

Journal Profile

PREMISE: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

eISSN : 2442482X | pISSN : 20893345

[Education](#)

[Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro](#)



S3

Sinta Score



Indexed by GARUDA

13

H-Index

13

H5-Index

626

Citations


619

5 Year Citations

Volume 8 No. 2 Desember 2017

ISSN 2643-8824

p-ISSN 2643-8824



PREMISE

Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
STANISIA ATS IN PROGRAM

Address:

Metro

Email:

premise.editor@gmail.com

Phone:

072542445

Last Updated :

2022-05-09


2018

2019

2020

2021

2022



Search..



« 1 2 3 4 5 » »

Page 1 of 15 | Total Records : 149

Publications	Citation
<u>English language learning strategies: an exploratory study of management and engineering students</u> B Mandasari, L Oktaviani Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 7 (2), 61-78, 2018	42
<u>An analysis of figurative languages used in coelhos's novel entitled "Alchemist"</u> TD Harya Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 5 (2), 46-63, 2017	35
<u>Utilizing Grammarly in evaluating academic writing: A narrative research on EFL students' experience</u> M Nova Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 7 (1), 80-97, 2018	34
<u>Uncovering students' attitude toward vlogging activities in improving students' speaking ability</u> B Mandasari, D Aminatun Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 8 (2), 214-225, 2019	26
<u>SHORT STORY AS A MEDIA FOR MOTIVATING STUDENTS'IMPROVEMENT IN READING</u> DI Pratiwi, J Putri, A Suhadi Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 9 (1), 30-41, 2020	22
<u>The correlation between students' vocabulary mastery and their interest in English toward reading comprehension in descriptive text</u> E Faliyanti Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 4 (2), 2015	20
<u>An analysis of students' speaking anxiety toward their speaking skill</u> JB Saputra Premise: Journal of English Education 7 (1), 111-123, 2018	17
<u>Difficulties of speaking that are encountered by English language students at Al Margeb University</u> M Dalem Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 6 (2), 20-29, 2017	17
<u>PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHERS'SELF-EFFICACY, THEIR ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND THEIR PREPAREDNESS FOR TEACHING PRACTICUM PROGRAM</u> HA Nugroho Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 6 (2), 1-11, 2017	14
<u>An analysis on readability of English reading texts for grade IX students at MTsN 2 Kota Bengkulu</u> Y Maryansyah Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics 5 (1), 69-88, 2016	14

Page 1 of 15 | Total Records : 149

« 1 2 3 4 5 » »

Citation Statistics



Volume 6 No 2, October 2017

e-ISSN :2442-482x

p-ISSN :2089-3345



PREMISE

Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

Speaking

Listening

Reading

Writing

Published by:

**MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF METRO
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
ENGLISH STUDY PROGRAM**



PREMISE

Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

ISSN :2089-3345 (Print)
ISSN :2442-482x (Electronic)

Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro

[HOME](#) [ABOUT](#) [LOGIN](#) [REGISTER](#) [SEARCH](#) [CURRENT](#) [ARCHIVES](#) [ANNOUNCEMENTS](#)

[Home](#) > [About the Journal](#) > [Editorial Team](#)

Editorial Team

Editor in Chief

Dr. DEDI TURMUDI, S.PD.,M.A. TESOL , ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, FKIP UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH METRO, SCOPUS ID:57203683470 SINTA ID:5973919 Researcher ID: AAB-5910-2021 Publons ID:3103830 Garuda ID:540946, Indonesia

Managing Editor

MR Refai Refai , PBI FKIP Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro, Indonesia

Associate Editors

MS AMREET K J SINGH , CENTRE FOR LANGUAGES AND GENERAL STUDIES SULTAN IDRIS EDUCATION UNIVERSITY 35900 TANJONG MALIM PERAK DARUL RIDZUAN, MALAYSIA Scopus ID: 55867754400, Malaysia

Mr Bonjovi Hassan Hajan , JOSÉ RIZAL UNIVERSITY, THE PHILIPPINES SCOPUS ID: 57209745369, Philippines

DR. KHALIL S.M. JAHBEL, M.A. , ALZYTOUNA UNIVERSITY TARHOUNA, LIBYA, Libya

Dr. HIMAWAN ADI NUGROHO, S.Pd.,M.Pd. , Universitas Negeri Surabaya SINTA ID : 6010901, Indonesia

DR. MADAR ALEXIUS, M.A. , UNIKA WIDYA MANDIRA, KUPANG, NTT SINTA ID: 6198801, Indonesia

Dr UMMI RASYIDAH, M.Pd. , UNIVERSITAS PASIR PENGARAIAN, Indonesia Scopus ID:57218279369 SINTA ID: 6004418, Indonesia

Layout Editor

MR Dedy - Subandowo , ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH METRO, LAMPUNG SINTA ID : 258454 SCOPUS ID: 57209745369, Indonesia

Copyeditor

AMIRUDIN LATIF , PBI FKIP UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH METRO, Indonesia

