OBE: *OBAT BATUK ENAK* OR OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION?

Ariatna
Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni
Universitas Negeri Medan

Abstract

As a result of English globalization and commercialization, the past three decades have seen rapid changes in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) around the globe. While some English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) nations are satisfied with the adoption of a traditional teacher-centered approach in their English language curriculum, others have opted for a more innovative student-centered approach in an attempt to produce communicatively competent graduates in their countries. Of all the existing student-centered approaches, one approach that has received increasing attention in many EFL/ESL countries is outcome-based education (hereinafter referred to as OBE). As an innovative model of pedagogy, this approach focuses on student learning outcomes which can be measured through what students know and what they can actually do upon completion of a course. This article provides an overview of the basic concepts of OBE and how it has developed across instructional contexts. To provide an objective perspective, the merits and downsides of OBE are also discussed along with some implementational possibilities and challenges. At the end of the paper, some educational considerations are offered.

Kata kunci: Outcome-based education; learning outcomes; student assessment

1. Introduction

As a global language, English plays a crucial role in all walks of life. From conventional offices to online markets, people speak English to communicate with each other. In other settings, English is widely used in formal writing and texts. In short, if people want to succeed in a particular field, English mastery is a must. In the ESL/EFL contexts, this is what Aziz (2003) called a gate-keeping function. This notion holds that English acts as a gate that will stop people from entering unless they have a key to the gate. For school graduates, this means that if they are not competent in English language they will not be able to compete with others both in the

educational and professional sectors (Sadtono, 2004).

As with many other EFL Asian countries such as China, Vietnam, and Korea (Nunan, 2003; Littlewood, 2007), Indonesian schools have been criticized for their failure in producing communicatively competent users. Quinn's (1975) and Dardjowijojo's (1996; as cited in Nur, 2004) studies, for example, showed that the majority of Indonesian secondary graduates were not able to function effectively in English despite years of instruction. This finding was corroborated by English First's finding (2022) which ranked Indonesia in the 80th place out of 112 ESL/EFL countries in terms of English Proficiency Index (EPI). The Indonesian graduates' low command of English language is often attributed to the adoption of traditional form-focused instruction which mainly focuses on grammatical rules and thus neglects the important use of the target language in the classroom. In these teacher-fronted language classrooms, the teacher talks most of the time and the students become good listeners with little or no chance to express their ideas in English. As a result, students are only taught in English grammar and have problems when communicating in the language.

In response to the low level of student competence in English, policy makers in ESL/EFL countries have attempted to improve English language teaching in their countries by reviewing their school practices and adopting new approaches which can make their students perform better in English. One of the many approaches that is increasingly adopted by educational authorities to boost student language performance is outcome-based approach. For countries which have opted to incorporate an outcome-based approach into their curricula such as Malaysia, India and Hong Kong, this approach represents a paradigm shift from teacher-focused to student-focused activities (Tam, 2014). It is believed that communicative competence cannot be achieved by students unless they are given opportunities to try using the language in the classroom. Language proficiency is measured by what the students can actually do with the language. Knowing a language is important but being able to use the language is more important.

In the following paragraphs, I will discuss the conceptual framework of outcome-based education and explore its positive and negative features to illustrate how this model of learning is interpreted at the level of theory.

2. Discussion

2.1 What is outcome-based education (OBE)?

The term outcome-based education was coined by an educational psychologist and sociologist, William G. Spady, to refer to a model of education which is based on activities of "clearly focusing and organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for all students to be able to do successfully at the end of their learning experiences" (Spady, 1994, p. 1). In Spady's view, student learning experiences should result in clear observable measurable learning gains or what he called 'learning outcomes'. These learning outcomes are demonstrated in the form of tangible actions rather than intangible concepts. At the end of their study, students should have developed the ability to apply what they have learned in the classroom. There is little point in learning about something if students cannot put their knowledge into action. In the simplest terms, OBE enables students to do things with what they already know. Thus, learning outcomes should be articulated using observable action verbs such as do, perform, design, create, etc. rather than non-action verbs such as know, understand, believe, think, etc.

