

LECTURERS PROFILE AND LEVEL OF INFRASTRUCTURE AT HIGHER EDUCATION IN RIAU PROVINCE IN RESPONDING 4 IR

Novitri, Nooreiny Maarof, Melor MD Yunus

(novitri@lecturer.unri.ac.id)

Universitas Riau, Indonesia

Abstract: In responding the challenge of 4.0 Revolution Industry, higher education has to be in line its development by fulfilling sufficient infrastructure when preparing the works of academia such as of research, teaching and learning and community works. The research objectives were to find out the lecturers profile and the level of infrastructure for EFL reading based on the lecturers' perception. The research design used is quantitative with 97 respondents teaching at public and private university in Riau. The instrument was questionnaire using 5-Likert scale. The research finding revealed that the lecturers' perception of infrastructure for EFL reading is at a moderate level. This means the infrastructure of facilities provided by the two groups universities were not at satisfactory level yet.

Keywords: *Infrastructure, Higher Education, 4.0 IR*

INTRODUCTION

Higher education is a central place for conducting various research and in this context Jenkins at al. (2005) has stated that the main hope is for realizing a genuinely student centered undergraduate education lies in reengineering the research. In this context, he used the word reengineering as suggested by Ramsden (2001), that the link does not occur by itself; it has to be designed, created, construct, contrive, and brought about. There are various indicators that make teaching and learning successful in higher education, among others are: system of infrastructure used in the institutions, the availability of human resources so that the planned objectives can be achieved, and so

Learning English as an EFL is compulsory in higher education such as at university level. In line with this, university students' levels of their proficiency in EFL are diverse and they can be grouped into low, intermediate and advanced levels (Dulay, Brown and Krashen 1982). Low proficiency refers to the very basic linguistic skills and the students at this level almost always are poor EFL readers, speakers, and writers. Intermediate one refers to linguistic skills that deemed mediocre/average. These students have reasonably fair ability so they can read, speak, and write effectively. Advanced proficiency level refers to linguistic skills that are superior. In fact, English is learnt and taught as an EFL in Indonesia hence the students have limited exposure to the language (Masduqi 2014)





Hak Cipta Dilindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan sumber:

- a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
- b. Pengutipan tidak mengaitkan kepentingan komersial atau keuntungan.

2. Dilarang mengutip

The research questions of this study are:

- 1) What is the profile of EFL lecturers in teaching EFL reading in Riau?;
- 2) What is the level of infrastructure at higher education in EFL reading in Riau?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the educational context, infrastructure is provided and used for facilitating teaching and learning activities at all institutional levels. These infrastructure facilities are crucial in facilitating learning and teaching processes. Besides, they make learning more contextual and interesting. Among infrastructural facilities includes audio, video, ICT facilities, and study rooms. In this study, infrastructure refers to those supporting facilities provided by universities in Riau that foster learning and teaching EFL reading.

Higher Education is often delivered at universities, academies, colleges, seminaries, conservatories, and institutes of technology, higher education is also available through certain college-level institutions, including vocational schools, trade schools, and other career colleges that award academic degrees or professional certification (Britanica dictionary). In this study, higher education refers to all universities in Riau province.

EFL reading is a compulsory subject learnt by English Department students and EFL reading is considered similar to the subject of General English that is compulsory for all non-English department students at both public and private universities during their first year of university in Riau. In this research, EFL reading is related to activities that the students engage in when they read EFL reading materials, especially during classroom based reading activities. University students must do many and various types of academic assignments as parts of the requirements of university. Thus, they have to be able to discern academic reading materials such as research journals, thesis, articles, textbooks, etc. However, most have little experience in the process of understanding longer texts (Dubin&Bycina, 1991).

The Industrial Revolution 4.0 (IR 4.0) has led new impetus/power to educational transformation lately. Education experts notice the profound impact that a countless of technological innovations in ICT is having on education and all disciplines (Md Abdul Kaseeb 2018; Marr 2016). They support that Education 4.0 will be shaped by technological innovations and will indeed have to train students to produce innovations. Besides, IR will provide new job, especially for specialist jobs and it is possible to eliminate blue-collar level job. In this 4th revolution, people face a range of new technologies in which physical, digital and biological worlds are combined. These new technologies will influence all disciplines, economies and industries, and even also challenge the ideas about what it means to be human.