Ms LILIS SHOLIAH, S.PD.,M.A. , ENGLISH EDUCATION FKIP UNIVERSITAS LAMPUNG, Indonesia

Proofreader

Ms AULIA HANIFAH, M.PD. QOMAR , ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, FKIP, UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH METRO, Indonesia

Section Editors

MR YASMIKA BAIHAQI, M.PD.BI. , ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FKIP UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH METRO, Indonesia

e-ISSN-2442-482x p-ISSN-2089-3355

[Download Premise Official Template 2022](#)

[Certificate](#)



[Home](#)

[Focus And Scope](#)

[Editorial Teams](#)

[Reviewer Teams](#)

[Publication Ethics](#)

[Indexing](#)

[Author Guidelines](#)

[Login](#)

[Register](#)

[Template](#)

Visitors



Premise Stats

USER

Username

Password

☐ Remember me

JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

Search Scope

[Browse](#)

[By Issue](#)



PREMISE

Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

ISSN :2089-3345 (Print)
ISSN :2442-482x (Electronic)

Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro

[HOME](#) [ABOUT](#) [LOGIN](#) [REGISTER](#) [SEARCH](#) [CURRENT](#) [ARCHIVES](#) [ANNOUNCEMENTS](#)

[Home](#) > [Archives](#) > **Vol 8, No 2 (2019)**

Vol 8, No 2 (2019)

Premise Journal: e-ISSN:2442-482x, p-ISSN:2089-3345

October Edition

Table of Contents

Research Articles

WHAT IS SO SCARY ABOUT LEARNING ENGLISH? INVESTIGATING LANGUAGE ANXIETY AMONG FILIPINO COLLEGE STUDENTS

Al Rynne Gabonada Gatcho, BONJOVI HASSAN HAJAN
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2221](#)

PDF
127-143

DEVELOPING SCREAMBLE MEDIA TO ENHANCE SPEAKING SKILL FOR PRESCHOOLERS

Rosita Aryani
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2416](#)

PDF
144-162

A SYNTACTICAL ANALYSIS OF SIMPLE SENTENCES IN KEMBANG BABUR

Evha Nazalatus Sa'adiyah Sy, Devie Reztia A, Devie Reztia A
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2112](#)

PDF
163-175

THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ANXIETY ON THE YOUTUBE VIDEO PROJECT IN EFL LEARNING IN INDONESIA

Angela Bayu Pertama Sari, Dwi Iswahyuni
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2179](#)

PDF
176-192

CODE-MIXING IN LANGUAGE STYLE OF SOUTH JAKARTA COMMUNITY INDONESIA

Jimmi jimmi, Rafelia Elsa Davistasya
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2219](#)

PDF
193-213

Uncovering Students' Attitude toward Vlogging Activities in Improving Students' Speaking Ability

Berlinda Mandasari, Dyah Aminatun
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2241](#)

PDF
214-225

ENGLISH AT HIGHER EDUCATION LEVEL: A NEED ANALYSIS

Tantry Ajeng Pamawati, Atik Ulinuha
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2296](#)

PDF
226-240

Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions on the Relationship between Learning Program Design Course and Their Teaching Preparations

Elizabeth Liza, Ouda Teda Ena
DOI : [10.24127/pj.v8i2.2329](#)

PDF
241-259

e-ISSN-2442-482x p-ISSN-2089-3355

[Download Premise Official Template 2022](#)

[Certificate](#)



[Home](#)

[Focus And Scope](#)

[Editorial Teams](#)

[Reviewer Teams](#)

[Publication Ethics](#)

[Indexing](#)

[Author Guidelines](#)

[Login](#)

[Register](#)

[Template](#)

Visitors



FLAG counter



Premise Stats

USER

Username

Password

☐ Remember me

JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

Search Scope

[Browse](#)

[By Issue](#)



Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions on the Relationship between Learning Program Design Course and Their Teaching Preparations

by

Elizabeth

Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta Indonesia

Lizzie.lizaa@gmail.com

Ouda Teda Ena

Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta Indonesia

ouda@usd.ac.id

Received: September 27, 2019

Accepted: October 10, 2019

Reviewed: September 29, 2019

Published: October 19, 2019

Abstract:

Learning Program Design is one of the compulsory courses offered to the English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students to prepare for their teaching. This study is aimed to find out and to identify the possible relationship between Learning Program Design course and students' teaching preparations. A survey study was conducted. The instrument used was questionnaire. A total of 30 students participated in this study. The perceptions of the pre-service teachers were obtained from their self-evaluations. The results of this study showed that most of the respondents had positive attitudes. They perceived that Learning Program Design Course had positive contributions to their teaching preparations.

Key Words: *perceptions, teaching preparations, learning program design course, self-evaluation*

INTRODUCTION

English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) has an objective in its vision which is to train and to produce all the teacher trainees there to be qualified and professional English teachers in the future. In order to achieve that goal, there are some courses which are offered to the students of English Language Education Study Program. Consequently, all of the courses offered to the students should be applicable to all the teacher trainees. One of those courses which will be focused on by the researchers in this study is Learning Program Design course.