As with other new approaches to education, OBE did not appear on the educational scene on its own but owed its existence to earlier theories and studies on educational objectives such as competency-based education (e.g. Franc, 1978), mastery learning (e.g. Bloom, 1973), and criterion-referenced assessment (Masters & Evans, 1986) (as cited in Killen, 2000). Lawson and Askell-Williams (2007) even argued that Spady's notion of outcome-based education originated from Tyler's (1950) system of curriculum design which holds that curriculum design starts with "specification of objectives followed by the selection and arrangement of learning experiences relevant to those objectives, and the evaluation of the extent to which the objectives had been met" (p. 5). For its supporters, OBE is often seen as a student-based learning model which represents a paradigm shift from dominant teacher's input to rich students' output. This change of viewpoints is described by Tam (2014) as follows:

> The traditional way of curriculum design, the teacher-centered approach focuses on the teacher's input and on assessment in terms of how well the students absorb the materials taught. A departure from this traditional paradigm is the

student-centered approach where the emphasis is on what the students are expected to be able to do at the end of the learning experience (p. 161).

As clearly stated above, OBE puts learners at the heart of instruction and this idea is in line with 'constructivism' (Mayer-Smith & Mitchell, 1997) which postulates that students construct their own learning during a study period with the teacher acting only as a facilitator. As such, learning outcomes are described in terms of what the students are capable of doing and performing when they have completed their study, not in terms of what the teacher does and gives to students in the course of their learning experience. For instance, one possible outcome for a Public Speaking subject might be 'at the end of this course, the students will develop an ability to speak in public for 7 minutes using eight different speech patterns: spatial, chronological, topical, cause and effect, problem-solution, value, BLUF, and symposium". The outcome of this subject involves the act of speaking in public rather than just knowing the different types of speech patterns. Another example of a learning outcome might say 'upon completion of this in Educational Content Creator course, the students will

be able to create two teaching materials for each of the three digital applications: picture-editing, video-making, and screen-casting". The outcome suggests that to succeed in this subject, the students must demonstrate the ability to create teaching content instead of merely understanding the manuals (How-to-Dos) of particular digital applications.

So far, have seen that learning outcomes are the driving factors of OBE. But what is it that makes OBE actually different from traditional forms of instruction? Spady (1994, pp. 6-7) argued that the differences lie in four major features: 1) *Outcome-based systems build everything on a clearly defined framework of exit outcomes:* in contrast to traditional education practices where learning outcomes are not clearly identified for students in their systems, OBE ensures that curriculum, implementational strategies, and assessment are integrated and devised in line with the target outcomes. 2) *Time in an outcome-based system is used as an alterable resource, depending on the needs of teachers and students*: In OBE, there is flexibility for teachers to adjust their teaching time to suit students' needs. In traditional systems, however, a teaching timetable is treated as a fixed study pattern where students must learn and finish their course in a timely manner

without the possibility to reschedule. 3) *In an outcome-based system, standards are clearly defined, known, and "criterion-based" for all students*: Outcome-based educational systems provide equal opportunities for all students to receive recognition for what they have achieved in a particular area. This is different from the traditional school practices where standards are defined in terms of comparison/competition; i.e. only the best achievers deserve access to special parts of the educational system. In the simplest terms, in OBE all students have equal opportunities to be successful in their learning. 4) *Outcome-based systems focus on increasing students learning and ultimate performance abilities to the highest possible levels before they leave school*: While in traditional systems student learning is assessed on how much they know about something usually through paper-based examinations, in OBE students are evaluated on the basis of what they can actually do in a particular area of knowledge. To quote Killen (2000); "assessment of student learning should focus on how well students understand rather than on how much they understand" (p. 9).

In his book, *Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers*, Spady (1994) further pointed out that the four distinctive characteristics of OBE mentioned above are premised upon three essential tenets: 1) *All students can learn and succeed, but not all in the same time or in the same way*. Students learn at different rates; some students are high achievers while others are low achievers. Nevertheless, if we give them ample opportunities, all students can attain high academic standards. 2) *Successful learning promotes even more successful learning*. Mistakes constitute an essential part of the learning process as they serve as a stepping stone to a better learning performance. And when students successfully perform something successfully in their learning experience, their confidence increases and it motivates them to be prepared for dealing with other learning issues. 3) *Schools (and teachers) control the conditions that determine whether or not students are successful at school learning*. All students are basically talented and administrators/teachers need to find ways to facilitate and develop their students' talent through effective learning. This can be achieved by providing detailed specification of the learning outcomes as well as giving freedom to teachers to decide appropriate content, approaches and evaluation. (p. 3).

