

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 363

FL 022 040

AUTHOR Djiwandono, M. Soenardi
 TITLE Program Accreditation through Institutional Self-Study and Peer Validation.
 PUB DATE 91
 NOTE 16p.; In: Sadtono, Eugenius, Ed. Issues in Language Teacher Education. Anthology Series 30; see FL 022 033.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); English (Second Language); English Departments; Foreign Countries; Government Role; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Evaluation; Peer Evaluation; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs
 IDENTIFIERS *Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This article reports on a study initiated by the government of Indonesia in 1987 to create foundations for a national accreditation process by establishing a set of standards for teacher education institutions. Five of Indonesia's 10 Institutes of Teacher Training and Education (ITTE) took part in this institutional self-study. A national committee of ITTE faculty members drafted manuals on ITTE teaching standards, their application, and the writing of institutional profiles. Self-study reports were compiled by faculty and staff at each of the five institutes, and these reports were validated by teams of outside educators. A summary of the profile of the English Department of ITTE Malang is included. Overall conclusions about the institutional self-study itself, as well as the organization, management, curriculum, faculty, students, facilities, and student teaching opportunities of the ITTEs, are reviewed. (MDM)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Program Accreditation through Institution Self-Study and Peer Validation

M. Soenardi Djiwandono

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wong Kim
Wong

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

PROGRAM ACCREDITATION THROUGH INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY AND PEER VALIDATION

M. Soenardi Djiwandono

The Background

As an independent country Indonesia is relatively young (independent since 1945, less than 50 years ago). For the young country development is urgent and indispensable. Unfortunately, in its efforts to develop itself and catch up with the developments of the rest of the world the country is confronted with a great number of problems in a variety of fields of various kinds and magnitudes. To name just a few of them, first of all physically and geographically the country is a very large country that is widely scattered in the equatorial area, comprising thousands of islands (approximately 13,500 islands). Secondly, in terms of population, with a rate of growth of around 2%, the country is still the fifth biggest in the world. (It has actually become the fourth due to the de-unification of the USSR). And thirdly, to make the situation more intricate, the enormous population is far from evenly distributed. The island of Java that is only 7% of the total area, is occupied by about 90 million people, which is more than half the total population, making it one of the most heavily populated islands in the world. All of those facts, along with many others, have created major problems in the management of many of the affairs that the country has to face, including problems in education.

In the field of education the dominating issue has been, and still is or is going to be, numerical and quantitative in the first place. For want of better education as a consequence of independence and need for development, more and more children want or need to go to school. And as the population grows and keeps on growing the number of children has been increasing, too, extensively. The result has literally been an explosion in the size of the student population. In the period between 1945 and 1989, for example, the student population was dramatically multiplied in all levels of education in a consistently increasing magnitude at the higher levels. At the primary school level the growth was from 2.5 to 30 million (12 times), the lower secondary from 90,000 to 6.6 million (74 times), the upper secondary from 18,000 to 4.1 million (230 times), and tertiary education from a mere 1,600 to 1.6 million (1000 times).¹ As one of the consequences of those figures reflecting the incredible numerical development of the student population, the demand for resources to provide proper education is enormous, including the

demand for more teachers who have to be recruited and trained properly, and speedily.

In such an emergency context it should not be too difficult to imagine nor too surprising to see that the training of teachers of a variety of subjects including English, has most likely been conducted in an emergency manner, too. In such a context a greater emphasis and priority may have been given to numerical and administrative factors rather than, and at the unavoidable expense of, qualitative and more professional considerations. This has undoubtedly affected and sacrificed many of the activities that otherwise need to be done in education including its evaluation and accreditation to determine the actual worth and quality of education. An initial attempt in that direction was the main concern of the study summarized in this paper, specifically a study for the accreditation of teacher education in Indonesia through institutional self-study and peer validation.²