Learning Program Design (KPE 377) is one of the compulsory courses which has been improved using integrated learning in the new curriculum of ELESP. It is still newly implemented for the ELESP students. This course is offered in semester five. As English teacher candidates, this prerequisite course is needed to prepare the ELESP students to get ready to do their real job, especially in developing English materials. Due to the fact that the ELESP students are required to be professional English teachers in the future, they are also expected to obtain and to implement what they have learned to their real life, especially in the educational field.

Learning Program Design is an integrated course between Instructional Design course (ID) and Curriculum and Material Development course (CMD). Previously, this course was divided into two courses, namely ID and CMD. Each of the courses has two-credit hours which should be taken by the English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students first. Prasetyo, Herawati, Prihatin, Budiraharjo, and Adji (2007) in *Panduan Akademik* state that Instructional Design course is a course which can facilitate the English teacher trainees to understand the principles and the good procedure of instructional design. Its procedures involve specification of objectives, evaluation items, and actual learning tasks, and also designing teaching instructions including lesson units i.e. for teaching reading, speaking, and grammar.

Additionally, Prasetyo, Herawati, Prihatin, Budiraharjo, and Adji (2007) in *Panduan Akademik* say that the Curriculum and Material Development course itself refers to a course that has an objective for the teacher trainees to be able to design a syllabus and to develop a lesson plan and materials based on the National Curriculum 2006 of English for grade schools including concepts and models curriculum, concepts and kinds of syllabus, syllabus and lesson unit content/material development, competency-based education, and competency-based curriculum, curriculum 2006 and its implementation, the principles and types of EFL (English as Foreign Language) material development, and syllabus design. From the explanations above, it can be seen that both ID course and CMD course have almost the same purpose for ELESP students which is to be able to design a syllabus and develop a set of lesson plan materials based on the curriculum used. Therefore, in order to gain better curriculum in ELESP efficiently, Instructional Design course and Curriculum and Material Development have been integrated into one course which has three-credit

hours for one semester now, namely Learning Program Design (LPD) course. However, the materials in LPD are the combination of ID and CMD materials.

As stated before that Learning Program Design course is the integration of Instructional Design (ID) course and Curriculum and Material Development (CMD) course, then in Learning Program design course, the ELESP students are trained to produce a set of lesson planning documents based on the current curriculum used in Indonesia. According to *Academic Guideline's Book 2010*, the purpose of this new integrated course of Learning Program Design course is to give more insights into the concept of current curriculum used in Indonesia, its program design elements and the implementation, such as syllabus and lesson unit plan. Besides, the ELESP students are also equipped with the knowledge of material development to develop teaching materials for grade schools based on the current curriculum. As a teacher candidate, having ability in developing materials as one of the planning instruction is required. Hunts at al. (2009) says that planning instruction is helpful in planning process to designate times when it occurs and purposes for the plans themselves. However, implicitly, Learning Program Design course prepares/helps the ELESP students to have good preparation in teaching. Borich (1996) also agrees that “effective teaching practices are always defined by who is being taught and under what conditions (curriculum, learning objectives, instructional materials, and learners)” (p.48).

However, Learning Program Design course is the prerequisite course for Micro Teaching & PPL II which provide the ELESP students with an opportunity for practice-based teaching into school community. In micro teaching course & PPL II course, the students are trained to develop and improve their knowlegde and skills in teaching English. Those two courses are the courses in which the students have to integrate the theoretical review and foundation of ELT methods, ELT teaching strategies, and the Instructional and material design. Micro Teaching is one of the requirements to implement the teaching basic competencies for the English teacher candidates. In fact, good planning is a first step to quality classroom instruction.

According to Hunt at al. (2009), “effective teaching involves effective planning, communicating, managing, and evaluating, as well as the actual act or process of instructing” (p.5). Thus, as a teacher candidate, having ability to apply the most appropriate teaching method, teaching skills, and strategies in their teaching practice is needed.

Therefore, every teacher candidate is required to have a teaching preparation in their teaching practice. Hunt et al. (2009) also mentions that the teacher is a planner of instruction. “The experience of lesson planning, teaching, and self-observation provided us as prospective teachers with meaningful insight into our future teaching” (Gebhard and Oprandy 1999, p. 177). Because of the reasons that have been mentioned before, it is important to evaluate this course by conducting a survey of students’ personal evaluation on the relationship between Learning Program Design course and students’ teaching preparation in order to see the relationship of Learning Program Design course towards the students’ teaching preparation as the minimum standard of planning process. Perception is important because perception can influence people’s behavior, attitude, interest, and motivation as a response (Robbins, 2001). In other words, perception is one of the factors in the successful of learning this course. Through the survey on perception on Learning Program Design course, it can be seen what the students feel and think about this new integrated course of Learning Program Design. Moreover, the students’ perception is essential because it can show the positive points and negative points of the course conducted from the students’ point of view.