METHODOLOGY

This research design used is mainly quantitative and it employed quantitative method for collecting analysing the data. The main research objective was to investigate the level of infrastructure at higher education in EFL reading in Riau. In addition, it was also to reveal the lecturers' profiles of teaching EFL reading. 90% of respondents (97 lecturers) replied the questionnaire which used a five-item Likert scale through which quantitative data was obtained. This type of questionnaire provided the researcher with descriptive statistics such as percentage, standard deviation, mean, and over all mean scores to determine the level of infrastructure available in teaching EFL reading. There were eight universities involved in this study, there were two public universities (Universitas Riau and Universitas Islam Negeri SUSQA) and six private universities (Universitas Islam Riau, Universitas Lancang Kuning, Universitas Muhammadiyah, Universitas Rab, Universitas Islam Indragiri, and Universitas Pasir Pengaraian). The sampling technique used is total sampling, means all lecturers teaching EFL reading involved in this research.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Profile of Respondents

A total of 97 EFL lecturers had responded to the survey questionnaire with a return rate of 90% and these lecturers work at public and private universities in Riau. Of the respondents, 54 are from public universities and 43 are from private universities. The demographic data consists of gender, age, marital status, qualification, length of service, last TOEFL scores, access to and frequency of internet use, teaching satisfaction and number of students per class. The demographic data of the respondents presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic of respondents

Demographic	Public University		Private University	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Gender				
Male	21	38.9%	19	44.2%
Female	33	61.1%	24	55.8%
Age				
Less than 30 years	22	40.7%	14	32.5%
30 - 40 years	10	18.6%	20	46.5%
More than 40 years	22	40.7%	9	21.0%
Marital Status				
Married	38	70.4%	28	65.1%
Single	15	27.8%	15	34.9%
Divorced	1	1.9%	-	-



Qualification				
PhD	6	11.1%	1	2.3%
Master	24	44.4%	23	53.5%
Bachelor	24	44.4%	19	44.2%
Teaching Experience				
Less than 5 years	28	51.9%	25	58.1%
6 - 10 years	3	5.6%	10	23.3%
11 - 15 years	4	7.4%	2	4.7%
More than 15 years	19	32.5%	6	13.9%
TOEFL Score				
Less than 450	20	44.4%	10	23.3%
450 – 500	18	33.3%	22	51.2%
More than 500	16	29.6%	11	25.6%
Access to and frequency of Internet use				
Always (>5 hours a day)	11	20.4%	17	39.5%
Often (3 -4 hours a day)	19	35.2%	8	18.6%
Sometimes (1-2 hours a day)	15	27.8%	12	27.9%
Seldom (< an hour a day)	5	9.3%	4	9.3%
Rarely (once a week)	4	7.4%	2	4.7%
Teaching satisfaction				
High satisfaction	18	33.3%	13	30.2%
Average satisfaction	33	61.1%	29	67.4%
Low satisfaction	3	5.6%	1	2.3%
Number of students per class				
15- 20	1	1.9%	2	4.7%
21- 30	32	59.3%	18	41.9%
31- 40	19	35.2%	13	30.2%
41- 50	2	3.7%	5	11.6%
More than 50	1	1.9%	5	11.6%

Figure 4.1 presents a distribution data of the respondents. In terms of gender, it seems that male public and private universities are slightly different in their number of lecturers: 58.1% (21) male public university lecturers, and 44.2% (19) male private university lecturers, respectively. On the other hand, public universities have 61.1% (33) female lecturers and private universities have 55.8% (24) female lecturers.