Because outcomes should be described in terms of what students are

capable of doing/producing at the end of a learning experience, Tam (2014) recommended that language educators consider three important things when developing a particular course for students: 1) *define clear measurable learning outcomes*: the word 'measurable' means that an activity should be able to be clearly measured or quantified. An outcome like 'at the end of this semester, the students will be able to speak in public' is too broad and requires further specification and quantification (e.g. the students will be able to speak in public for 7 minutes using eight different speech patterns). 2) *design activities that will help students achieve the designated learning outcomes*: In the context of the public speaking subject, this can be done, for example, by crafting mini-seminar activities or focused group discussions in the classroom where students have ample opportunities to practice giving a talk on eight speech topics in front of their peers. Prior to students' presentation, the teacher can provide modelling. Scaffolding and feedback can follow modelling to support the students' performance. 3) *assess whether or not the students have learned successfully*: Educators can devise a relevant checklist or modify an established speaking rubric to suit local assessment. To assess a public speaking performance, for

instance, language practitioners might refer to Toastmaters's (2016) evaluation scheme. In short, OBE planning requires "effective alignment between outcomes, the content of teaching, teaching methods and procedures used in assessment" (Lawson and Askell-Williams, 2007). This alignment at all phases of teaching, learning and assessment activities is consistent with the notion of 'constructive alignment' advocated by earlier educational authors such as Cohen (1987) and Biggs (2003).

2.2 Advantages and disadvantages

It is widely acknowledged that when a teaching innovation is introduced in a particular instructional context, it will be met with both acceptance and resistance (McArthur, 1983). This is also the case with OBE. According to Ewell (2008), those who welcome the introduction of OBE are usually attracted to its four positive features: clarity, flexibility, comparison, portability. *Clarity* means that the nature of OBE which clearly specifies learning outcomes will make stakeholders understand what is required of them in the system. For example, students will understand about what to do at the end of their learning experience; teachers will understand how to facilitate student learning to achieve

the target outcomes. Similarly, companies and educational authorities will be informed about the competencies acquired by graduates in a particular profession or field of study. *Flexibility* refers to the degree of freedom given to teachers to use any means necessary to achieve the exit outcomes. Although the course learning outcomes are determined at the beginning of an education experience, there is no prescriptive method or approach that teachers must follow in teaching their students at the level of implementation. Teachers are free to use and experiment with different ideas and technologies as long as the intended outcomes can be achieved. This flexibility also means that different learning styles that students have can be accommodated through the use of various teaching strategies and media. *Comparison* has to do with the extent to which the outcome-based standards can be used as a point of reference to compare one school with another or even one group of students with another. Given the clear and measurable nature of OBE standards, comparative evaluations can be easily done across instructional contexts. The data collected from a comparative study might benefit principals, teachers, course owners and other stakeholders in terms of school accreditation, teacher certification, and

course improvements. *Portability* is related to the degree to which students can easily transfer their earned credits in one outcome-based program to another outcome-based program. Schools or universities operating under the outcome-based curriculum framework will have similar criteria for student achievement in a particular subject, thus making it easier for students to transfer their study credits across institutional settings. The portability also means that in this era of increased mobility, OBE provides much room for domestic and international student exchange programs to take place.

While many educators support OBE, "it should be acknowledged that not all educators are in favour of OBE" (Killen, 2000, p. 4). Detractors of OBE often criticize this model of education as being of little worth both at the level of theory and practice. Ewell (2008) summarized that the criticisms toward OBE are directed at four key areas: definition, legitimacy, fractionation, and serendipity. *Definition* refers to the idea that the specification of learning outcomes in a course or a country is often context-based making it difficult to be applied to other instructional settings. For instance, the learning outcomes for a Public Speaking subject in an Indonesian university might be different from those of an American university; course

designers in a developed country might formulate different learning outcomes for a Digital Educational Content Creator subject compared to their counterparts in a less developed country. There are also people who question the objectivity of learning outcomes by saying that learning outcomes are interests-biased or serve only the interests of the policy makers. In response to this, Killen (2000) argued that the objectivity of learning outcomes does not rely on who crafted them, instead it is contingent upon how important and significant the learning outcomes are for student learning. If the learning outcomes are devised in line with the established key competencies that the students need upon completion of their learning experience, then the outcomes are of value or importance for the students.