The Objectives and Characteristics

The study was officially initiated in 1987 by the Directorate General of Higher Education as an implementation and elaboration of the result of a similar study of a much smaller scale conducted several years earlier in a more local setting. Considering the weaknesses and inadequacies of the accreditation programs typically applied in the field of education in Indonesia including teacher education, the main objective of the study was "to create foundations for a national accreditation process" by establishing "a set of commonly agreed standards by which institutions could be evaluated". Related to and as a result of that, the other objective was to "establish a baseline for continued institutional development for the participating institutions".³

Basically the study was conducted along the line of a model that was developed by NCATE and redesigned in 1985 to be used for accrediting "professional educational units that prepare educators in US colleges and universities".⁴ Naturally some modification and adaptation were made to suit the needs and conditions prevalent in Indonesia, especially in relation to the standards and their indicators as well as the final action following the accreditation process. Unlike the application of NCATE model, in this study no attempt was made at this stage to actually notify a participating institute of its accreditation status. Instead at the end of the study a set of suggestions and recommendations were given to a participating institute for a serious consideration in its planning for development.

An important characteristic of the accreditation procedure in the study was its main concern in what was more directly involved in and relevant to the process and implementation of the educational program. This was a significant departure from what was typical in the practices of evaluation and accreditation procedures in the country that, more often than not, were focused more on the static matters of administration, finance and organization. Another important characteristic of the study was the active role given to, or rather required of, the participating institutes. An institute, that is an IKIP or Institute of Teacher Training and Education, wanting to participate in the program was required to submit a proposal describing a plan for the implementation of an accreditation process of itself. The plan was written following an outline and directives prescribed by a committee at the national level in charge of planning and coordinating the entire program. This plan was to be used later, if accepted, to make a thorough study of itself to produce its own institutional profile which was why the study was first of all characterized as an institutional self-study.

Another important characteristic was reflected in the step that was an integral part of the study, following and complementing the institutional self-study. At this stage the profile of an institute describing the states, characteristics and worth of many of its aspects that had previously been prepared through its institutional self-study, was checked and verified by a team of validators. These validators were recruited from faculty members from participating institutes (or peers) other than the institute whose profile was being verified, characterizing the study further as institutional self-study with peer validation.

In other words the study was conducted as an attempt to develop a mechanism by which the worth, primarily academic worth, of an educational program notably teacher education, can be assessed and accredited. In the study a serious and sincere intention of an institute to participate was crucial and prerequisite for its inclusion in the accreditation study. That is why a participating institute was required to make a proposal outlining the plan of the study to describe and evaluate many aspects of its educational programs and to produce its own profile. And finally for a more objective and accurate evaluation, a team of faculty members of peer institutes made a verification of the profile in a peer validation scheme.

The Organization

As a national project the study was initiated, organized and coordinated at the national level by the "Project for the Development of Teacher Training Institutes", an *ad hoc* working unit subordinated to the Directorate General of Higher Education, Department of Education and Culture, in Jakarta. The general responsibility of this unit was to coordinate various kinds of activities for the development of the existing teacher training colleges in training and producing high school teachers of a variety of subjects. These teacher training colleges may either be Schools of Teacher Education attached to universities, known as FKIPs, or independent Institutes of Teacher Training and Education popularly referred to as IKIPs. At this developmental stage of the study only five out of ten existing IKIPs took part involving 25 departments of 11 major studies.⁵ Three of those participating departments were English departments of IKIP Yogyakarta, Surabaya and Malang. The limited number of the participating institutes was not only caused by the fact that the resources available to support the national project was limited but also due to the un-readiness of the other institutes to participate.

To carry out the study a national committee was appointed consisting of faculty members of some of the IKIPs. This committee was responsible for the coordination of the entire study from the beginning stage to the end, including preparing and writing the overall plan of the study, disseminating the basic principles and ideas about the study, preparing a set of manuals and instruments, setting up standards and procedures, determining the participating institutes, recruiting and training validators and, finally, writing the final report of the entire study.

