KNOWLEDGE MAPPING OF THREE READING COURSES FOR UNDERGRADUATE EFLTEP STUDENTS AT ONE INDONESIAN UNIVERSITY

Susanah

University of Iowa
Email: susanagus78@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify how reading knowledge is constructed in three reading courses for EFLTEP students at one state university in Jambi and to investigate the degreeof alignment between course content with the learning outcomes stipulated in the 2017 ELT curriculum implemented in that university and the 2013 ELT curriculum for secondary education. This study employed a content analysis by extracting information from the course syllabi. Data were gained solely from three sets of syllabi for *Reading for General Purposes, Reading for Academic Purposes*, and *Critical Reading and Writing* courses. The study showed that course content catered to the expected learning outcomes, although knowledge discrepancies and genres were overlapping among those three courses. It was also noticed that the contents were aligned with reading knowledge stipulated in the 2013 ELT curriculum as the courses continue to develop reading skills in terms of text structure, types, and comprehension level.

*Keywords***:** reading comprehension, ELT curriculum, syllabi, reading courses

INTRODUCTION

Reading instruction facilitates learners to work on the text, contextualize information, and employ strategies to comprehend the text and eventually achieve reading skills. In gaining reading comprehension, readers activate their background knowledge, metacognition, and reading strategies to deal with word recognition, vocabulary, sentence difficulty, and text structure (Shabaan, 2006). Interaction between the reader and the text becomes a determinant factor in achieving reading skills (Mohammed & Ab Rashid, 2017) as readers decode the information and construct meaning to comprehend the text and gain skills.

Reading skills are highly important in thereading instruction of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context because learners can progress in comprehending foreign language texts, particularly subject-related ones (Saengpakdeejit&Intaraprasert, 2014). Undeniably, the ability to

read EFL texts and achieve English reading skills has been the primary purpose of English instruction in EFL contexts, including Indonesia (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006).

EFL reading instruction in Indonesia aims to train students to develop reading skills that can aid them in comprehending English text related to their course or field of study. However, EFL reading instruction at the tertiary level differs from the secondary level. In secondary education, EFL reading emphasizes recalling and retaining information or receptive reading (Van Camp & Van Camp, 2013) because it only introduces text types of describing, narrating, and reporting an object or an event. Students at secondary schools are introduced to linguistically modified texts with general topics, supplemented with literal comprehension questions (Sunggingwati& Nguyen, 2013; Murtiningsih&Hapsari, 2018). These studentsmay struggle with the course-related texts written in English at tertiary education which use explanation and discussion genres (Pammu et al., 2014; Murtiningsih&Hapsari, 2018) because these text typesare not learned during secondary and high schools (Sundari et al., 2018). In addition, compared to students from other OECD countries, Indonesian students are ranked low in reading and comprehension (OECD, 2019; Murtadho, 2021).

For students majoring in English Education, teaching reading aims to develop their EFL reading proficiency and prepare them as English teachers who will teach reading skills at the secondary school level. Therefore, reading is taught in a series of reading comprehension courses designed according to various readability levels, comprehension levels, and genres (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). For instance, English as a Foreign Language Teacher Education Program (EFLTEP)students in the English Education Department (EED) must enroll in a series of compulsory reading courses: *Reading for General Purposes, Reading for Academic Purposes,* and *Critical Reading and Writing*. These courses are differentiated by the course materials' text structure, comprehension level, and text types. These courses aim to enhance the reading skills and proficiency necessary for understanding academic textbooks written in English and gaining knowledge of reading pedagogy at secondary and high school levels.

The EFLTEP in one state university implemented the 2017 ELT curriculum, which was developed by the curriculum developers in the department. This curriculum was specifically developed for EED students at that university. According to this curriculum, students are expected to acquire reading skills and comprehend texts at literal, inferential, and critical levels. However, their reading performances were relatively low at inferential and critical levels of

comprehension based on their scores in the reading courses. They might stem from how EFL reading was taught at secondary and high schools. Teaching English, including EFL reading, for secondary and high school students was based on a nationally implemented curriculum called the 2013 Curriculum. The Ministry of Education and Culture in Indonesia enacted this curriculum to be nationally implemented for all primary, secondary, and high schools.

Based on the analysis of nationally prescribed textbooks for English at a secondary level under the 2013 Curriculum, some things could be improved in developing reading skills. First, texts are linguistically simplified in terms of grammar and vocabulary to meet the intermediate level of language proficiency and the heterogeneity of students' background knowledge of English. Second, although the texts include cultural information from the target culture (culture belonging to English-speaking countries) and the local culture of Indonesia (Sulistiyo et al., 2021), the textbooks need more content relating to subject-specific academic texts written in English or job-related communication in Last, texts do not cover other content areas that are beneficial for enriching students' knowledge. There needs to be more learning the language and other school subjects.

