

Challenges in the Implementation of Curriculum Based on the Indonesian National Qualification Framework

Magdahalena Tjalla

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Parepare, Indonesia

Abdul Haris Sunubi

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Parepare, Indonesia

Abstract

This study was intended to find out the challenges faced by lecturers and students in the implementation of the Indonesian National Qualification Framework Curriculum (INQF) in the English Education Department of IAIN Parepare in three aspects: learning plan, learning process standard, and learning evaluation standard. The questionnaire data were analyzed using the Rasch model to know the item difficulty of curriculum implementation indicators. The data were elaborated through interviews, FGD, and documentation. The study showed that in the learning process aspect, lecturers perceived some items of interactive, holistic, and collaborative indicators were difficult to implement. In addition, in the learning plan, they perceived that compiling lesson plan was easy to implement. They also found no difficulties in implementing the learning process standard indicators such as scientific, effective, and student-centered. Likewise, they found no problems in implementing the learning assessment standard, especially in the techniques and procedures of assessment indicators. Students also perceived some indicators item of the learning process standard were difficult to implement such as holistic, collaborative, contextual, and thematic. In addition, they perceive the assessment procedures indicators items of the learning evaluation standard were not implemented by lecturers. These data suggested that lecturers did not implement these indicators items in the classroom. The research also showed the causes of the difficulties of curriculum implementation: student factors, lecturer factors, and institutional factors.

Keywords

Challenges, Implementation, Indonesian National Qualification Framework Curriculum

Corresponding Author:

Magdahalena Tjalla, Department of English Education, IAIN Parepare, Indonesia

Email: magdahalenatjalla@iainpare.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia has implemented several educational curriculums. It has been noted eight curriculums, such as the curriculum of 1967, the 1975 curriculum, the 1984 curriculum, the 1990 curriculum, the 2000 curriculum, the 2004 curriculum, the 2013 curriculum, and the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (INQF) curriculum. Although each curriculum is constructed to cover the weaknesses of the previous curriculum, some still perceive that no curriculum has succeeded to daze the problems faced by the educational institution, especially the higher education level (Digdowiseiso, 2020) and (Hidayah et al., 2021). The implementation of each curriculum has been problematic, and English teachers in Indonesia struggle to meet the requirements of the curriculum while still having to get their pupils ready for the national exam (Masduqi & Prihananto, 2021).

While the curriculum is mentioned as one of the factors affecting the success of learning a second language (Apsari, n.d.); Mukminin, A., et al., 2019;(Poedjiastutie et al., 2018), it is found that the English language competence of high school and university graduates in Indonesia is commonly at a low level. Even though students have learned English since they are in the primary level, their competence has not shown satisfactory results (Dzulkifli Isadaud et al., 2022), (Fitriani et al., 2024) & (Dzulkifli Isadaud et al., 2022); (Poedjiastutie et al., 2018). It is an irony since the curriculum reform is done to improve the quality of teaching learning process (Pajarwati et al., 2021).

Considering the importance of curriculum in improving educational quality, each implementation should be evaluated. In the area of the INQF curriculum, there have been some studies conducted to assess the curriculum implementation, such as the ones conducted by (Neliwati et al., 2019), (Oviyanti et al., 2020), and (Simbolon et al., 2021). However, none of the studies were about the implementation of the curriculum in the area of English language in the university. The current research was intended to describe challenges in the implementation of the INQF curriculum in the perspective of lecturers and students in English Education Study Program of IAIN Parepare. Three research questions were answered, namely, 1) what are the lecturers' perceptions of the implementation of curriculum based on the Indonesian National Qualification framework; 2) what are the students' perceptions of the implementation of curriculum based on the Indonesian National Qualification framework; 3) what are the causes of difficulties encountered by lecturers in implementing the curriculum Evaluation of curriculum implementation is crucial to conduct to maximize the benefits of the implementation for the better quality of the university graduates (Mitra & Purnawarman, 2019).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The INQF curriculum was implemented in the higher education based on the regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic Indonesia number 7 of 2013 based on the issuance of Presidential Regulation number 8 of 2012 on Indonesia

National Qualification Framework (Yonanda Exaputri & Santriane, 2019) and (Sardi et al., 2017). The curriculum is designed to guide higher education in preparing the students to meet the demands of the stakeholders by determining competency levels that the graduates should achieve according to the market needs (Yuwono, 2019). The effective implementation of the INQF curriculum may increase the quality of Indonesian education (Sibarani, 2021). This means that the ELT program graduates are expected to have a proficiency in English language field and to able to apply that proficiency in the teaching, in addition to being prepared for a variety of other jobs (Yuwono, 2019).