To see the benefits of Learning Program Design course towards the students’ teaching preparation, the researchers is going to discover the students’ personal evaluation of the ELESF students on Learning Program Design course. It is essential because ELESF student personal evaluation on this new integrated course can affect their academic result in completing the course.

Indeed, by presenting the answer of the research question, it can help the lecturers to be able to develop their teaching strategy of this Learning Program Design course to prepare the pre-service teachers in English Language Education Study Program. Furthermore, it will also be able to help the ELESF students to improve their teaching skills, especially in planning process through Learning Program Design course optimally.

The fact that Learning Program Design course is a new integrated course in ELESF really makes the researchers interested to investigate about the course. The aim of this study is to identify and find out what the ELESF students really think about Learning Program Design course and identifying what the possible contributions of Learning Program Design course towards their teaching preparation. Therefore, this study is going to focus more on

the relation between Learning Program Design's contributions to the ELESP students' teaching preparation. In this study, the researchers formulates one problem to be solved, "what are the pre-service teachers' perceptions on the relationship between Learning Program Design course and students' teaching preparation in English Language Education Study Program?"

Students' personal evaluation

The students personal evaluations are used to obtain the data about perceptions. The theory about self-evaluation is needed as the basic theory in this study since this study deals with the pre-service teachers' perceptions. There are so many definitions related to the term "self-evaluation". In common way, self-evaluation can be defined as what people think or perceive about something in their own mind. However, the understanding of the word "self-evaluation" itself can be derived from some sources.

According to Kastrati (2013), "self-evaluation is defined as "students judging the quality of their work, based on evidence and explicit criteria, for the purpose of doing better work in the future" (p. 431). Gilmore (1973) also describes that "a system of self-evaluation by students designed to increase personal attention and interest in learning and to reduce uncertainty and anxiety." Lew and Schmidt (2011) add that self-evaluation refers to "the processes that a learner undergoes to look back on his past learning experiences and what he did to enable learning to occur, and the exploration of connections between the knowledge that was taught and the learner's own ideas about them".

In other words, personal evaluation is something that comes up to people feelings and thoughts which is influenced by the environment around them then they use it to interpret the phenomenon. Personal evaluation usually comes from the interpretation of something come up to their mind through what they see. Thus, People may see different things when they are faced by the same things. The way of each person see of one thing may have different interpretation. It depends on the stimuli organized or interpreted into their thought. It named conceptual / perceptual process.

Miron (1988) argues that students' personal evaluation can improve students' learning performances. Kastrati (2013) also agrees that "self-evaluation is a potentially powerful technique because of its impact on student performance through enhanced self-

efficacy and increased intrinsic motivation” (p.431). However, the response of someone is measured by the product of preceding learning. It becomes increasingly influenced by learning. Personal evaluation is formed by their past learning experience.

Their past experience will lead people to take awareness based on their own personal evaluation. After the personal evaluation is formed, it will lead people to the behavioral responses or attitudes based on their own personal evaluation. Gordon argues that students’ responses to the instruction, colleges, and universities can help to send the important messages which can support the teaching-learning process (p.3). In other word, the students’ personal evaluations are value to perceive the effectiveness of instruction.

Therefore, self-evaluation here is also something essential because someone behaves based on her or his interpretation of situation, events and condition. Even, each individual’s motivation in achieving objective of learning is affected by their perceptions, whether it is good or bad personal evaluation. If every student has positive personal evaluation towards the subject matter explained above, then they will show the positive attitude towards it and vice versa. In order to know what inside pre-service teachers’ mind about the implementation of Learning Program Design course (LPD) as a new method/ integrated course, the students’ personal evaluation is needed in this study to investigate further the relationship between Learning Program Design course and ELESP students’ teaching preparation, especially in Micro Teaching class and PPL. As Gordon says that “the most obvious way to measure personal evaluation is simply to ask the observer what she or he perceives (p.3). Asking people to describe their personal evaluation can make important contributions to the teaching-learning process.

Based on the understanding of the word “self-evaluation” stated by the experts above, it can be concluded that self evaluation is the way a man views a phenomenon based on their own experiences towards the phenomenon. Then, it can lead people to the different attitudes or responses. These positive responses will influence the success of Learning Program Design course. Additionally, the success of the learning process depends on the students’ personal evaluation toward the course.

English Language Teaching

The theories about English language teaching are used to describe the actual act or the process of instruction and to explain the relationship between the English language teaching and English language planning. Richards (1990, p.1) in the book “The Language Teaching Matrix”, says that second language teaching deals with teaching methods or with the design and use of instructional materials. In addition, Richards (1990) also views that English language teaching is seen to result from interactions among the curriculum, teachers, students, methodology, and instructional materials. In other words, there are three factors to make the English teaching becomes effective, that are the curriculum, methodology, and instructional materials. Kennedy (1989) also views the connection between English language teaching and language planning. As Richards (2001) says that being an effective teacher meant much more than becoming a more skillful and knowledgeable classroom practitioner. It means learning how to develop and adapt materials, to plan and evaluate courses, to adapt teaching to students’ needs, and to function within an institutional setting. Brown (1987) adds that English language teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the conditions for learning.