Legitimacy is the second issue that some commentators of OBE have brought to attention. They argued that learning outcome statements fail to cover the broad aspects of learning as they focus only on measurable things that students can do where actually there is more for students to learn at the end of their learning experience than just performing a number of observable actions. For this reason, OBE's conceptualization of student learning is deemed illegitimate for violating widely acknowledged learning standards. In a similar vein, McKernan (1993) contended that OBE is problematic because it is difficult or impossible to formulate appropriate outcomes for students given the complexity of learning. Killen (2000), however, has made a different stance on this matter by pointing out the possibility of drawing up learning outcomes:

> OBE supporters argue that it is always possible, but not always easy, to specify appropriate outcomes. Further, they suggest that the specificity of outcomes will depend on the scope of the curriculum that is being described. If it represents the total school curriculum, an outcome such as "skills in problem solving and decision making" might be reasonable; whereas a curriculum for a subject such as Computer Studies might have an outcome such as "summarise the steps involved in producing a solution to a problem". At the level of an individual lesson, the outcome would become more specific, such as "use a spreadsheet to develop a what-if scenario to generate possible solutions to a financial problem" (pp. 8-9)

Another area that has been frowned upon by OBE critics is *fractionation or* the practice of dividing student learning into discrete smaller units of competence. When fractionation is implemented, it may result in

incomplete assessment of student learning because student learning should be defined and evaluated in terms of holistic skill components. OBE assesses only few particular areas of student progress and neglects other important areas of development. In reply to this statement, Killen (2000) argued that OBE actually provides a comprehensive way of assessing student learning by taking short-term outcomes (subject-related outcomes) and long-term outcomes (key competencies-related outcomes) into consideration. In order to achieve a complete assessment of student learning, Killen further suggested that teachers must assess students' progress on a regular and transparent basis.

The last drawback of OBE which has often been denounced by OBE opponents is its restricted *serendipity*. This is related to the nature of outcome-based education where learning outcomes are determined prior to the commencement of a course. When course learning outcomes are specified in advance, there is likelihood that students will miss the chance of experiencing unexpected valuable lessons that may take place during their learning activities. In the simplest terms, pre-decided outcomes put student learning in confinement with little or no opportunity to learn other beneficial things. Similarly,

Killen (2000) pointed to the fact that some teachers opposed the notion of pre-determined outcomes because it kills their innovation and creativity. Nevertheless, this is not the view that Killen shared. He further argued that the opposite is actually true: "the goal of having all students succeed in achieving a set of meaningful learning outcomes implies that teachers must be innovative and creative in order to develop ways of helping students to achieve that goal" (p. 10).

As shown above, the emergence of OBE as a new approach to education has generated both support and disapproval from language educators and researchers. Despite the controversy, however, the rich discussions about the adoption of OBE among educational experts was a blessing in disguise for teaching practitioners. The strengths and weaknesses of OBE generated from the ongoing debates provide teaching practitioners with balanced insights into how the tenets of OBE can be best implemented in their instructional contexts. In the next section, we will see the implementation of OBE in different instructional contexts.

2.3 OBE in action

Although the benefits of OBE might be well-acknowledged by teachers

at the theoretical level, it is not always easy to put its theories into action. When it comes to application, instructional design may vary from context to context depending on local interpretation and policy. In their discussion on the implementation of outcome-based education in Australia, for instance, Lawson and Askell-Williams (2007) provide a useful comment on how the faces of outcome-based education might change at the practical level:

> Outcomes-based education is not a single idea or set of procedures. Rather outcomes-based education is like democracy – there are many different versions practised in different ways in different places, all with the label outcomes-based education. Examination of the different curriculum frameworks in the Australian States and Territories shows this to be the case, for all show some influence of principles of outcomes-based education. Like democracy, there are family resemblances between these different versions of outcomes-based education, which makes it possible to comment on their similarities and differences (p. 3)

