanning), guessing unknown words in a text, understanding text organization, understanding specialist vocabulary in a text, reading speed, reading in order to respond critically, understanding a writer’s attitude and purpose, and general comprehension. These types of reading activities are also relevant with Needs Analysis findings (Sulastini, 2011). Students find difficulties in understanding text organization (identifying

general description text, comparison, time relationships as well as cause and effect) and guessing unknown words in a text.

In terms of reading activities, Harmer (2002:200) states two reasons for reading. They are instrumental and pleasurable. Instrumental reading is reading for certain purpose. Pleasurable reading is reading for fun, for example reading comics, novels, etc. In some cases, instrumental reading "may be done for fun as well as for some utilitarian purpose, for example reading psychology book which is the reader's field of study and interest" (Harmer, 2002:201).

Reading skills include library skills, summarizing materials, analyzing written materials, knowledge of vocabulary, reading quickly, reading critically, reading for author's viewpoint and general reading comprehension. These types of reading skills are also relevant with Needs Analysis findings (*Laporan Kegiatan Analisis Kebutuhan Program Pembelajaran MKU BING*, 2006). It is stated that reading comprehension skills needed by students are understanding the main points and the details of the text quickly, understanding a writer's attitude and purpose, reading in order to respond critically, understanding specialist vocabulary in a text, understanding text organization.

Harmer (2002:201-202) asserts some skills for reading a text, such as identifying the topic, predicting and guessing, reading for general understanding, reading for specific information, reading for detailed information, and interpreting the text. First, the readers decide the topic of a text by involving their own background knowledge. Then the readers

make a prediction about what is in the text and read the whole text to check their prediction. Reading for general understanding means that the readers try to get the general idea of the text by having a quick look at the text without examining every single word (skimming). Reading for specific information means that the readers search for specific details in the text (scanning). In reading for detailed information, the readers try to understand the detail in text, for example reading instruction, procedure, and direction. In interpreting text, the readers interpret what is stated implicitly beyond the text by involving their own background knowledge.

In line with Harmer, Nunan (1999) asserts a useful typology of reading strategies, such as, having a purpose, previewing, skimming, scanning, clustering, predicting, inferring, and so on. Those strategies are developed by teachers in the ELTU (English Language Teaching Unit) at a Chinese university.

Ur (2001:146) adds several activities to the list. First, the students make a summary of the content of the text. Second, if the text is a story, the students might suggest what might happened before and what might happen next. Third, the students find some mistakes in the text. Fourth, the students are given two text which have similar topic, then they are asked to compare them by identifying the similarities and differences of the texts. Fifth, the students represent the content of the text in forms of drawing, graph, diagram, or map. This is to ensure that the students understand the content.

E. Principles of Teaching Higher Education Students

Higher education students are adults who have high intellectual abilities to help them succeed in various classroom activities (Brown, 2001:90). Therefore, teaching adults is different from teaching young students. Brown (2001:90) identifies five principles for teaching adults.

First, Brown (2001:90) and Harmer (2002:40) come in agreement that adults' learning engages abstract thought, but overuse of abstract rules and concepts may result in ineffective learning. Overuse of fun activities such as games and song can also be deadly for adults (Harmer, 2002:40). Therefore, appropriate activities are needed to create an effective and meaningful learning.

Second, adults learn best when the material and activities are relevant to their interests (Brown, 2001:91). To ensure this, teacher can involve them in the development of learning objectives (Brundage&Macheracher, 1980, in Nunan, 1999:15). Lieb (1991, in Jager-Vanderwal, 2004:8) shares the similar view.

Third, adults learn best when learning activities involve their multiple senses (Brown, 2001:91). The teacher can use varied media in teaching, such as audio, visual, and audio-visual media. Even if the media is not varied, adults can "struggle on despite boredom" since they are more discipline than young students (Harmer, 2002:40).

Fourth, the effectiveness in adults' learning is influenced by the emotional factors (Brown, 2001:91). They tend to be more confident than

children. Lieb (1991, in Jager-Vanderwal, 2004:8) adds that adults are “autonomous and self-directed in their learning.” Furthermore, they have their own goals of learning (Harmer, 2002:40).

Fifth, adults learn best when the material and activities are authentic and meaningful (Brown, 2001:91). Harmer (2002:40) and Brundage and Machercher (1980, in Nunan, 1999:15) add that the material and activities have to be relevant to their experience. The teacher can associate adults’ past experience to promote this principle.

Good teacher of adults takes all of these principles into account. Lieb (1991, in Jager-Vanderwal, 2004) offers a learning activity that can be applied to the principles discussed before; the teacher needs to create tasks which are relevant to students’ interest, and tasks which encourage them to work collaboratively. Richards and Rogers (2001:167) state that the role of teacher here is the facilitator of interaction between teacher-student(s), student(s)-student(s), and student(s)-various activities in the classroom.

F. Task-Based Language Teaching

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is considered as the appropriate approach nowadays. It is a development of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) since it draws on several principles of CLT. TBLT is an approach in which task holds a central place in teaching and learning process (Richards & Rodgers, 2001:223). Harmer (2002:86)

emphasizes that it focuses more on the meaning rather than the accuracy of language form.