As the experts state about the definition of English language teaching above, there are three major factors to effective teaching: the curriculum, methodology, and instructional materials. Thus, Borich (1996) defines seven instructional events of lesson plan (the components of the teaching skills) as five parts, that is the set induction & set closure, classroom management, reinforcement, questioning, and explaining. Hunt and Wiseman (2009) also adds the characteristics of effective teaching involves effective planning, communicating, managing, and evaluating, as well as the actual act or process of instructing.

Besides, Borich (1996) also describes the five key behaviors contributing to effective english language teaching : (1) Lesson Clarity, (2) Instructional Variety, (3) Teacher task orientation, (4) engagement in the learning process, (5) student success rate. They are considered essential as the parts for english language teaching.

“Good planning, of course, will not ensure good teaching, but it is a very important prerequisite to quality classroom instruction” (Hunt at al. 2009, p.54). According to Borich (1996), planning is the systematic process of deciding what and how your students should learn. Hunt at al. (2009) describes that “the planning process in today’s accountability

environment begins with each teacher examining the appropriate state standards” (p.54). The standard documents identify indicators or skills that students need to learn.

These indicators are extremely important to the planning process. According to Borich (1996), there are some steps in the planning process for which decisions must be made: (1) the importance of aims and goals in the planning process, (2) the learners’ needs, (3) the themes, (4) orchestrating the various teaching methods to meet the objectives, (5) the instructional media and materials should be used, (6) on what basis should the instruction be revised. In other words, the instructional plans must decide on instructional goals, learning needs, content, and methods. Based on Borich (1996), the important process of unit and lesson planning begins with implementing the five planning inputs: (1) knowledge of aims and goals, (2) knowledge of learners, (3) knowledge of subject matter content and its organization, (4) knowledge of teaching methods, (5) tacit knowledge acquired from day-to-day experiences and feedback in the classroom. Further, Borich (1996) states:

These input to the learning process result from pre-lesson planning, in which you consult sources of societal and professional values, and select as relevant certain goals, learning needs, content, and method. This selection is made in part by the curriculum adopted by the school district, because both societal and professional values were instrumental in curriculum selection (p.182).

Learning program design

According to Rennekamp and Jacobs, “a program is defined as a sequence of intentional actions and events organized in a manner that they result in valued outcomes for a clearly defined audience”. According to Papier (2005), “a learning programme is defined as the ‘plan’ (the sequential learning activities) for getting the learner to meet the specified outcomes as set out by the curriculum” (p.3). Richards (1990) in his book “The Language Teaching Matrix” says that in order to plan for effective second language teaching, a comprehensive view is needed of the nature and process of language program development:

Language curriculum development like other areas of curriculum activity, is concerned with principles and procedures for the planning, delivery, management, and assessment of teaching and learning. curriculum development processes in language teaching comprise needs analysis, goal setting, syllabus design, methodology, and testing and evaluation (p.1).

As stated by Richards (2001) in his book “Curriculum Development in Language Teaching”, teaching and learning in schools or educational systems can be planned, measured, and evaluated. Borich (1996) describes that Four primary activities within the

planning process are establishing instructional goals, identifying learner needs, and selecting and organizing content. However, syllabus is one aspect of a specification of the content of a course of instruction and lists what will be taught and tested during the course (Borich 1996, p. 2). Richards (1990) says that syllabus is concerned with the choice and sequencing of instructional content usage a curriculum. The concept of syllabus also helps to develop the language teaching practices. Richards (2001) advises the syllabus design as:

the process of developing a syllabus. It includes the processes that are used to determine the needs of a group of learners, to develop aims or objectives for a program to address those needs, to determine an appropriate syllabus, course structure, and teaching methods, and materials, to carry out an evaluation of the language program that results from these processes. (p.2).

Dick and Carey (2005) also state the principles in English Learning Program Design as follows :

1) Identify Instructional Goals

First is to determine what the learners are able to do when they have completed your instruction.

2) Conduct Instructional Analysis

It is required to determine step-by-step what the students are doing when they perform that goal. It includes to what skills, knowledge, and attitudes.

3) Analyze learners and contexts

Analyzing the learners characteristics and the contexts in which they will learn the skills, and the context in which they will use them.

4) Write performance objectives

This is the step to write the statements of the goals.

5) Develop Assessment Instruments

In order to measure the learners' ability in performing the objectives that have written before.

6) Develop Instructional Strategy

It is the step to identify the strategy that would be used in the instruction in order to achieve the terminal objective.

7) Develop and select Instructional materials

This step is to develop the instructional materials, such as the instructor's guides, students' modules, overhead transparencies, videotapes, computer-based multimedia formats, and web-pages for distance learning.

8) Design and Conduct Formative Evaluation of Instruction

This step is used to identify how to improve the instruction.