There is a difference in the number of lecturers between public and private universities in terms of the three age categories used: less than 30 years, 30-40 years, and more



than 40 years. Public university lecturers' age group is less than 30 years is 40.7% (22 persons) and it is higher than the number of private university lecturers which is 32.6% (14 persons). The private university lecturers' age group of 30 - 40 years is 46.6% (20 people) and the number is higher than the state university lecturers 18.6% (10 persons). Lastly, the number of state university lecturers over 40 years is 40.7% (22) which is higher than the number of private university lecturers: 21.0% (9 persons).

Most of the respondents are married. In public universities: (70.4% (38) and private universities: 65.1% (28) respondents are married. Only 1 person (1.9%) is divorced. In terms of educational qualifications, lecturers have three different levels of qualifications: bachelor's degree, master's degree and Ph.D. Public universities seem to have more highly qualified lecturers compared to the private universities, especially in the number of lecturers who hold a Ph.D.

Data from public universities show that lecturers with Ph.D. qualifications make up 11.4% (6), 44.4% (24) lecturers hold a master's qualification, and 44.4% (24) have bachelor's degree. Meanwhile, of the data from private universities, 2.3% (1) hold a Ph.D. qualification, 53.5% (23) have a master's degree, and 19 (44.2%) hold a bachelor's degree. In terms of the length of service of the public university lecturers, 28 (51.9%) had been teaching for 1 – 5 years, while in private universities the number was 25 (58.1%). 29.6% (19) of public university lecturers had been in the job for more than 15 years while for private university lecturers the number was (13.9%) 6 persons. Those from public universities has served a length of service of 6 to 10 years was 5.6% (3) lecturers and from private universities the number was 23.3% (10). 4 (7.4%) lecturers from public universities were in the job for 11 to 15 years meanwhile there are only 2 (13.9%) lecturers from private universities.

The TOEFL scores of lecturers is one of variables considered in this study. Most public universities lecturers had a TOEFL score in the range of 351 – 450, while most private universities lecturers had a TOEFL score with the range of 451 – 500. As many as 20 (51.1%) of public university lecturers had a TOEFL score ranging from 351 to 450, and 22 lecturers (51.2%) from private universities had a TOEFL score ranging from 451 to 500. Public university lecturers scored higher (16 persons/29.6%) than private university lecturers (11/ 25.6%) in the number of lectures with a TOEFL score greater than 500.

Respondents from the two categories of universities also reported that their frequency of using the internet ranged from always to sometimes. Most public university lecturers had accessed the internet 3-4 hours a day while private university lecturers used the internet more than 5 hours per day. Only a few of them accessed the internet once a week. The lecturers also reported that their level of satisfaction in teaching EFL teaching is predominantly at the average level: 33 lecturers (61.1%) from public universities and 29 lecturers (67.4%) from private universities. 18 (33.3%) of public university lecturers and 13 (30.2%) from private universities had a high level of teaching satisfaction. Only a few reported their teaching satisfaction to be low: 3 (5.6%) from state universities and 1 (2.3%) from a private university. Table 4.1 shows the number of students per class. The majority of classes consisted of 25 – 30 students,



followed by 35 – 40 students in both public universities and private universities. Then, there were only a few classes having a class size of 45 to 50 students and more than 50 students. Private universities have fewer classes than state universities.

Level of Infrastructure for EFL Reading

Descriptive analysis such as frequencies, percentages and means were conducted to determine the level of infrastructure for EFL reading. Descriptive analyses of the results are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Level of infrastructure for EFL reading