The INQF curriculum has thirteen indicators of the implementation, where the learning plan aspect has one indicator, the learning process standard has nine indicators, and the evaluation standard has three indicators. The curriculum aspects and their indicators are shown in the following table:

ASPECT	INDICATOR
Learning plan	1. Compiling lesson plan
Learning process standard	1. Interactive 2. Holistic 3. Integrative 4. Scientific 5. Contextual 6. Tematic 7. Effective 8. Collaborative 9. Students-centered
Assessment standard	1. Assessment techniques 2. Assessment instruments 3. Assessment procedures

Some studies have been conducted on the implementation of curriculum based on the Indonesian national qualification framework in Indonesian higher educational context (Neliwati et al., 2019); (Oviyanti et al., 2020); (Simbolon et al., 2021). All the studies find that the implementation of the INQF curriculum by the lecturers have been run well, but some difficulties are stillfound. However, none of the preceding studies address the INQF implementation in an ELT program.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research applied a mix-methods with sequential explanatory model by implementing the qualitative research after completing the quantitative method. Using this model, data collection and data analysis of the qualitative method were done based on the results of the quantitative analysis. The current study involved lecturers of English Education Program of IAIN Parepare. There were 17 lecturers observed as the participants; the lecturers were of two types: civil servants and non-civil servants. They are all partaken in the survey that seeked to find out lecturers' perception on the implementation of the KKNi curriculum. The research also selected 100 students from

three classes of English Education Study Program as the research respondents to reveal their perception on the implementation of the INQF curriculum by the lecturers. The questionnaire presented 39 items of the 14 indicators of the INQF curriculum implementation in three aspects: learning design, learning process, and assessment process (Direktorat Pendidikan Tinggi Keagamaan Islam Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Islam Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2018). The items reflect the implementation of the INQF curriculum in EFL teaching at the English Language Education Program of IAIN Parepare. The items of the curriculum implementation indicators are shown in the following table:

Table 1 Indicators of the INQF Item of Implementation Curriculum Implementation

Compiling Lesson Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Lecturers compile lesson plan.2. Lecturers distribute lesson plan to students.3. Lecturers discuss lesson plan content with students.
Holistic	<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Lecturers relate teaching materials with moral values that are based on religion.5. Lecturers associate teaching materials with moral values that are based on the local culture of the people of South Sulawesi.
Interactive	<ol style="list-style-type: none">6. Lecturers involve students in learning process.7. Lecturers used various teaching methods8. Lecturers relate learning materials to moral values that are based on Indonesian national culture.
Integrative	<ol style="list-style-type: none">9. Lecturers link all language components in learning English.10. Lecturers relate all aspects of language in teaching English.
Scientific	<ol style="list-style-type: none">11. Lecturers use learning methods that encourage students to be critical.12. Lecturers use learning methods that encourage students to be able to solve problems with the knowledge they have.
Contextual	<ol style="list-style-type: none">13. Lecturers relate learning materials to the problems of learning English in Indonesia.14. Lecturers link learning materials with the world of work.
Thematic	<ol style="list-style-type: none">15. Lecturers arrange learning materials

	based on themes.
	16. Lecturers discuss the selection of themes with students.
Effective	17. Lecturers use teaching strategies that improve students' understanding of the material and competence in English. 18. Lecturers use teaching strategies that encourage students to use English actively in class and outside the classroom.
Collaborative	19. Lecturers assign students to work on assignments in small groups. 20. Lecturers do not allow students to work individually in completing assignments.
Students-centered	21. Lecturers encourage student creativity by utilizing technology as a learning resource. 22. Lecturers encourage students to use English actively in the classroom and outside the classroom to improve student competence. 23. Lecturers present teaching materials according to the level of students' competence 24. Lecturers encourage students to access materials through various sources to increase students' independence. 25. Lecturers give assignments to read materials at home to increase students' independence.
Assessment technique	26. Lecturers carry out written tests to assess student-learning outcomes. 27. Lecturers carry out oral tests to assess student-learning outcomes. 28. Lecturers give assignment tests to assess student-learning outcomes. 29. Lecturers assess student attitudes during the learning process. 30. Lecturers assess the personality of the students during the teaching-learning process.
Assessment Instrument	31. Lecturers develop learning

assessment instruments based on indicators of achievement of the final ability of each learning stage.