9) Revise Instruction

The final step in the design and development process is revising the instruction.

METHOD

Design

The researchers used survey research in gaining the answer to the research question which had been stated above. This method was usually used in finding out about attitudes, behavior, self evaluation, or opinions. According to Ary et al (2002), "survey is a research technique in which data are gathered by asking questions of a group of individuals called respondents" (p.374).

In this study, the researchers would like to find out the perceptions through their own self-evaluation of the ELESF students on the relationship between Learning Program Design course and students' teaching preparation for the ELESF students as the English teacher candidates, hence the researchers employed questionnaire as the strategy to ask the ELESF students questions in order to find out their opinions or behaviour related to the students' experience when they joined the course.

Personal evaluation was maybe different from another because it depended on someone's experience and the way they saw or interpreted an event or a phenomenon. The researchers used this method because survey research usually deals with the relationship of educational (Wiersma 1995, p.15). It could be used to measure their attitudes, opinions, or achievements (Wiersma 1995, p. 169).

It was aimed to identify to what they think and feel about what they had experienced after all the process in Learning Program Design course. Besides, Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1990) also agreed that survey was the appropriate method to obtain all the data needed to solve the formulated problem in this study which was conducted by asking questions to a

group of individuals. In order to collect the data related to the personal evaluations of ELESPP students on the relationship between Learning Program Design course and the students' teaching preparation. The research instruments employed in carrying out this study was questionnaire.

The sample of this study was obtained by purposive sampling. According to Ary et al. (2010, p.156) in their book "Introduction to Research in Education", purposive sampling chooses sample elements which are judged to be typical or representative from the population. The researchers only gathered from one class since it was impossible to take all of the classes as the total population by considering the accessibility to the respondents, financial constraint, and time availability. Therefore, the researchers took class D as the sample of this study. It means that class D was considered as the representative for this study.

According to Wiersma (1995, p.178), there were several steps as the procedures in conducting this study. The first step was planning. The researchers formulated the problem formulation which needed to be solved. Then, the researchers determined the hypothesis and the purpose of this study. It was needed to investigate the relationship between Learning Program Design course and students' teaching preparations. After that, the researchers compiled some reviews of related literature to support this study.

The second step was selecting the sample. The researchers identified the participants to prepare the research instrument and research method in collecting the data needed. The target population of this study was the ELESPP students who had taken Learning Program Design course. Moreover, the researchers limited the participants because it was rather difficult to learn about a very large subject. The sample subjects of this study were the ELESPP students who were in class D. Class D was chosen as the sample to be the representative of Learning Program Design students.

The third step was constructing a set of instrument(s). In order to collect the data needed in this study, it would be obtained by questionnaire. The questionnaire used only the open-ended part. There were twenty two questions would be put in table based on the Likert Scale which provided four options for each respondent to answer the questions given, which were strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD). In the closed-ended part, the respondents chose the options based on the statements given.

Fourth, the researchers would get the permission from the chairperson of the ELESPP to conduct the research. Then, the researchers gained the data needed by distributing the questionnaire to the particular subjects who had been chosen before. the researchers asked permission and conducted the research.

Fifth, the researchers analyzed the data in the close-ended question which had been collected from the questionnaire by making it into percentage to make it easy to calculate. As stated before, the researchers used Likert Scale in the closed-ended questions which provided the degree of agreement. So, the questions or statements answered by choosing one of the four degrees of agreement. The researchers calculated the number of the ticks from every degree of agreement. Then, the result of the counting was changed into percentages. The results of the data from the closed-ended question was presented in the table to ease the readers read the results.

At last, the researchers drew the conclusion by discussing or reporting the analysis in this study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This part would answer the research question stated in the problem formulation. The researchers would present and discuss the data obtained from the results of questionnaire. The researchers analyzed 30 data of the total respondents in Learning Program Design class. There was only one main section would be discussed in this part, namely the relationship between Learning Program Design course and the ELESPP students' teaching preparation.

1. The relationship between Learning Program Design Course and ELESPP students' teaching preparation

This section was aimed to know how well the respondents perceived the relationship between Learning Program Design course and ELESPP students' teaching preparations. Due to the fact that Learning Program Design Course was still newly implemented in the ELESPP curriculum, it was important to evaluate the learning process of Learning Program Design course towards their personal evaluation of the students in class.