To cope with these challenges and facilitate students' development of their reading proficiency as targeted in the curriculum, lecturers in the English Education Department at Jambi University should design reading courses that cover various text readability levels, comprehension levels, and genres. Those courses should be designed to meet the purposes of reading instruction in secondary education because the students will transfer their reading knowledge when working as pre-service and in-service teachers at school in the future. However, no emphasis yet to be researched has inquired about reading knowledge mapping at secondary and tertiary education levels in Indonesia. Therefore, this study formulated research questions as follows:

1. How was reading knowledge mapped in each course based on the expected learning outcomes of the 2017 ELT curriculum implemented?

2. How did the content of these courses align with the expected reading knowledge of the current ELT curriculum for secondary and high school students?

Models of Reading Processes

Reading is not a single-factor process; it integrates various cognitive, linguistic, and nonlinguistic skills. Therefore, reading processes involve word-level and text-level meaning-making (van Elsäkker, 2002; Gorsuch & Taguchi, 2010). Word-level processes are lower-order cognitive processes that include encoding the visual pattern of a printed word (word encoding) and accessing its meaning in an individual's mental dictionary or lexicon access. At this level, readers identify the meanings of words in their texts. Text-level processes are higher-level comprehension and integration at sentence, paragraph, and discourse levels. These processes compute semantic, syntactic, and referential relations between words, phrases, and sentences in a text. It also connects the text with the reader's background knowledge and inferencing capacity.

Readers comprehend what they read as they activate word-level and text-level processes. Nassaji (2003) defines reading comprehension in a second language as combining and integrating various knowledge sources, including lower- and higher-level knowledge sources.

Furthermore, Shaaban (2006) asserts that the knowledge of word recognition, vocabulary, sentence difficulty, and text structure awareness substantially determine reading comprehension. Comprehension is also affected by the reader's schemata, sensory and perceptual abilities, cognitive abilities, reading strategies, and affective aspects, such as motivation to read and reading engagement. In other words, reading comprehension means understanding what is being read and sorting out the information presented in the text by activating the reader's prior knowledge through three reading processes: bottom-up, top-down, and interactive.

The bottom-up process guides readers to comprehend what they are reading hierarchically from most general to most specific (Saricoban, 2002) and from letters to words and phrases (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). This process occurs if the readers have different background knowledge from the author of the text. Thus, the readers learn to sort out the meaning of the text by focusing on grammar points and vocabulary presented in the text (Ulfiati, 2012).

The top-down process activates when the readers learn to figure out the intention or message presented in the text and connect it with their prior knowledge, draw inferences, understand the tone of the text, and predict what the text might discuss in the preceding paragraph of is going to discuss in the next paragraph for facilitating comprehension (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006; de Debat, 2006). In this process, the readers can build up general predictions

and seek detailed information in the text. Readers can understand the text using both processes (Ulfiati, 2012; Saricoban, 2002).

Since bottom-up processing occurs at a lower level and top-down processing occurs at a higher level of reading skills, de Debat (2006) recommends that teachers supplement top-down tasks with bottom-up ones to aid students in comprehending the text. However, reading in a second or foreign language is more challenging than reading in the first language. Therefore, knowing the meaning of unfamiliar words in that language increases difficulty. When students learn to read in a second language like English, they learn the skills, new vocabulary, and collocative patterns and work on transferring these skills into real-life settings (Saricoban, 2002). L2 students must elicit the interaction between bottom-up and top-down processing skills to grasp the meaning of the words and catch the messages delivered in the text.

The interactive reading process model amalgamates readers' prior knowledge and prediction, visual information in the text, and interpretation of textual information (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006; de Debat, 2006; Nassaji, 2003). In other words, readers integrate different sources of information to construct the meaning of a text.

The integration can occur by activating four reading areas: vocabulary development, extensive reading, reading rate, and discourse knowledge. Vocabulary development involves recognizing keywords, identifying superordinates, subordinates, and attributes, figuring out synonyms, antonyms, collocation, and idioms, recognizing word-formation rules, and associating conceptual knowledge with the word (de Debat, 2006). Extensive reading offers readers enjoyment and fluency in learning to read as they read for pleasure. Reading rate accounts for reading activities under pressure to boost paced reading skills. Discourse knowledge refers to enhancing reading fluency and efficiency by stimulating readers' awareness of the rhetorical organization of texts (de Debat, 2006).