Lawson and Askell-Williams go on to say that in Australia, OBE is practiced in two major ways: lower-case outcome-based education (obe) and upper-case outcome-based education (OBE). By lower-case, they refer to the condition in which the application of OBE has been blended with local curriculum design (a mixed-design OBE). Whereas upper-case OBE refers to a version of OBE advanced by Spady (1994) (a pure OBE). Another difference between the lower-case and upper-case also lies in what the students need to master at the end of their learning experiences. The lower-case OBE gives importance to mastery of subject-specific and cross-discipline outcomes (short-term or traditional/transitional OBE) while the upper-case OBE puts an emphasis on mastery of cross-curricular outcomes and future life roles (long-term or transformational OBE) (Willis & Kissane, 1995).

In the Australian context, as Lawson and Askell-Williams (2007) further pointed out, local teachers experience a number of implementational obstacles which include the vague nature of outcomes, workload, assessment procedures, student learning process, practicality of individual progression, etc. Louden et al. (2007), for instance, reported that local teachers had problems translating broad outcome statements into classroom practices. In the same vien, Andrich (2006) cited local teachers' concern about increased workload associated with the need to assess learning outcomes and the time-

consuming obligation to provide formal reports about students' progress. With regard to the extra work that teachers need to invest in managing OBE, Jansen (1998) commented:

> To manage this innovation teachers will be required to reorganise the curriculum, increase the amount of time allocated to monitoring individual student progress against outcomes, administer appropriate forms of assessment and maintain comprehensive records" (p. 67).

Furthermore, as evident in Tognolini's (2006) report, there is an issue of limited assessment support for teachers as to how learning outcomes should be formatively and summatively evaluated. In spite of the existing local constraints encountered by local teachers, Lawson and Askell-Williams (2007) suggest that OBE offers educational merits that the teaching profession can benefit from. Examples of such merits include the viability of the 'designing back' principle in curriculum design, educational coherence as a result of constructive alignment, shared responsibility for attaining agreed outcomes, etc. As such, problems surrounding the implementation of OBE in Australian schools should not be seen as educational mistakes, rather they

should be viewed as 'a source of reflections' with which teachers can contemplate on their practices for teaching improvements in the future.

As with Australia, the introduction of OBE in Malaysia is also subject to local barriers. In a recent study involving vocational school teachers and administrators, Damit et al. (2021) found that "the challenges that hinder OBE implementation in Vocational Colleges are the workload of teachers, poor curriculum implementation, unstable system implementation, and lack of administrator support" (p. 198). The implementation of OBE in Malaysian Vocational Colleges means that a new teaching and learning system is put into effect and the old educational system is abandoned. As such, teachers were required to do additional work in teaching, assessing and reporting to make the innovation successful; not to mention the meetings and conferences they needed to attend to discuss related issues and upgrade their skills. Those who were not ready for this change found the new instructional design burdensome. The research findings also revealed that local teachers had a low level of understanding of what OBE is and what it really involves. As a result, they were unable to meet the teaching, learning and assessment standards required by OBE.

For instance, there was no uniformity in the way teachers assessed their students' achievement of particular learning outcomes (i.e. different teachers used different assessment methods). Another issue that makes the implementation of OBE problematic was the fact that local teachers were faced with the constantly changing policies in OBE instructional design. Some teachers, for example, reported that frequent changes in vocational curriculum made them and their students confused and this sudden notice had badly disrupted the ongoing teaching and learning process. What made things more complicated was the inadequate support provided by administrators in monitoring the implementation of OBE in Vocational Colleges. Local teachers, for instance, expressed concern about the absence of monitoring activities in their school. Some other teachers also described the inadequate support in terms of limited funding and equipment. At the end of their report, however, Damit et al. (2021) asserted that they should be treated as 'valuable feedback' on how things can be improved in the future and that teachers and administrators should work collaboratively to support the outcome-based innovation in their institution.