32. Lecturers develop assessment instruments to measure student knowledge.
33. Lecturers develop assessment instruments to measure student skills.

Assessment Procedures

34. Lecturers carry out assessments in accordance with the lecture contract.
35. Lecturers provide feedback on student test results
36. Lecturers give students opportunity to questions the exams' result.
37. Lecturers report the value according to the specified time.
38. Lecturers document the assessment process.
39. Lecturers document learning outcomes.

After completing the questionnaire questions, the researchers selected seven of them to be interviewed to find data on the problems encountered by lecturers in implementing the curriculum. The interview was then followed by class observation with the same purpose.

Data from the questionnaires were transformed into quantitative data and were then analyzed using Rasch model analysis to know the item difficulty of the curriculum indicators. Rash model is commonly used because it is easy to implement, and the result is accurate (Darmana et al., 2021). This model is widely used in education studies such as assessing students' reading comprehension (Pratama et al., 2020), assessing critical thinking ability (Widhia Sabekti et al., 2018), assessing students' scientific reasoning ability (Wati et al., 2019 & Sardi et al., 2022) and measuring students' literacy test (Sihombing et al., 2018). The analysis was assisted by a software called WINSTEP application. The results of the quantitative analysis, namely the indicators of the curriculum implementation that were mostly difficult to do were then elaborated through interview questions to lecturers to find out the causes of the difficulty. To help the researchers analyze the interview responses, they utilized n-vivo12 software application in categorizing and concluding the data of the implementation of the curriculum aspects.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Lecturers' Perception on the Implementation of the INQF Curriculum

Research findings show that lecturers perceive some indicators of learning process in INQF curriculum are tricky to implement, such as collaborative, interactive, holistic. As table 2 shows, for example, most of the lecturers choose item 20 (lecturers do not

allow students to work individually in completing assignments) and item 16 (lecturers discuss choice of themes with students) as two difficult things to do. Other difficult indicators are item 7 (lecturers relate teaching materials with moral values that are based on the local culture of the people of South Sulawesi), item 9 (lecturers link all language components in teaching English language subject), and item 10 (lecturers relate all aspects of language in teaching English language subject). These findings indicate that lecturers do not implement the four items of indicators of the learning process in the INQF Curriculum.

Table 2 Lecturers' Perception of the Difficult Items of the INQF Curriculum Implementation

Aspect	Indicator	Item
Learning process standard	1. Collaborative	1. lecturers do not allow students to work individually in completing assignments (20)
	2. Thematic	1. lecturers discuss choice of themes with students (16)
	3. Holistic	1. lecturers relate teaching materials with moral values that are based on the local culture of the people of South Sulawesi (7)
	4. Integrative	1. Lecturers link all language components in learning English 2. lecturers relate all aspects of language in teaching English

On the other hand, lecturers also perceive that some other indicators are easy to implement. As table 3 shows, there are 12 easy items of the indicators to the learning process standard and evaluation process standard considered easy by lecturers. They are item 1 (lecturers compile RPS/lesson plans), item 2 (lecturers discuss the contents of RPS/lesson plans with students), item 4 (lecturers involve students in the learning process), item 11 (lecturers use teaching methods that encourage students to be critical), item 17 (lecturers use teaching strategies that improve students' understanding of English language materials and competencies), item 21 (lecturers encourage student creativity by utilizing technology to obtain information as a learning resource), item 23 (presenting teaching materials based on student's competency level), item 25 (lecturers give reading assignments at home to increase student independence), item 26 (lecturers provide assignment to assess student learning outcomes), item 34 (lecturers carry out assessments according to the learning contract), item 36 (lecturers provide students the opportunity to question test results), and item 37 (lecturers report scores according to predetermined time).

Table 3 Lecturers' Perception of the Easy Items of the INQF Curriculum Implementation

Aspect	Indicator	Item
Learning plan	Compiling lesson plan	1. Lecturers compile RPS/lesson plans 2. Lecturers discuss the contents of RPS/lesson plans with students
Learning process standard	Interactive	1. Lecturers involve students in the learning process)
	Scientific	1. Lecturers use teaching methods that encourage students to be critical
	Effective	1. Lecturers use teaching strategies that improve students' language understanding and language competency.