Theories Underpinning the Reading Comprehension Instruction

The reading processes involve the text, the reader, and the interaction between the text and the reader. When readers are concerned about the organization of information in the text, take advantage of their existing knowledge to comprehend it, and interact with it, they activate two theories underpinning the reading comprehension instruction: the text structure theory and the metacognitive theory.

The text structure theory signifies that a text is organized from easily remembered information at the upper level to more peripheral information at the lower level of structure (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). Text structure theory works when a reader attempts to comprehend a text by skimming for a general picture of a text and scanning for specific information in the text (Goodman, 1967). In second language instruction, activating text structure theory helps readers improve their L2 reading comprehension (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). In her research, Carrel (1985) found that the overt teaching of recalling information at the upper-level text organization accelerates the quantity of information an L2 reader grasps from the text and aids in identifying general and peripheral ideas in the texts. Besides, concept mapping, which interweaves common information with its specific information, aids readers in understanding subject-specific textbooks because they can identify and connect key ideas (Mickulecky et al., 1989). However, in comprehending a text, readers also think about the context associated with the information, which is called the metacognition strategy.

Metacognition strategy refers to how readers use their mental process of cognition like predicting, self-questioning, paraphrasing, summarizing, rereading to clarify meaning, and retelling to digest new information and ignite their thinking (Pammu et al., 2014; Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). In the teaching of reading comprehension, metacognitive theory takes place in each reading phase: prereading, while reading, and post-reading because when a reader attempts to predict the text in advance and keep questioning during and after reading it, he or she applies the metacognition strategy (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006).

In applying metacognitive theory, learners process information by preparing and planning, using strategies in reading, monitoring, and evaluating the strategy for generating constructive reading comprehension (Pammu et al., 2014; Anderson, 2002). Reading instruction can be effective and efficient when the teacher facilitates learners in activating their existing knowledge in the prereading stage, elaborating on main ideas and detailed information of the text while reading activities, and getting feedback about what they have learned from the text (Mickulecky et al., 1989).

In conclusion, how to teach EFL reading can be reflected in the application of text structure and metacognitive theories. Besides, the bottom-up, the top-down, and the interactive model processes aid learners in comprehending ESL or EFL Reading, particularly in the Indonesian context. As EFL reading dominates the teaching of English at secondary and tertiary

education levels, it is necessary to review how reading is formulated in ELT curricula in Indonesia.

ELT Curricula in Indonesia

How EFL reading is taught at schools in Indonesia is remarkably intertwined with the history of EFL curricula implemented since Indonesia's independence in 1945. Eight EFL curricula that emphasize specific approaches have been implemented. In some of the curricula, reading is prioritized in EFL pedagogy as one of the language skills.

The first curriculum using the Grammar-Translation Method, or "reading approach," was initiated in 1945 (Zein *et al*., 2020; Lie, 2007; Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). This curriculum targeted the comprehension of short reading texts with an emphasis on word knowledge and word equivalence between English and students' native language yet overlooked the communicative purposes of ELT (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). Given the lack of communication ability developed by the methods, this curriculum was shifted to another approach, i.e., Audio Lingual Method, which was emphasized in the Oral Approach of 1968 and the Structural Approach of 1975 (Zein *et al*., 2020; Lie, 2007).

Both the 1968 and 1975 curricula were highly influenced by Audio-Lingual Method and behaviorism. These curricula emphasized developing oral skills (listening and speaking) rather than reading and writing skills (Lie, 2007). A set of learned behaviors for language proficiency was developed through the drilling of sounds (phonetics), words, and expressions (Zein *et al*., 2020). Given the implementation of the bottom-up model in these curricula, reading was delivered as passive instruction, which began with developing decoding abilities from recognizing letters, words, and phrases (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). However, the emphasis on language usage in these curricula and Dell Hyme's Communicative Approach led to introducing a new curriculum, i.e., the 1984 Communicative Curriculum.