For the execution at the level of the individual institutes a local committee was appointed by the rector of each of the participating institutes. The local committee was basically responsible for the implementation of the institutional self-study to produce the institutional profile of itself and of each of its participating departments. For this reason the local committee appointed the departments, recruited and trained profile writers, and coordinated the actual writing of the profiles as well as scheduled and organized meetings with the validators coming from other institutes for their validation work. For more successful and credible results of the study the appointment of faculty members in the local committee was based primarily on their expertise and capability in addition to their sincere will and ample time to participate actively. To be a profile writer of a department one was required to be a full-time faculty member of the department having the relevant academic background.

Similar requirements were set up in the recruitment and appointment of validators. They were faculty members of similar academic background to what they were assigned to validate having the significant academic authority more than just administrative seniority. Of course for a more objective performance a validator was only assigned to conduct validation outside his own institute. Altogether 29 validators were recruited from nine IKIPs including some from non-participating institutes.

The Instruments

Two sets of instruments were developed and used in the study: one for collecting data for the writing of institutional profile, and another for conducting validation of the profile by the validators. In the first set of instruments a series of four manuals were prepared. The first, designated as Book 0, contains a general description of the study and introduction of the main ideas behind it including the basic concepts, the organization, the instruments and the procedures in which the study was to be conducted. Book I "The Standards of Teacher Training Institutes" describes the standards to be used to produce the institutional profile in terms of six major components, namely (1) the organization and management of the institute (2) the curriculum (3) practice teaching or internship program (4) the teaching staff (5) the students, and (6) the facilities.⁶ Each component is described briefly in Book I showing its role and function in the implementation of the educational programs, and subdivided into several sub-components containing elaboration of the main component. Another brief description is made of each component along with a list of relevant indicators for use in checking whether or not a standard has been met.

Book II: "The Manual for the Application and Use of the Standards" specifies the manner in which the standards are to be used to check the actual implementation of the educational program. Following the same order in which the components and subcomponents with their indicators appear in Book I, this manual describes in detail how the indicators are to be checked and verified to determine the worth or quality of the (sub)components in comparison to the standards. The description, therefore, includes the source or reference of the information, the technique to obtain the information, the qualitative evaluation of the findings, and the score indicating the quantitative evaluation of the finding ranging from the score of 5 (the highest) to 1. In the final step of the evaluation of a (sub)component, an average score can be obtained from scores of its relevant indicators. This average score is to be converted, qualitatively, into one of three levels, namely (1) score 5 = completely in accordance with the standard (2) scores between 3.76 and 4.99 = approaching the standard (3) less than 3.76 = below the standard.

Book III is the "Manual for Writing the Institutional Profile". This manual gives directions about how the profile is to be written to record and describe the findings of the institutional self-study as a result of careful and critical observations of itself and application of the standards and their indicators specified in Book I and Book II. The description of each indicator is to be made complete and specific including the score reflecting the institution's own evaluation of its worth in relation to a certain (sub)component.

As the set of manuals containing description of the general aspects of the study (including the general principles and background, the standards of teacher training institutes in Indonesia, their indicators and how to use them, and the manual for writing the profile), the first set of instruments was developed by the Project as the national coordinating body. The other instruments for collecting data to make the institutional profile were left to the participating institutes to develop for their own use. The important thing was that the profile be written following the prescribed principles and directions on the basis of critical observation and evaluation of the existing facts.

The Institutional Self-Study

The final product of institutional self-study, as it has been described earlier, was the institutional profile containing detailed description and self evaluation of the institute in terms of the six major components. This was done by analyzing the data obtained and collected in different ways from different sources by using the instruments that had been developed following the standards and directions discussed in the previous section.

As specified in Book II: "The Manual for the Application and Use of the Standards", the data were to be obtained from various sources including respondents and/or documents. The data from respondents were mostly obtained in written form in response to a set of written questions and requests given to them for the purpose. Some other data were collected through interviews. The respondents were those in the campus who were in the relevant positions to give information relevant to the concern of the study including officials holding different kinds of administrative functions such as rector, deans, heads of departments, heads of administrative units, faculty members, and also students. Meanwhile documents referred to in the study included government regulations, various manuals, calendars, curriculums, and a variety of plans and reports, syllabuses etc.