Despite the contextual constraints of OBE implementation mentioned above, some educational scholars in other parts of the world cited successful implementation of OBE in their country. Commenting on the results of their quantitative study in the Philippines, Custodio et al. (2019) for example stated:

> The implementation of outcome-based education in the University promoted and enhanced students' acquisition of relevant subject knowledge, critical and problem solving skills as well as moral and ethical values. OBE ensured that learning outcomes are relevant and attainable and drives curriculum design, program delivery in terms of the adoption of more student-centered teaching strategies and the use of balanced assessment (p. 37).

Similarly, Dai et al. (2017) after conducting an experimental study in Macau (China), reported that students who experienced outcome-based education performed better than non-OBE students in terms of their learning effectiveness, especially problem-solving ability.

2.4 OBE in Indonesia

The origin of outcome-based education in Indonesia can be traced back to 2004 when Competency-Based Curriculum (hereinafter referred to as CBC) was introduced by the Indonesian Ministry of Education. As a successor to

the previous curriculum, CBC represented a curricular move from content-based learning to competency-based learning with two important changes: 1) teacher's role as a facilitator and co-communicator rather than as a transmitter and an authority in the classroom, and 2) focused assessment in three key areas: cognitive knowledge, practical skills and social attitude. In practice, CBC specified a number of competencies (i.e. main competencies, supporting competencies, and other competencies) that students needed to achieve at the end of their learning experiences. Although CBC was aimed at developing students' core competencies in particular subjects, it was not directed at integrating school education with professional career. To fill the gap between student learning and student employment, in 2012 the Indonesian government devised *Kerangka Kerja Nasional Indonesia* or hereinafter referred to as KKNI (National Qualification Framework). Tuck (2007) defined qualification framework as a structure for classifying competencies based on established levels of education. KKNI is comprised of nine levels of qualifications ranging from operator and analyst levels to expert and specialist levels. In the following year, 2013, the Indonesian Ministry of Education

officially announced the adoption of KKNI-based curriculum. This marked the beginning of the OBE era in Indonesia with a 'backward design' approach acting as the operating principle in curriculum development. Spady (1994) used the term 'designing back' to refer to the need for teachers to decide teaching content, methods and assessment procedures based on the learning outcomes specified in advance. In KKNI, a backward design approach was implemented in elementary and secondary schools by formulating thematic content with scientific learning methods whereas the learning content of the higher education was developed in line with the agreed demands of the job markets (i.e. in terms of learning outcome statements). In its developments, KKNI curriculum was divided into two types: CBC-KKNI curriculum (used prior to 2019) and OBE-KKNI curriculum (used from 2020 onwards). As the names suggest, the difference lies in the underlying principles under which each curriculum operated. For the sake of clarity, our focus in this paper is confined only on the 2020 version of KKNI or commonly called the new KKNI curriculum.

Despite the government's effort to integrate student learning with job opportunities, research has shown that the implementation of the OBE-KKNI

curriculum is problematic in a number of significant ways. In a recent study involving 42 lecturers from Indonesian public and Islamic universities, for example, Solikhah (2022) found that the issues surrounding the implementation of OBE-KKNI in Indonesia included lack of specification in the curriculum (i.e. the OBE-KKNI curriculum did not properly specify how courses are distributed throughout semesters), limited dissemination of information from government (i.e. lecturers and faculty members were not aware of the shift in orientation from CBC-KKNI to OBE-KKNI curriculum), low level of comprehension (i.e. there was a lack of understanding among local lecturers about how to formulate learning outcomes at the course level), etc. The confusion among language practitioners regarding the implementation of OBE-KKNI, as Solikhah further argued, was worsened by the fact that early this year the government introduced the so-called *Merdeka Belajar* or Freedom to Learn Curriculum. This newly-adopted curriculum, which gave students freedom to study off-campus (e.g. doing apprenticeship in a company/institution or studying in another university outside of their home university), left local lecturers and administrators with new challenges such as course conversion,

semester credit units, student journal publication, and thesis writing equivalence.