The success of Learning Program Design course depends on how well the students perceive the learning process in class. Close-ended questions were conducted to measure the respondents' degree of agreement or disagreement towards the statements. The particular numbers related were statements number 1 up to 7. The results can be seen in Table 2.1

Table 2.1 the relationship between Learning Program Design Course and ELESP students' teaching preparation

No.	Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	I get clear explanation about the concepts of competence standard (<i>standar kompetensi</i>) and basic competence (<i>kompetensi dasar</i>) in <i>syllabuses</i> and <i>lesson plans</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (23.33%)	22 (73.33%)	1 (3.33%)
2.	I am trained to develop plans for one semester (<i>syllabuses</i>) for high schools	1 (3.33%)	4 (13.33%)	18 (60%)	7 (23.33%)
3.	I am trained to develop lesson plans (RPP) for high schools	0 (0.00%)	3 (10%)	16 (53.33%)	11 (36.67%)
4.	I am trained to design ELT (English Language Teaching) materials	1 (3.33%)	4 (13.33%)	15 (50%)	10 (33.33%)
5.	I get some comments & feedback from my lecturer on my English materials which I designed	1 (3.33%)	4 (13.33%)	10 (33.33%)	15 (50%)
6.	I am assigned to make annual programs (<i>program tahunan</i>) for high schools	5 (16.67%)	6 (20%)	11 (36.67%)	8 (26.67%)

7.	I am assigned to make semester programs (<i>program semester</i>) based on determined annual programs for high schools	3 (10%)	4 (13.33%)	13 (43.33%)	10 (33.33%)
----	--	------------	---------------	----------------	----------------

From the data in table 2.1, it was shown that the majority of the respondents had positive personal evaluation on the relationship between Learning Program Design Course and students' teaching preparation. In the first statement, it was clear that 73.33% of the total respondents agreed that they got clear explanation about the concepts of competence standard (*standar kompetensi*) and basic competence (*kompetensi dasar*) in syllabuses and lesson plans of Learning Program Design course, 3.33% of the total respondents strongly agreed, 23.33% of the total respondents disagreed, and none of the respondents or 0.00% strongly disagreed with that statement. To sum up the results then, 76.66% of the total respondents had positive perception on the explanation about the concepts of competence standard and basic competence in syllabuses and lesson plans clearly.

In the second statement, there were 60% of the total respondents agreed, 23.33% of the total respondents strongly agreed, 13.33% of the total respondents disagreed, and only 3.33% strongly disagreed that they were trained to develop plans for one semester (syllabuses) for high schools in evaluating the learning process of Learning Program Design Course towards students' teaching preparation. To sum up the results, 83.33% of the total respondents had positive perception on the statement that they were trained to develop lesson plans for one semester (syllabuses) for high schools.

For the third statement, it was indicated that 53.33% from the total respondents agreed, 36.67% of the respondents strongly agreed, 10% of the respondents disagreed, and none of the respondents or 0.00% strongly disagreed with the statement that they are trained to develop lesson plans (RPP) for high schools dealing with the contribution on the learning process of Learning Program Design course. To sum up the results, 90% of the total respondents had positive perception on the statement that they were trained to develop lesson plans (RPP) for high schools.

Related to the fourth statement, there were 50% from the total respondents agreed that they were trained to design and to produce the ELT (English Language Teaching) materials. In addition, 33.33% of the respondents strongly agreed, 13.33% of the respondents disagreed, and only 3.33% of the respondents strongly disagreed. By adding the number of the respondents who strongly agreed and agreed, it indicated that more than half of the respondents had positive responses with the statement that they were trained to design ELT (English Language Teaching) materials, by having 83.33% from the total respondents.

The fifth statement was related to the comments and feedback given from their lecturer in class about the materials which they designed. The researchers intended to know whether the students got some comments and feedback on the materials designed which could improve the students' performances. It was shown by the total agree and strongly agree percentages reaching 83.33%. On the other hand, the total of disagree and strongly disagree percentages reached 26.33%. It could be concluded that more than half respondents had positive personal evaluation on getting some comments and feedback from the lecturer on the English materials which they had designed.

For the sixth statement, it was clear that 36.67% agreed that they were assigned to make annual programs (*program tahunan*) for high schools, 26.67% of the total respondents strongly agreed, 20% of the total respondents disagreed, and only 16.67% of them strongly disagreed with that statement. To sum up the total results then, 53.34% or more than half of the total respondents showed positive attitude to the statement that they were also assigned to make annual programs (*program tahunan*) for high schools.

The last statement asked the respondents whether they were assigned to make annual programs (*program tahunan*) for high schools. The results showed that 43.33% from the total respondents agreed and 33.33% of the respondents strongly agreed. Meanwhile, 13.33% of the total respondents disagreed while 10% of them strongly disagreed with the statement. It could be concluded that most of respondents had positive personal evaluation on the statement that they were assigned to make annual programs (*program tahunan*), by having 76.66% from the total respondents.

Besides, it could be seen that the relationship between Learning Program Design Course and ELESF students' teaching preparations was positive. It gave insightful contribution to the Micro Teaching class and PPL. The ELESF students perceived well

about the lesson in Learning Program Design class. It led them to the program design elements as the part of teaching preparation. The results were presented in table 2.1.

From the table 2.1 above, it was clear that majority of the total respondents had positive response on the learning process in Learning Program Design course. They agreed that they could get clear explanation about the concepts of competence standards and basic competence in syllabuses and lesson plans which can be useful in their own teaching. The respondents agreed that they were trained to develop plans for one semester (syllabus) for high schools. Besides, they were trained to develop lesson plans (RPP) for high schools. They were also trained to design ELT (English Language Teaching) materials. They also got some comments and feedback which can increase their performances in the real teaching. They were also assigned to make annual and semester programs for high schools.