Following standard procedures of coding and tabulating the data were analyzed using simple calculation of frequencies and percentages from which scores for certain aspects could be derived. For other aspects with qualitative information the scores were obtained by comparing the information with the standards before converting it into a score. The summary of all this factual information about different aspects of an institute or department, and the scores assigned to them, made up the institutional profile as it was perceived by the institute itself.

The Peer Validation

This part of the study was conducted following the institutional self-study. For this purpose a team of validators from outside the institute being validated came to the campus and stayed for a couple of days. Equipped with the profiles of the departments and facilitated by their peers from the host institute the validators were engaged in validation activities: reading documents, visiting places, observing activities, and even talking to some sample respondents including faculty members and students. Through a series of direct observations, interviews and discussions with respondents the validators were able to determine whether or not the descriptions of the (sub)components were correct and acceptable, and the assigned scores accurate.

Following the direct observations, "investigations" and interviews, a series of conferences were held between the visiting validators on one side and the profile writers of the host institute on the other. In these meetings the findings of the validators were discussed, including the discrepancies that may have been observed. From these discussions some modifications of the descriptions and the scores were agreed to make the profiles more realistic and representative of the actual situation. Notes, suggestions and recommendations were also included for possible improvements. In fact the final part of the entire validation process was the formal signing of a document recording those findings and notes by representatives of the visiting team of validators and the host institute.

A Sample Profile

To provide an illustration of the process by which an institutional profile and some of its main contents were prepared, a reference can be made of the profile of the English department of IKIP Malang, one of three English departments participating in the study.⁷ The profile was part of the product of a one-year institutional self-study conducted at IKIP Malang from April 1987 to April 1988.⁸

In the profile a general description of the department was presented in the beginning to provide general information such as historical background, various academic programs, curriculum, number of students (408 in 1988), number and academic qualifications of full-time faculty members (43 in 1988 with five professors and 12 doctors) etc. A description was also made of how the institutional self-study had been conducted including the groups of respondents including a group of 39 out of 43 faculty members, a sample group of 31 students, the instruments used for different groups of respondents, the collection and analysis of data, etc.

But the main content of the profile was a detailed description of the department in terms of the six major components and their sub-components. For each sub-component a description was written and a score was assigned to indicate its relative position to the standards prescribed in Book II. Through a closer examination of the profile and a simple calculation to obtain the averages of the scores, all of the components were found to be of the same level of qualification, i.e. the second level of "approaching the standard".⁹ Of course the actual averages were not necessarily the same but each of them was invariably comparable to the upper half of the second level of qualification with scores ranging from 3.76 to 4.99. The complete list of scores of all of the components and their equivalent levels is as follows: (1) Organization and Management with 3 subcomponents and 17 indicators, average score: 4.7 (2) Curriculum with 5 subcomponents and 18 indicators, average score: 4.6 (3) Practice Teaching or Internship with four subcomponents and 22 indicators, average score: 4.8 (4) Faculty with four subcomponents and 18 indicators, average score: 4.5 (5) Students with five subcomponents and 27 indicators, average score: 4.5, and (6) Facilities with eight indicators, average score: 4.1.

However, in the summary of profiles of three participating English departments more details of the profile of English department of IKIP Malang were available.¹⁰ In the summary it is shown that actually out of a list of 19 sub-components eight reached the maximum level of qualification (level 3: "completely in accordance with the standards"), eight others reached the second level ("approaching the standards"), and only three were at the lowest level of qualification ("below the standard"). These three low quality subcomponents were especially related to teaching materials of the curriculum component, and faculty. Apparently the textbooks and references used in the English department of IKIP Malang were not up-to-date according to the standard used (more than five years old) and most of them had to be obtained from abroad. Meanwhile the average level of involvement of faculty members in the five kinds of activities required of them was found to be low. The five activities were teaching, research, community

service, participation in campus development program, administration and management.