2.5 Where do we go from here?

In his theory of diffusion of innovations, Rogers (2003) pointed out that the effectiveness of a curricular innovation should be evaluated against five important indicators: 1) Relative advantage: the extent to which an educational reform is seen by users as having merits, 2) compatibility: the degree to which a teaching innovation is congenial to the existing instructional methods and beliefs, 3) complexity: the extent to which an innovative approach is easy to grasp or implement, 4) trialability: the degree to which a curricular reform can be tried out prior to full adoption, and 5) observability: the extent to which the results of an educational model can be seen by users or stakeholders. Rogers' evaluative model of an innovation is relevant to the context of OBE-KKNI curriculum implementation in Indonesia in the following ways:

No	Indicator	Educational implication	Practical consideration
1.	Relative advantage	The success of OBE in Indonesia will depend on 1)	The need to conduct a needs analysis and a

No.	Aspect		
		whether or not local teachers experience initial dissatisfaction with the existing teaching methods, and 2) whether or not they perceive OBE as offering new educational benefits which cannot be found in their previous teaching methods.	retrospective analysis (a tracer study) to identify both teacher's needs and learners' needs.
2.	Compatibility	It should be noted that before OBE was adopted, the so-called teacher-centered instruction has long been a dominant instructional paradigm in Indonesia. The substitution of local teacher-fronted practices with student-oriented practices is not an overnight task and thus requires time to implement.	The need to provide ongoing support in local schools from educational authorities (e.g. regular visits or expert mentoring).
3.	Complexity	As with other innovative models of education, OBE-KKNI is comprised of new abstract concepts at the theoretical level. If OBE is to be successfully implemented in Indonesia, local teachers need to be made clear about the complexity of OBE precepts and to be shown how these theories can be put into effect in the classroom.	The need to hold outcome-based preparation and professional development programmes for both pre-service and in-service teachers (e.g. introductory seminars, enrichment workshops, teaching practicum sessions, focused group discussions)
4.	Trialability	The implementation of OBE involves three important stages: formulating learning outcomes, developing relevant materials and methods to achieve the learning outcomes, and assessing students whether or not	The need to devise and distribute free samples of ready-to-teach syllabuses, manuals, assessment methods and other practical outcome-based resources for teachers

No.			
		they have achieved the exit outcomes. Providing teachers with a ready-made outcome-based syllabus or an outcome-based practical guide can be helpful as this will make them see that the innovation is doable.	
5.	Observability	There is little point in doing a curricular innovation if the results of the innovation are not visible to the practitioners and other people. The observability of OBE can be attained in two ways: 1) teachers are shown evidence of successful implementation of OBE, 2) teachers investigate and present their own practice. If teachers, as agents of change in the classroom, cannot see the relevance of OBE to their student learning improvements, they will be demotivated to support the innovation.	The need to provide teachers with free electronic access to international publications on OBE implementation; the need to offer educational grants to teachers to conduct or publish research in the area of OBE practices.

3. Conclusion

The emergence of OBE in the educational setting has sparked both praises and criticisms. Positive comments about OBE included its practicality and flexibility in meeting students' needs while negative comments about OBE revolved around its ambiguity and lack of legitimacy in conceptualising student learning. Despite the ongoing debates, efforts to introduce OBE as an innovative paradigm of education are increasing around the globe with both success and failure stories. This reminds us of the fact that given the unique characteristics of any instructional context, a reform in education requires collective endeavors among stakeholders (policy makers, school administrators, students and teachers). The introduction of a new curriculum should be followed by the provision of continuous support at lower level to avoid confusion and to optimize

intended results. Another thing that needs to be taken for granted is the fact that innovation takes time. There is no quick fix to an educational problem in a particular country. In this regard, Indonesia is no exception. OBE should not be regarded as *Obat Batuk Enak* (Delicious Cough Medicine) serving as a miracle cure to the existing educational 'diseases'. The implementation of OBE in Indonesia will not run as expected unless it is constantly monitored, evaluated and supported by its stakeholders.

References

Aziz, E. A. (2003). Indonesian English: what's del tuh?. *TEFLIN Journal*, *14*(1), 140-148.

Andrich, D. (2006). A report to the Curriculum Council of Western Australia regarding assessment for tertiary selection. https://www.researchgate.net/ profile/StephenHumphry/publicati on/237276918_A_report_to_the_ Curriulum_Council_of_Western_ Australia_regarding_assessment_f or_tertiary_selection/links/540d7e 0f0cf2d8daaacb207c/Areport-to-the-Curriculum Coun cil-of-Western-Australia-regarding-assessment-for-tertiary-selection.pdf

Biggs, J. (2003). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, *32*(3), 347-364.