It is obvious that task is the core of TBLT. Richards and Rodgers (2001:223-224) define task as a goal-oriented activity which engages students in their learning process. Furthermore, task motivates students in their learning due to the facts that it provides varied opportunities to use target language in communication, engages students' personal experience, and promotes team work (Richards and Rodgers, 2001:229).

Richard and Schmidt (2002, in Jager-Vanderwal, 2004:37) assert "communicative and interactive task" as the core of TBLT. Nunan (1989, in Richards & Rodgers, 2001:224) provides a definition of communicative task as it fully engages students in the target language by focusing on meaning rather than form.

To sum up, Feez (1998, in Richards & Rodgers, 2001:224) states criteria of task. First, it should be goal-oriented. Second, the primary focus is on meaning and communication. Third, it should provide opportunities for the students to fully engage in language learning. Last, it is ordered from the easy to the difficult one.

Nunan (1989:11) points out several components of task. They are goals, input, activities, teacher's role, students' role, and settings. Goals are the intended outcomes of the task. Input is the starting point of the task. Activities refer to anything that the students do to the input. Roles refer to how students and teacher interact in a task, while settings are the

classroom arrangement affecting interaction entailed in the task, such as pair work or group work.

In terms of task varieties, some experts design different tasks.

Task Designer	Types of Task
Nunan (1989)	real world task pedagogic task
Willis (1996)	listing ordering and sorting comparing problem solving sharing personal experience creative task
Pica, Canagy, and Falodun (1993)	jigsaw tasks information-gap tasks problem solving tasks decision-making tasks opinion exchange tasks

Nunan (1989, in Richards & Rodgers, 2001:231) asserts two types of task. He makes a distinction between real-world and pedagogical tasks. A real-world task is a task which can be applied in the real world. Using the internet to send e-mail, using fax machine, etc. are the examples of this kind of task. A pedagogical task, on the other hand, is defined as task which involves students in comprehending, manipulating, or producing in the language, for example, information gap task, problem solving task, etc.

Willis (1996, in Richards and Rodgers, 2001:234) classified task into six types; they are listing, ordering and sorting, comparing, problem solving, sharing personal experiences, and creative tasks. Listing task tend to generate a lot of talk as students explain their ideas. In ordering and sorting task, students persuade each other by justifying their priorities.

Comparing task deals with finding out how many students who agree or disagree with the content of the report and why. While doing problem solving task, students compare and evaluate solutions to solve a problem then choose the best solution for the problem. In sharing personal experiences task, students note points of interest and compare them later, write questions to ask speakers, etc. Creative task facilitates students write a review of another groups' work.

Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993, in Richards and Rogers, 2001, p. 234) classify tasks into the following types: jigsaw, information-gap, problem-solving, decision-making, and opinion exchange tasks. Jigsaw tasks enable students to form a complete text from different pieces, for example some groups are given different pieces of a text and they have to combine them in such a way so that they become a complete text. Information-gap tasks enable students to find out missing information to form a complete text. In problem-solving tasks, students have to find the best solution for a problem. Decision-making tasks, in the other hand, enable students to discuss the best solution for a problem from the given solutions. In opinion exchange tasks, students state their opinion and discuss them without necessary to reach agreement.

G. Program Evaluation

Brown (1995:218) and Richards (2001:286) define program evaluation as systematic process of collecting, analyzing, and synthesizing

data aiming at improving a program. Richards (2001:286) adds another purpose of program evaluation. It is to find out the implementation, effectiveness, and successfulness of the program.

In terms of the purposes of program evaluation, Weir and Roberts (1994, in Richards, 2001:288) assert two major purposes: “program accountability” and “program development.” Accountability-oriented evaluation aims at assessing the successfulness of the intended goals and objectives at the end of the program. Development-oriented evaluation, on the other hand, aims at promoting program improvement (Weir & Roberts, 1994, in Richards, 2001:288).

Richards (2001:288) suggests different purposes of evaluation, such as “formative, illuminative, and summative” evaluation. In terms of purposes, formative evaluation aims at finding out the effectiveness of program implementation and making an improvement on the program (Richards, 2001:288, Brown, 1995:225). Illuminative evaluation aims at providing “a deeper understanding of the processes of teaching and learning that occur in the program” and it doesn’t result in improvement of the program (Richards, 2001:289). Summative evaluation aims at assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, and acceptability and improving the program (Richards, 2001:291-292, Brown, 1995:225). In terms of time, formative evaluation is conducted during the program, while summative evaluation is conducted at the end of the program (Richards, 2001:288,292 and Brown, 1995:225).

There are five aspects to be addressed when evaluating a program (<http://www.admin.exeter.ac.uk/academic/tls/tqa/Part%209/9Aevaluat.pdf>)

. They are the purpose, focus, evaluators, stakeholders, and methods. The purpose of the evaluation is to find out “the quality of the educational provision, performance of the provider(s), the experience of the students, or a combination of those things.” The focus of the evaluation is related to question: what are the elements of the program that need to be evaluated? The evaluators can be internal and external evaluators. The stakeholders are related to question “who will see the outcomes of the evaluation; who will act upon them?” The methods of evaluation are questionnaires, structured-group interview, student-staff liaison committee, self and peer evaluation.