Statement	SD	D	UN	A	SA	Min	Interpretation
Sufficient EFL reading materials are provided at the faculty/learning centre.	4 (4.1)	21 (21.6)	25 (25.8)	43 (44.3)	4 (4.1)	3.23	Moderate
EFL reading materials are available at university library.	2 (2.1)	16 (16.5)	29 (29.9)	40 (41.2)	10 (10.3)	3.41	Moderate
Team teaching in EFL reading help lecturers teaching EFL reading.	3 (3.1)	13 (13.4)	45 (46.4)	33 (34.0)	3 (3.1)	3.21	Moderate
EFL reading materials available at the university are relevant to students' life experience.	4 (4.1)	13 (13.4)	46 (47.4)	29 (29.9)	5 (5.2)	3.19	Moderate
Sufficient contact hours are allocated to teaching EFL reading.	2 (2.1)	19 (19.6)	24 (24.7)	45 (46.4)	7 (7.2)	3.37	Moderate
The aims of teaching EFL reading is to obtain a good TOEFL score.	5 (5.2)	35 (36.1)	28 (28.9)	24 (24.7)	5 (5.2)	2.89	Moderate
There is enough support for teaching EFL reading e.g. syllabus, learning materials, and lesson plans.	3 (3.1)	7 (7.2)	13 (13.4)	65 (67.0)	9 (9.3)	3.72	High
Resources for developing EFL reading materials are sufficient.	3 (3.1)	17 (17.5)	27 (27.8)	45 (46.4)	5 (5.2)	3.33	Moderate
ICT facilities are available for teaching EFL reading.	4 (4.1)	16 (16.5)	34 (35.1)	38 (39.2)	5 (5.2)	3.25	Moderate



5.	A conducive EFL reading atmosphere is available at the faculty.	4 (4.1)	18 (18.6)	29 (29.9)	41 (42.3)	5 (5.2)	3.26	Moderate
6.	A conducive EFL reading atmosphere is available at the university.	3 (3.1)	18 (18.6)	26 (26.8)	47 (48.5)	3 (3.1)	3.30	Moderate
Total							3.29	Moderate

Table 2 shows that every item in the level of lecturers' perceptions of 'Infrastructure for EFL Reading' is moderate to high. The item with highest mean is 'There is enough support for teaching EFL reading' (e.g. syllabus, learning material, and lesson plan) (mean = 3.72). In terms of frequency and percentage, 65 lecturers (67.0%) agreed, 13 (13.4%) were undecided, 9 (9.3%) strongly agreed, 7 (7.2%) disagreed and 3 (3.1%) strongly disagreed. The item with lowest mean is 'EFL reading materials available at the university are relevant to students' life experience' (mean = 3.19). In terms of frequency and percentage, 46 lecturers (47.4%) were undecided, 29 (29.9%) agreed, 13 (13.4%) disagreed, 5 (5.2%) strongly agreed and 4 (4.1%) strongly disagreed. This shows that the lecturers' perception of infrastructure for EFL reading is at a moderate level. This means that the infrastructure or facilities provided by the two groups universities were not at satisfactory level yet, almost all items have revealed less positive except item no 7.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data presented earlier, it is concluded that lecturers' perception from both public and private universities (public and private) of infrastructure for EFL reading is not at satisfactory level yet (refer to table 2). These aspect deal with availability of reading materials, resource for developing reading materials, conducive atmosphere in learning, and ICT facilities need to be improved.

REFERENCES

1. Dillard, F. & Bycina, D. (1991). Academic reading and the EFL/EFL teacher. In M. Celce-Mercia (Ed), Teaching English as a second or foreign language (2nd ed., pp. 195-215). Boston: Heinle.
2. Dillard, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). Language Two. Oxford: Oxford University Press
3. Dillard, S. at al. (2016). Tangible 4.0: a scenario-based approach to learning for the future of Education. Procedia CIRP 54 pp. 13-18

<https://www.britanica.com/topic/higher-education> retrieved 17 Oktober 2018





Hak Cipta Dilindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan sumber:

- a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan Universitas Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin Universitas Riau.

- <https://www.forbes.com/sites/deloitte/2018/09/21/social-progress-requires-stronger-measurement--collaboration/#46517ce8303c>. Why everyone must get ready for the 4th Industrial Revolution. retrieved 16-10- 2018
- Jenkins, A. at al. (2005). Reshaping teaching in higher education. Taylor and Francis e-Library
- Masduqi, H. (2014). EFL Reading in Indonesian Universities: Perspectives and Challenges in Cultural Contexts. *Journal of Teaching and Education*. 3(3) pp385-397
- Newstrait Times. 16 Oktober 2018. Higher education in the era of IR 4.0
- Ramsden, P. (2001). Strategic management of teaching and learning in Improving Student Learning, ed C Rust,. Pp 1-10, OCSLD, Oxford.