The findings of the easy items suggest that lecturers compile RPS (lesson plan) before teaching; even they discuss the contents with students. In addition, lecturer can make students actively involved in the learning. The findings also show that lecturers have good competency in pedagogic skill since they can present learning materials based on student's competency level and choose learning methods and strategies that enable students to be critical and their understanding of materials improved as well as their competency. Moreover, lecturers are able to encourage students to be independent learners by giving reading assignments at home before presenting materials in the classroom. Besides having good competency in pedagogic skill, lecturers also show their competency in utilizing technology to encourage students' creativity. In the implementation of assessment process standard, the research findings indicate that lecturers select assignment to assess student-learning outcomes instead of written and oral tests. In assessment procedures, lecturers carry out assessments according to the lecture contract, providing students the opportunity to question test results, and report scores according to predetermined time. These suggest that lecturers implement the assessment process standard well.

Though lecturers implement the learning process and the assessment standard well as previously explained, the findings also show that lecturers do not apply some other indicators of the learning process. It is said that the findings indicate that lecturers allow students to work on task individually, even though the curriculum recommends lecturers to encourage students to collaborative learning. In addition, lectures do not discuss the choice of topics while lecturers choose presenting materials based on topic. Moreover, lecturers do not connect materials to local values or culture of people in South Sulawesi whereas the study program vision and mission entrust the study of English language education integrates Islamic and cultural values. Finally, lecturers do not connect both language components and language aspects to learning English.

2. Students' Perception on the Implementation of the INQF Curriculum

Dealing with students' perception, the class A students perceive some of the items are difficult to implement namely item 35 (lecturers provide feedback on students test results) item 20 (lecturers do not allow students to work alone in completing assignments), item 19 (lecturers assign students to work on assignments in small groups) and Item 18 (lecturers use teaching strategies that encourage students to be active in using English in class and outside of class). Among them, item 18 is the most difficult one to agree on. This means that lecturers do not encourage students to actively use the English language by utilizing a suitable learning strategy whereas students cannot master the language if they do not practice it.

Table 4 Students' of Class A Perception of the Difficult Items of the INQF Curriculum Implementation

Aspect	Indicator	Item
Learning process Standard	Effective	18. Lecturers use teaching strategies that encourage students to be active in using English in class and outside of class
	Collaborative	19. lecturers assign students to work on assignments in small groups.
Evaluation standard	Assessment procedure	20. Lecturers do not allow students to work alone in completing assignments
		35. Lecturers provide feedback on student test results

Meanwhile, the class B students perceives three other items of indicators as hard to approve such as item 26 (lecturers carry out oral tests to assess student learning outcomes), item 19 (lecturers assign students to work on assignments in small groups), and item 20 (lecturers do not allow students to work individually in completing tasks). This fact means that according to the class of 2019 students, lecturers do not use oral tests for assessing students' learning outcomes, lecturers do not assign students to work in small groups, and lectures allow students to work on tasks individually.

Table 5 Students' of Class B Perception of the Difficult Items of the INQF Curriculum Implementation

Aspect	Indicator	Item
Learning process standard	Collaborative	19. Lecturers assign students to work on assignments in small groups.
		20. Lecturers do not allow students to work individually in completing assignments.

Evaluation standard	Assessment technique	26. Lecturers carry out written tests to assess student-learning outcomes.
---------------------	----------------------	--

On the other side, the class C students perceive six items of indicators of the learning process standard and evaluation process standard as hard to agree on. The tricky items are as follows: item 13 (lecturers relate teaching materials to problems in English learning in Indonesia), item 7 (lecturers connect teaching materials to the local culture of the people of South Sulawesi), item 15 (lecturers discuss the choice of theme with students), item 20 (lecturers do not allow students to work on task individually in completing assignments), item 38 (lecturers document learning outcomes), and item 39 (lecturers document the assessment process). These findings indicate that students perceive lecturers do not implement all these items of indicators above.

Table 6 Students' of Class C Perception of the Difficult Items of the INQF Curriculum Implementation

Aspect	Indicator	Item
Learning process standard	Interactive	7. Lecturers connect the materials to the local culture of the people of South Sulawesi.
	Contextual Thematic	13. lecturers relate learning materials to problems in English learning in Indonesia)
		15. lecturers discuss the choice of theme with students
	Collaborative	20. Lecturers do not allow students to work on task individually in completing assignments
Evaluation standard		36. Lecturers document the assessment process.