It is important to set a procedure in conducting evaluation to avoid too narrow or too broad questions which can lead the evaluator to unimportant and unnecessary discussion (Aldrich, 2007). Fleischman and Williams (1996) suggest a set of procedures in conducting evaluation. First, the evaluators set the purpose and scope of evaluation. Second, they formulate the evaluation questions, then develop evaluation design and data collection plan based on the questions. Third, the data are collected and analyzed. Last, the evaluation report is used to improve the program.

There are two methods in collecting and analyzing the data. They are quantitative and qualitative. Richards (2001:296) states that quantitative measurement "can be expressed numerically" and "can generally be analyzed statistically." Qualitative measurement, on the other

hand, "cannot be expressed numerically and that depends more on subjective judgment and observation" (Richards, 2001:297).

Richards (2001:299) offers different procedures used in conducting program evaluation, such as "tests, interviews, questionnaires, teachers' written evaluation, diaries and journals, teachers' records, student logs, case study, student evaluations, audio- or video-recording, and observation," and he also mentions the advantages and disadvantages of each procedure. Those procedures can be used to collect quantitative and qualitative data. Questionnaires, for example, are the source of quantitative data. Interviews, case study, and observation are some sources of qualitative data. According to Richards (2001:297), qualitative data tends to be "soft" or "less rigorous" than quantitative, but both of them are needed in program evaluation because "they serve different purposes and can be used to complement each other."

H. Previous Studies

Some studies related to educational program evaluation in higher education context have been conducted by some researchers. These studies are useful for other researchers conducting research in the same area. There are three studies discussed under this section.

The first study is 'Evaluation of English Language Teaching Education Curriculum by Student Teachers' conducted by Ögeyik. The purpose of the study is "to evaluate how the recent curriculum works

regarding the student teachers' perspectives and, thus, to provide data on this topic by determining the emerging problems and advantages" (Ogeyik, 2010:3). Fifty-three respondents who were third-year student teachers suggest that the current curriculum is "encouraging and productive for teaching profession" (Ogeyik, 2010:7).

The second study is 'Evaluating an English Language Teacher Education Program through Peacock's Model' by Coskun and Daloglu. This study identifies some aspects of the English teacher education program that should be maintained and improved with reference to Peacock's (2009) model of evaluation. Quantitative and qualitative data have been collected from teachers and student teachers. The teachers agree that the program is insufficient to improve student teachers' linguistic competence. However, student teachers think that "the pedagogic side of the program needs to be improved" (Coskun & Daloglu, p.24). According to the obtained data, some matters in need of improvement are "lack of practice opportunities, overuse of presentations as a teaching learning technique, and lack of instructor evaluation by student teachers" (Coskun & Daloglu, p.32).

The third study is a Needs Analysis of UNJ Students (Sulastini, 2011). The study identifies UNJ students' English needs. The result shows that 50% students want to have English skills to support their professional life.

The first two studies discussed under this section suggest the advantages of finding out students' perceptions of their program. First, the studies are to find out how successfully the programs work and what the strengths and weaknesses of the programs are. Second, the result of the studies can be used as the basis for decision-making for further development and improvement. The needs analysis (Sulastini, 2011) can be used as consideration in conducting this study since it is the latest UNJ students' needs that must be facilitated by MKU BING.

I. Theoretical Framework

It is obvious that MKU BING needs to be responsive to UNJ students' needs as changes increase rapidly and affect their needs. Unfortunately, there is no sufficient attention given to the course, especially in terms of evaluating the responsiveness of the course to the students' needs.

Findings of UNJ students' needs analysis (Sulastini, 2011) reveals several things. First, the students are in need of academic tasks and mastery of English skills to support their academic and professional life. Second, the students need two types of materials in their learning activities. They are fiction and non-fiction materials. Third, there are difficulties encountered by students, such as identifying text organization and lack of vocabulary.

In terms of reading comprehension skills, *Laporan Kegiatan Analisis Kebutuhan Program Pembelajaran MKU BING(2006)* asserts some skills needed by students. They are reading critically, understanding the main ideas, supporting details, main points of the text, writer's attitude and purpose, vocabulary in a text, and text organization.

MKU BING must be responsive in facilitating UNJ students' needs and skills. Reading comprehension skills and difficulties encountered by students can be covered and solved by applying reading strategies in Nunan (1999). Those strategies are developed by teachers in the ELTU (English Language Teaching Unit) at a Chinese university. This is relevant with the context of this study (reading for higher education students).

This study is a part of illuminative program evaluation because it "seeks to provide deeper understanding of the processes of teaching and learning that occur in the program, without necessarily seeking to change the course in any way as a result" (Richards, 2001:289). One measurement to determine the effectiveness of a program evaluation is from students' perception. Based on Marsh (1987:257-259, in Sulastini 1996:311), students' perception are valid and reliable because "background and demographic characteristics had very little effect on their perception".