Cohen, S.A. (1987). Instructional alignment: Searching for a magic bullet. *Educational Researcher*, *16*(8), 16-20.

Custodio, P. C., Espita, G. N., & Siy, L. C. (2019). The Implementation of Outcome-Based Education at a Philippine University. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *7*(4), 37-49.

Dai, H. N., Wei, W., Wang, H., & Wong, T. L. (2017, December). *Impact of outcome-based education on software engineering teaching: A case study* [Paper presentation]. IEEE 2017: Teaching, Assessment, and Learning for Engineering, Macau.

Damit, M. A. A., Omar, M. K., & Puad, M. H. M. (2021). Issues and challenges of outcome-based education (OBE) implementation among Malaysian vocational college teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in*

Business and Social Sciences, *11*(3), 197-211.

English First. (2022). *The world's largest ranking of countries and regions by English skills.* https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/

Ewell, P. (2008). *Building academic cultures of evidence: a perspective on learning outcomes in higher education* [Paper presentation]. The symposium of the Hong Kong University Grants Committee on Quality Education, Quality Outcomes, Hong Kong. https://www.mec.cuny.edu%2Fw pcontent%2Fuploads%2F2018%2 F01% FBuilding-Academic-Cultures-of-Evidence-Peter-Ewell present_peter.pdf &usg=AOvVaw1BtnfaAPhs16rK RYti7F2z

Jansen, J. D. (1998). Curriculum reform in South Africa: A critical analysis of outcomes-based education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *28*(3), 321-331.

Killen, R. (2000). Outcome-based education: Principles and possibilities. [Unpublished manuscript]. University of Newcastle.

Lawson, M. J., & Askell-Williams, H. (2007). *Outcomes-based education.* Adelaide: Centre for the Analysis of Educational Futures - Flinders University

Louden, W., Chapman, E., Clarke, S., Cullity, M., & House, H. (2007). *Evaluation of the curriculum improvement program phase 2.* Crawley: University of Western Australia.

Mayer-Smith, J. A., & Mitchell, I. J. (1997). Teaching about constructivism: Using approaches informed by constructivism. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building a world of new understandings* (pp. 129-153). London: The Falmer Press.

McArthur, T. (1983). *A foundation course for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKernan, J. (1993). Some Limitations of Outcome-Based Education. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *8*(4), 343-53.

Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40, 243–249.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region.

TESOL Quarterly, *37*(4), 589-613.

Nur, C. (2004). English language teaching in Indonesia: Changing policies and practical constraints. In H. W. Kam & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (pp. 178–186). Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press

Sadtono, E. (2004, December 1-3). *Is English on The Cross-Road in Indonesia*? [Paper presentation]. CLS 2004: Current Perspective and Future Directions in Foreign Language Studies, Singapore.

Solikhah, I. (2022). Revisiting the EFL curriculum in the outcome-based education framework and freedom to learn program. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, *13*(2), 243-264.

Spady, W. (1994). *Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers*. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators.

Tam, M. (2014). Outcomes-based approach to quality assessment and curriculum improvement in higher education. *Quality assurance in education*, *22*(2), 158-168.

Tuck, R. (2007). *An introductory guide to national qualifications frameworks: Conceptual and practical issues for policy makers*. International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---ifp_skills/documents/instructional material/wcms_103623.pdf

Toastmasters. (2016). *Evaluation form: Toastmasters international.* https://www.toastmasters.org%2FwebsiteApps%2FPathways%2Ftm100101_SCORM12_20151004%2Ftm100101%2Fresources%2F8101E%2520Evaluation%2520Resource.pdf&usg=AOvVaw3QiZ_k55-8BpzsxfTptic4

Tognolini, J. (2006). *Meeting the challenge of assessing in a standards-based education system.* Perth: Curriculum Council.

Willis, S., & Kissane, B. (1995). *Outcome-based education: A review of the literature*. Perth: Education Department of Western Australia.**2.1.1.1...dst.**