While students of the three classes have a different perceptions of the tricky items to agree on, they agree on one item, namely item 20 (lecturers do not allow students to work on tasks individually). The fact means that according to students of the three classes, lecturers do not encourage students to work in group as the curriculum recommend. In the current research context, lecturers and students have the same perception that collaborative learning is hard to do by students for some reasons that have been previously explained. This finding is contrast to the one of (Simbolon et al., 2021) in English Language Education Study Program of Universitas Kristen Indonesia where students prefer group work and believe that involvement in task is a part of training to be a future teacher. Some previous studies prove that collaborative learning in EFL context has positive impact to the students' learning motivation improvement (Bećirović et al., 2022); improve students' language skill (Babiker, 2018) collaborative

skill, as well as sociolinguistic, discourse and communicative competence (Noviyenti, 2022), (Salma, 2020).

Table 7 Students' of Class A, B, and C Perception of the Easy Items of the INQF Curriculum Implementation

Aspect	Indicator	Item
Learning process standard	Collaborative	20. Lecturers do not allow students to work on task individually in completing assignments

Referring to easy items, the class A students perceive eight items easy to agree on such as item 1 (lecturers prepare RPS/lesson plan), item 4 (lecturers involve students in the learning process), item 9 teaching (lecturers link all language components in teaching English), item 15 (lecturers present learning materials based on themes), item 17 (lecturers use Referring to easy items, the 2020 students perceive eight items as easy to agree on, such as item 1 (lecturers prepare RPS/lesson plan), item 4 (lecturers involve students in the learning process), item 9 (lecturers link all language components in learning English), item 15 (lecturers present teaching materials based on themes), item 17 (lecturers use teaching strategies that improve students' understanding of English materials and competencies), item 22 (lecturers encourage students to use English inside and outside the classroom), item 24 (lecturers encourage students to access materials through various sources to encourage students to be independent learners), and item 25 (lecturers give assignments to read materials at home).

These results suggest that students agree that lecturers implement eight items that represent the learning process standard of the curriculum. The perception of the class A students those lecturers encourage students to use English actively inside and outside the classroom is in contrast to that of the class B students that show lecturers do not encourage students to use English inside and outside the classroom. Whereas the goal of English teaching and learning is to develop students' communicative abilities with English both orally and in written mode (Andini et al., 2020). This is the reason why government is concerned with the communicative competence in the English curriculum. Therefore, lecturers should play a role as models who can assist students in developing their English communicative competence.

In addition, the class B students also perceive some easy items to approve, namely item 1 (lecturer compiles RPS (lesson plan), item 15 (lecturers present learning materials based on themes), item 26 (lecturers give the assignment to assess student learning outcomes), and item 34 (lecturers carry out assessments according to the lecture contract). This fact means students believe that lecturers compile the lesson plan, and lecturers present learning materials based on themes/topics. Moreover, these findings also indicate that lecturers give an assessment as a technique to assess student-learning outcomes, and lecturers follow the assessment procedure, namely, assessing students' learning outcomes according to the lecture contract. Moreover, the class C of students also perceive some indicators are easy to agree on, such as item 1 (lecturers

compile RPS/lesson plan), item 4 (lecturers involve students to be active in the learning process), item 24 (lecturers encourage students to access material from various sources so that they become independent learners), item 26 (lecturers carry out written tests to assess student learning outcomes), item 28 (lecturers provide assignment tests to evaluate student learning outcomes), item 29 (lecturers assess student attitudes during the learning process), and item 30 (lecturers assess student personality during learning, and test content measures student knowledge).

The item that the three classes of students agree is item one (lectures compile the lesson plan). This means that students obviously believe that all lecturers have compiled their lesson plans. This also indicates that lecturers are well prepared to teach because they have designed their lesson plan. It seems that lecturers understand the benefits of lessons plans as (Iqbal et al., 2021) argue that enhancing teaching and learning capacity requires lesson plans. Making a lesson plan also allows teachers to organize and deliver lessons efficiently within the allowed time (Rashad et al., 2018); (Emiliasari & Jubaedah, 2019). In the curriculum, compiling lesson plans is an indicator of the learning plan, therefore all institutions have trained all lecturers of IAIN Parepare to have a good competency in compiling a good lesson plan.

Table 5 Students’ Perception of the Difficult Items of the INQF Curriculum Implementation

Aspect	Indicator	Item
Learning plan	Compiling lesson plan	16. Lecturers compile RPS/lesson plans
		17. Lecturers discuss the contents of RPS/lesson plans with students
Learning process standard	Interactive	2. Lecturers involve students in the learning process)
	Scientific	2. Lecturers use teaching methods that encourage students to be critical
	Effective	18. Lecturers use teaching strategies that improve students’ language understanding and language competency.