Through another closer look at the profile, however, it was found out that in terms of eight subcomponents the maximum level of qualification (average score 3) was reached for each subcomponent, indicating the highest quality of their conditions. These subcomponents were (1) organization (2) relevance and elaborate description of curriculum (3) academic qualification and number of faculty members (4) faculty development program (5) availability and proper use of students' plans of study (6) observance of students' regular attendance (7) students' participation in extra-curricular activities, and (8) availability and proper use of special facilities (language laboratory). Apparently neither of the other two participating English departments reached that level in any of the subcomponents. The rest of the subcomponents were at the second level of qualification ("approaching the standards"), including (9) administration (10) academic programs (11) the use of syllabuses (12) teaching-learning activities (13) in-campus teaching practice programs (14) internship program (15) faculty's efforts and realization of responsibilities, and (16) faculty's practice in evaluating students' progress.

The Results

At the completion of the entire peer validation activities in December 1988 a conference was held at the national committee level to make a comprehensive review of the study and to synthesize the results. To share and disseminate the results of the study further another national conference was organized involving not only committee members but also authorities and functionaries at the level of Directorate General of Higher Education and rectors of all the ten government IKIPs in the country. With reference to the objectives of the study set up in the beginning, some of the main results identified in the conference include the following:

The Study

1. In general an enthusiastic response to the accreditation study was noted as a means to find ways for improving the quality of educational programs. Some of the findings reflected in the profiles helped people realize, sometimes with a shock, the existing discrepancies between the reality and the standards that need to be reached.

2. Some indicators were not clearly or sufficiently identified and described, sometimes creating misunderstandings and different interpretations.

3. The time allotted for peer validation (four days) was found insufficient for conducting a thorough verification of the profile.

4. Not all members of the institute being verified had a sufficient knowledge and degree of familiarity with some of the details of the institutional profile.

5. More appropriate standards and criteria for acceptable references and bibliography need to be formulated.

The Organization and Management

1. Documents and references related to academic programs and activities were limited and sketchy in the department level.

2. Formal requirements of functionaries tend to be more compromised at the lower levels of faculty and department than at the institute level.

3. There was a general tendency of reluctance to express opinions and make evaluation of others, especially those of higher positions than oneself.

4. Flow of communication was mostly one way, usually from top down.

5. Although the institutional structure and organization of various units was generally in accordance with the existing system, the actual mechanism of many activities was not always explicitly prescribed.

The Curriculum

1. In the curriculum there was apparently no agreement in how the major components were to be distributed. Each of the major components: basic and general subjects, education subjects, teaching-learning process subjects, specified subjects, was not necessarily allotted the same number of credits at different institutes.

2. In the specified subjects group not enough options were offered as elective subjects.

3. There was no easy agreement about the interpretation and application of the concept of hierarchy in the specified subjects group to set up a system of prerequisites.

4. Most institutes faced common problems and difficulties in regularly updating their teaching materials prescribed in the curriculum.

5. Giving regular feedback to students was not found to be a common practice among many faculty members.

Practice Teaching or Internship

1. The concept and practice for limited teaching skills of the type of micro-teaching was still marked with diverse understanding and interpretation.

2. The program was not always conducted as a continuous activity uninterrupted by other academic programs.

3. There was a general lack of and difficulties in obtaining appropriate schools for internship program. This was due to the increasing number of IKIP students and the potentially negative effects of practice teaching program on the schools and their students.

4. Although a student-teacher was, officially, under the guidance of both an IKIP supervising faculty member and a class teacher, in most cases only the latter could give a regular guidance.

The Faculty

1. There was a disproportionate number of faculty members in comparison with the number of students.

2. Faculty development programs were marked more with upgrading programs than with systematic, professional development activities of the junior by the senior members.

3. Not enough efforts had been attempted for the establishment of a solid coordination between IKIPs and high schools for a systematic integration between theoretical knowledge and practical application of educational principles and practices. A similar lack of cooperation was noted in relation to non-educational institutions for more grounded and up-to-date orientation in various fields of study.

4. In general considerable discrepancy was noted in the average number of teaching hours among faculty members, ranging from 3 to 28 credit hours per semester.

5. Feedback mechanism was not adequately employed both from students to faculty members and among faculty members themselves.