CONCLUSION

This study is aimed to find out the pre-service teachers' perceptions on the relationship between Learning Program Design course and their teaching preparations. The perceptions of the pre-service teachers are obtained from their self-evaluations. Therefore, the theories of self-evaluation are used to find the data about perception.

From the data findings, it is apparent that the majority of the pre-service teachers have positive response on the relationship between Learning Program Design Course and their teaching preparations. The pre-service teachers have clear concepts of competence standard and basic competence. They are also trained to develop syllabuses, lesson unit plans and the English teaching materials for high schools.

Learning Program Design course facilitates the pre-service teachers to improve their teaching skills, equip them with the knowledge of English materials development, and improve their creativities in developing English teaching materials. Learning Program Design Course helped pre-service teachers to have good teaching preparations, and gave them more confidence while they are teaching.

BIO-PROFILE

Elizabeth, S.Pd is a student of Master Program at English Education in Sanata Dharma University. She graduated her undergraduate program in English Education, Teachers Training and Education

Premise Journal Vol. 8 No 2, October 2019, e-ISSN: 2442-482x, p-ISSN: 2089-3345, p.241-259
Copyright©2019 by PJEE

Faculty, Sanata Dharma University in 2015. She experienced teaching as an English teacher at any level. She ever taught at Allplus Purikids Language Institution in Jogjakarta. Further, She ever taught at Seven Seas Cruise Ship Institution. Next, she taught at Daniel Creative School (DCS) Semarang. She is now pursuing her postgraduate program in the same department and university. Her research interests is teaching and evaluation program. She can be reached at lizzie.lizaa@gmail.com

BIO-PROFILE

F.X. Ouda Teda Ena, M.Pd., Ed.D. is a lecturer in English Education Study Program and English Education Master's Program of Sanata Dharma University. He graduated his post-graduate program at Loyola University, majoring in Curriculum and Instruction. He has published some articles, journals, research papers, and books on education either national or international journals. He can be reached at ouda@usd.ac.id.

REFERENCES

- Andrade, M.R. (n.d.). *Monitoring student performance with self-evaluation checklists: An Ongoing Case Study*. Retrieved February 22, 2015, from <http://www.jrc.sophia.ac.jp/courses/pdf/kiyou2701.pdf>
- Ary et al. (1990). *Introduction to research in education* (4th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Group, Thompson Learning.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Borich, G. D. (1996). *Effective teaching methods* (3th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice hall, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (2th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., Carey, J.O. (2005). *The systematic of instruction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gilmore, J. B. (1973). Learning and student self evaluation. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 3(1), 54-57.

- Gordon, P. A., & Huitt, W. G. (n.d.). *Student evaluations of colleges instructors*. Patterson St: Valdosta State University.
- Hunt, G., Wiseman, D., Touzel, T. J. (2009). *Effective teaching: preparation and implementation*. Springfield: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- J. Papier, S. Thomas, T. McBride, N. Prinsloo, L. Daniel, J. Martin & Bartlett. (2005). *Developing learning programs*. South African Authority. Retrieved February 22, 2015, from <http://www.saqa.org.za/docs/guide/2005/dlp.pdf>
- Jacobs, C., & Rennekamp, R. (n.d.). *Program design*. Lexington: University of Kentucky.
- Kastrati, S. (2013). *Student self-evaluation in albanian language*. Rome-Italy. *Journal of Educational and Social Research MCSER*, 3(7), 431-435.
- Kennedy, C. (1989). *Language planning and english language teaching*. Birmingham: Prentice hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Lew, M. D. N., & Schmidt, H. G. (2011b). Self-reflection and academic performance: Is there a relationship? *Advances in Health Science Education*, 16, 529-545.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-011-9298-z>
- Lucas, R. I. G. (2008). A Study on Portfolio Assessment as an Effective Student Self-Evaluation Scheme. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 16(1), 23-32.
- Miron, M. (1988). Students' evaluation and instructors' self evaluation of university instruction. *Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht Netherlands. Higher Education*, 17, 175-181.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1999). *Language teaching awareness: A guide to exploring beliefs and practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, H. G., Lew, M. D. N. (2011). Self-reflection and academic performance: is there a relationship?. *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract*, 16(4), 529–545.
- Schwartz, M. (n.d.). the Learning and teaching office. *Research Associate*. Retrieved February 22, 2015, from <http://www.ryeson.ca/content/dam/lt/resources/handouts/SelfEvaluation.pdf>

- Tim Penyusun. (2007). *Panduan Akademik untuk Dosen dan Mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Tutyandari, C., Prasetyo, H., Kristiyani, C., & Bram, B. (Eds.). (2010). *Panduan akademik program studi pendidikan bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma Univeristy.
- Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York: A Simon and Schuster Company.