As has been discussed, students perceive that lecturer of the English education study program of IAIN Parepare have implemented the INQF curriculum in the learning plan, learning process, and evaluation. Lecturers also believe that they have implemented the curriculum even though they admit that some indicators of the curriculum are difficult to do. Lecturers argue that compiling lesson plans are easy, therefore they have been ready to teach. However, some indicators of the curriculum are hard to implement and this is caused by their inadequate knowledge of the curriculum.

Lecturers argue that there is not enough socialization on the curriculum implementation. That less socialization affects the knowledge of the curriculum is commonly found in studies of curriculum implementation (Adiantika, 2021), (Oviyanti et al., 2020), & (Mitra & Purnawarman, 2019).

Other research also found that relating to institutional factor, no evaluation, no needs assessment, and top-down leadership approach are some barriers to the successful curriculum implementation (Poedjiastutie et al., 2018). Therefore, to achieve the best implementation of any curriculum, there should be an initiative of institution to always do evaluation, assessment, and change the institutional leadership management into down-top to provide good support for well-implemented curriculum. According to (Karakuş, 2021), curriculum implementation problems should be holistically evaluated; this means that evaluation should focus on all the elements of the curriculum implementation, such as teachers, students, curriculum, and schools. Also, good interaction between institution, teachers, and students will likely guarantee the well implementation of curriculum.

19. Causes of the Problems on the Implementation of the INQF Curriculum

Based on the result of the interviews to the lecturers and FGD, it was found that lecturers, and institution cause the difficulties of the curriculum implementation. Dealing with the student factor, the problem is caused by the difficulty to implement one of the curriculum aspects, namely collaborative, in which students should work on assignments in groups, and therefore lecturers should not allow them to work individually. In the implementation, the aspect is hard to do since when lecturers assign teamwork, students are not active, do not cooperate, and do not have facilities like hand-phone and laptops, and most of them do not like group study. Virtual learning during the pandemic era also makes students difficult to meet to complete a task together sources another factor.

Concerning the problem of lecturers in connecting learning materials to the local culture of people, some lecturers argue that they do not understand the culture, while others have improper knowledge of the curriculum, so they think it does not assign them to connect teaching to local culture. Some lecturers argue that having less knowledge of the curriculum might be caused by less socialization by the institution.

Some researchers also argue that socialization is one of the keys to successful curriculum implementation (Oviyanti et al., 2020) Oviyanti. That less socialization affects the curriculum implementation is also shown in the research findings on the INQF curriculum implementation in the economics education study program of HKBP Nommensen University Medan (Simbolon et al., 2021). Other previous research findings also prove the urgency of socialization and teachers' (lecturers') understanding on the curriculum to the effectiveness of curriculum implementation (Adiantika, 2021), (Mitra & Purnawarman, 2019). These facts indicate that in order to achieve success in curriculum implementation, institution should conduct enough socialization to the lecturers, academic staffs, and students.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions, it is clear that the lecturers in the English Education Study Program of IAIN Pare have implemented the INQF curriculum in all stages; however, they find some problems in implementing some indicators, such as

holistic, integrative, collaborative, assessment procedure, effective, and assessment technique. Concerning the holistic indicator, the item that is tricky to implement is relating materials to the local culture of people; while dealing with integrative, the difficult ones are connecting materials to the language components and connecting materials to the language aspects. In the collaborative indicator, the tricky ones are not allowing students to work on assignments individually and assigning students to do tasks in small groups. Lecturers also do not follow the assessment procedure because they do not give feedback to students' works, not effective because they do not use learning strategies that encourage students to be able to use English inside and outside the classroom, and do not follow assessment technique such as conducting oral tests to assess student learning outcomes. In addition, the study found some causes of the problems in the curriculum implementation; the problems were sourced from students, lecturers, and institutional factors. Therefore, there should be some actions to overcome the problems, such as providing an opportunity for all lecturers to attend training for their knowledge and pedagogic quality improvement and encouraging students to be active and critical. Next, the institution should support the curriculum implementation by conducting more socialization of each new curriculum to students, lecturers, and other parties in the university.