Students

1. The requirements for students to make an overall and comprehensive plan for study was not consistently implemented in all IKIPs. Modifications of students' plans was carried out differently, too, in terms of when and how to do it.

2. The guidance and counseling practices varied a great deal in department as well as institute levels.

3. The GPA at the end of a student's study was not computed properly, disregarding the possibility that some courses may have been taken more than one time.

Facilities

1. The main concern was the minimum office facilities available to faculty members to do their work in the campus.

Conclusions

There may still be a long way for educational leaders and administrators in Indonesia to establish methods of accrediting their educational programs most effectively, but concrete initial steps have been taken through this study. Hopefully follow-up steps will be taken for the improvements of education, particularly teacher education including language teacher education. That will at least be one

step closer to and more in accordance with the aspiration of educators everywhere as reflected in the second mission of NCATE "to encourage institutions to meet rigorous academic standards of excellence in professional education".¹¹

REFERENCES

Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, P2LPTK, Jakarta: 1989.

a. *Laporan Hasil Penyelenggaraan Rintisan Kegiatan Penelitian Institusi dan validasi Sejawat.*

b. *Buku 0: Petunjuk Umum.*

c. *Buku I: Standar LPTK.*

d. *Buku II: Pedoman Penggunaan Standar LPTK.*

e. *Buku III: Pedoman Penulisan Profil LPTK.*

_____, *Profil Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP Malang, Laporan Penelitian Institusi/Validasi Sejawat, Jakarta: 1988.*

NCATE or National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, NCATE Redesign, Document prepared by Committee on Process and Evaluation and Committee on Standards, the Subcommittee of NCATE, and adopted by NCATE Council, Washington, D.C., 1985.

RAKA JONI, T., Creating the Foundation for National Accreditation of Teacher Training Program in Indonesia, paper presented at the 23rd. Annual Meeting of the Cooperative and International Education Society, Harvard Graduate School of Education, March 31-April 1, 1989, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Notes

- (1) See Raka Joni, T., *Creating the Foundation for National Accreditation of Teacher Training Programs in Indonesia*, Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Cooperative and International Education Society, Harvard Graduate School of Education, March 31 - April 1, 1989, Cambridge, Massachusetts, p.6.

- (2) Most of what is presented in this paper is based on a series of reports of a national study under the chairmanship and coordination of Dr T Raka Joni, in his capacity as former director of the then *Project for the Development of Teacher Training Institutes* of the Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Jakarta, Indonesia. Unless stated otherwise most of the details and information about the study presented in this paper refer to the series and sources referred to at the end of this paper. In the study the author of this paper was acting as one of the validators for the accreditation of English department program.
- (3) See Raka Joni, *Op. cit.*, p.17.
- (4) See NCATE or National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, *NCATE Redesign*, Document prepared by Committee on Process and Evaluation and Committee on Standards, the Subcommittee of NCATE, and adopted by NCATE Council, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- (5) The five IKIPs were IKIP Padang, IKIP Bandung, IKIP Yogyakarta, IKIP Surabaya, and IKIP Malang comprising 25 departments of 11 different major studies in the education of Mathematics, Chemistry, Biology, Physics, Geography, Business, English, Indonesian, Electrical Engineering, and Sports.
- (6) As a comparison it can be noted that NCATE's standards address five areas, namely (1) knowledge base for professional education (2) relationship to the world of practice (3) students (4) faculty, and (5) governance and resources.
- (7) The other two English departments were of IKIP Yogyakarta and IKIP Surabaya.
- (8) See Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi, *Profil Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP Malang*, Laporan Penelitian Institusi/Validasi Sejawat, Jakarta: 1988.
- (9) A small number of scores were presented separately as appendices outside the profile and were not available at the time when this paper was prepared.
- (10) See Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, P2LPTK, *Laporan Hasil Penyelenggaraan Rintisan Kegiatan Penelitian Institusi dan Validasi Sejawat*, Jakarta, 1989, p.90.
- (11) See NCATE, *Op.cit.*, p. 1.