REFERENCES

- Adiantika, H. N., Charisma, D., Aprianti, F., & Winarto, E. R. (2021). Indonesian 2013 Curriculum Implementation: Teachers' Techniques, Challenges, and Voices towards Students' Affective Competence. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 7(1), 33-42. <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/article/view/3988>
- Andini, T. N., Eun, L. Y., Khramova, A., & Žok, A. (2020). ELT comparison: increasing students speaking ability in Indonesia, South Korea, Russia, and Poland. *English Language in Focus (ELIF)*, 2(2), 131-140. <https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/ELIF/article/view/6078>
- Apsari, Y. (2018). Teachers' Problems and Solutions in Implementing Curriculum 2013. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture*, 3(1), 11-23.
- Attardo, & Raskin, V. (1991). Script Theory Revisited: Joke Similarity and Joke Representation Model. *HUMOR: International Journal of Humor Research*, 30/4(293-347).
- Babiker, A. (2018). Improving speaking skills in EFL classes through collaborative learning. *American Scientific Research Journal for Engineering, Technology, and Sciences (ASRJETS)*, 44(1), 137-154.
- Bin-Hady, W. R. A., & Abdulsafi, A. S. T. (2019). How can i prepare an ideal lesson-plan. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 7(4). <http://ijee.org/assets/docs/22wazdi.28065943.pdf>
- Darmana, A., Sutiani, A., Nasution, H. A., Ismanisa, I., & Nurhaswinda, N. (2021). Analysis of RASCH model for the validation of chemistry national exam instruments. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Indonesia*, 9(3), 329-345. <https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/JPSI/article/view/19618/14027>

- Direktorat Pendidikan Tinggi Keagamaan Islam Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Islam Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2018). Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum PTKI Mengacu pada KKNI dan SN-Dikti.
- Digdowniseiso, K. (2020). The Development of Higher Education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9(2). <http://repository.unas.ac.id/564/>
- Emiliasari, R. N. (2019). Lesson planning in EFL classroom: A case study in lesson plan preparation and implementation. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 3(2), 367-375. <https://wej.unwir.ac.id/index.php/wej/article/view/67>
- Fitriani, I., Kalsum, K., & Sardi, A. (2024). THE STUDENTS' MOTIVATION IN STUDYING ENGLISH AT SMPN 5 LEMBANG PINRANG. *English Language, Linguistics, and Culture International Journal*, 4(1), 18-34.
- Hidayah, S. N., Martani, W., & Supartono, W. (2021). Accommodating Stakeholders' Voices in the Curriculum Development in an Indonesian Higher Education Institution. *JURNAL EDUCATIVE: Journal of Educational Studies*, 6(1), 18-31.
- Iqbal, M. H., Siddiqie, S. A., & Mazid, M. A. (2021). Rethinking theories of lesson plan for effective teaching and learning. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 4(1), 100172. <https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/>
- Irawan, L. A., Frank, T. O., & Dehghani, S. (2022). Developing an ELT Instructional Model for Vocational High Schools Students at Tourism Zones. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 2(1), 1-11. <https://journal-center.litpam.com/index.php/jolls/article/view/669/514>
- Isadaud, D., Fikri, M. D., & Bukhari, M. I. (2022). The Urgency Of English In The Curriculum In Indonesia To Prepare Human Resources For Global Competitiveness. *DIAJAR: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 1(1), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.54259/diajar.v1i1.177>
- Karakus, G. (2021). A Literary Review on Curriculum Implementation Problems. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 2021, 9.3: 201-220. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1300927.pdf>
- Mitra, D., & Purnawarman, P. (2019). Teachers' Perception Related to the Implementation of Curriculum 2013. *Indonesian Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology Studies*, 7(1), 44-52. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcets.v7i1.27564>
- Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Prasojo, L. D., Idi, A., & Hamidah, A. (2019). Curriculum reform in Indonesia: Moving from an exclusive to inclusive curriculum. *CEPS Journal*, 9(2), 53-72. https://www.pedocs.de/frontdoor.php?source_opus=17442
- Neliwati, N., Marbun, D., & Mahariah, M. (2019). The Implementation of Curriculum Based Indonesian National Qualification Framework (KKNI) in Islamic Education Study Program at the Islamic Higher Education in Medan. *International Journal on Language, Research and Education Studies*, 3(1), 71-84. <http://jurnal.uinsu.ac.id/index.php/ijlres/article/view/3184>
- Noviyenty, L, et al. (2022). English Speaking Lecturers' Performances of Communication Strategies and Their Efforts to Improve Students' Communicative Competence. *European journal of educational research*, 11(2), 1047-1062. <http://repository.iaincurup.ac.id/1055/1/the%20artikel.pdf>
- Oviyanti, F., et.al. (2020). The Evaluation of National Qualification Framework Curriculum (KKNI) at UIN Raden Fatah Palembang. *Jurnal Ta'dib*, Vol 23 (2),

2020.
<https://ojs.iainbatusangkar.ac.id/ojs/index.php/takdib/article/view/2038/1827>
- Pajarwati, D., Mardiah, H., Harahap, R. P., Siagian, R. O., & Ihsan, M. T. (2021). Curriculum Reform In Indonesia: English Education Toward The Global Competitiveness. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review*, 1(1), 28-36. <https://etdci.org/journal/ijrer/article/view/51/85>
- Pratama, D., & Husnayaini, I. (2020). Applying Rasch Model to Measure Students` Reading Comprehension. *JISAE: Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation*, 6(2), 203 - 209. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jisae.v6i2.14920>
- Prihananto, N. (2021). Communicative approach in the five curricula of English subject for secondary schools: A paradox in English language teaching in Indonesia. *ScienceOpen Preprints*. <https://proceeding.unikal.ac.id/index.php/nspbi/article/view/248>
- Poejiastutie, D., Amrin, Z. A., & Setiawan, Y. (2018a). English communication competence: Expectations and challenges (a case in Indonesia). *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(6), 184-191. <https://eprints.umm.ac.id/60578/>
- Poedjiastutie, D., Akhyar, F., Hidayati, D., & Nurul Gasmi, F. (2018b). Does curriculum help students to develop their English competence? A case in Indonesia. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, 9. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3201937 for Arabic and English, 3(2), 169-174. <https://ejournal.iainkendari.ac.id/index.php/langkawi/article/view/587/581>
- Sabekti, A. W., & Khoirunnisa, F. (2018). Penggunaan rasch model untuk mengembangkan instrumen pengukuran kemampuan berikir kritis siswa pada topik ikatan kimia. *Jurnal Zarah*, 6(2), 68-75. <https://ojs.umrah.ac.id/index.php/zarah/article/view/724>
- Salma, N. (2020). Collaborative learning: An effective approach to promote language development. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 7(2), 57-61. <http://eprints.tiu.edu.iq/633/>
- Sardi, A., Haryanto, A., & Weda, S. (2017). The Distinct types of diction used by the efl teachers in the classroom interaction. *International Journal Of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 6(3), 1061-1066.
- Sardi, A., & Mujahidah, M. (2020). Could I Be Illogical. *Cibi Guide) For Non-Native Speaker*.
- Sibarani, B. E. (2021). The Influence of Curriculum Based on the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework (KKNI) on the Quality of Student Learning (Studies on Students at the State University of Medan). *Aptisi Transactions on Technopreneurship (ATT)*, 3(2), 171-180. <https://att.aptisi.or.id/index.php/att/article/view/179>
- Sihombing, R. U., Naga, D.S., & Rahayu, W. (2019). A Rasch Model Measurement Analysis on Science Literacy Test of Indonesian Students: Smart Way to Improve the Learning Assessment. *IJER - Indonesian Journal of Educational Review*, 6(1). Retrieved from <https://journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/ijer/article/view/12588>
- Simbolon, B. R., Sinaga, D., & Naibaho, L. (2021). Students Perception on the Implementation of Higher-Educational Curriculum Based on Indonesian Qualification Framework at Postgraduate Program Universitas Kristen Indonesia.

- Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 560, 196-201.
<https://download.atlantispress.com>
- Sofiana, N., Mubarak, H., & Yuliasri, I. (2019). English Language Teaching in Secondary Schools: An Analysis of the Implementation of Indonesian ELT 2013 Curriculum. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1533-1544.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1201318.pdf>
- Sukmayadi, V., & Yahya, A. (2020). Indonesian Education Landscape and the 21st Century Challenges. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 11(4), 219-234. <http://openurl.learntechlib.org>
- Susiati, S., Exaputri, A. Y., & Santriane, A. (2019, November). Teaching Materials in ELT for Future Employment: What are Appropriate?. In *Proceeding of The Progressive and Fun Education International Conference* (Vol. 2, pp. 57-69). <http://repository.profunedu.id/index.php/proceeding/article/view/60>
- Wati, M., Mahtari, S., Hartini, S. & Amelia, H. (2019). *A Rasch Model Analysis on Junior High School Students' Scientific Reasoning Ability*. International Association of Online Engineering. Retrieved February 13, 2023 from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/216516/>.
- Yuwono, U. (2019). Ideologies underpinning the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (IQF) for higher education website text. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 668-677.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8233/28140dc4a819e83e4b9a3713e179f561d0f0.pdf>