The 1984 Communicative Curriculum places language as a means of communication. It emphasizes the meaning and function of language (Ena, 2013; Zein *et al*., 2020). However, it failed to meet communicative goals due to several ambiguities. First, the curriculum promoted a communicative approach, yet the guidelines, the syllabi, and the textbooks needed to be more structurally oriented, not employing language use in learning (Zein *et al*., 2020; Lie, 2007). Second, many teachers needed more language mastery and, thus, were heavily driven by

structural-oriented textbooks (Lie, 2007). Furthermore, this curriculum needs to match its objectives and the order of importance of the language skills needed. Reading skills were considered the most important to teach because English was seen as a foreign language, not a means of communication. Therefore, reading was taught through the top-down model, which stresses the reconstruction of meaning and comprehension by adopting instructional strategies of active readers, such as guessing meaning from context, previewing the texts, and predicting text structure (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). The strategies propelled students to activate their vocabulary, sentence knowledge, discourses, and real-world connections.

As the 1984 Communicative Curriculum failed to meet its goals, the 1994 Meaning-based Curriculum was still oriented to Communicative Approach. Given the emphasis on meaningfulness, the textbooks meet the curriculum guidelines and must include content themes, grammar, language functions, and vocabulary items (Lie, 2007). Reading skills were emphasized more than other language skills, and the instruction was oriented on language themes and functions (Mister, 2005; Ena, 2013). Reading passagesfulfilled the perspectives of students' diversity regarding gender, socioeconomic classes, ethnicity, and geography. However, the passages could have highlighted intercultural understanding, and equality tended to be irrelevant and meaningless for students' comprehension (Lie, 2007).

The other three curricula were introduced after the Reformation Era in Indonesia and the educational trend of the 21st century. The curriculashifted due to the initiation of decentralization in education in 2003 (Winarti, 2012, p. 66; Akrom, 2015, p. 21). Decentralization in education policy diminished the central government's monopoly over curriculum development and mandated individual schools to develop their operational curricula (Akrom, 2015, p. 21). Those curricula are the competency-based curriculum), The school-level curriculum (*KTSP*) and the 2013 curriculum). These curricula shifted Communicative Language Teaching into Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and a Genre-Based Approach (GBA) (Zein *et al*., 2.020).

The Competency-Based Curriculum, nationally mandated in 2004, emphasized Celce-Murcia's communicative competence and Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar approach. This curriculum was conceptually supposed to promote students' ability to perform integrated language skills and communicate in different contexts (Widodo, 2016). The government centralized the guidelines, the syllabi, and the contents of textbooks. Therefore, textbooks should be systematically organized into themes and tasks, text types and forms, and macro language

skills; however, activities in the available textbooks need to match the organization and tend to emphasize testing students' comprehension and memorization (Widodo, 2016).

KTSP 2006 (a school-based curriculum) is a curriculum developed at school. The school-based curriculum has three characteristics. First, educational activities are developed by schools under the national guidelines. Second, aspects of the school-based curriculum are developed, implemented, and evaluated collectively by school community members. Last, schools are mandated to manage their curricula with administrative rights and professional authority in the hands of the schools (Akron, 2015, p. 22) to cater to the different needs of students and institutions and empower their local resources (Lie, 2007). *KTSP 2006* applies the Genre-based Approach and Systemic Functional Framework for English language teaching (Widodo, 2016). A genre-based approach initiates students to the social dimension of texts and introduces structural and language features of text genresto aid students in comprehending the texts (Lee, 2012). In other words, reading skills are emphasized to develop students' language competencies.

Even though GBA is still accentuated in the learning phases, the 2013 ELT Curriculum emphasized the development of students' character, skills, and knowledge related to the 21st century, referred to as the Scientific Approach (Widodo, 2016; Lie, 2007). The Scientific Approach comprises five learning cycles: observing, questioning, exploring/experimenting, associating, and communicating. In this curriculum, students' communicative competence is developed through short functional and transactional texts; thus, reading skills are developed at low-level thinking.

METHOD(S)

Design and Procedure

This study scrutinized the course syllabi by analyzing their content based on the taught curriculum. In other words, content analysis was conducted to identify knowledge mapping delivered in the course. Qualitative data can be dissected with analytical constructs to draw conclusions from the text and make inferences contextually through content analysis (Maschi *et al*., 2019; Hoffman *et al*., 2011; White & Marsh, 2006). This current study undertook inductive analysis by delineating categories within the syllabi, further discussed in the section on Data Analysis Procedure.

Data Sources and Collection Procedure

A series of EFL reading courses for EFLTEP students were chosen to answer this study's research problems. Those courses were *Reading for General Purposes*, *Reading for Academic Purposes*, and *Critical Reading and Writing*. In terms of the course sequence, they were taught in the first three semesters. Each course is a prerequisite, and students must pass each course in the sequence to enroll in the next course. In identifying knowledge mapping from those courses, the instructors' syllabi of the courses were gathered and became the primary data instrumentation. Three syllabi sets were extracted and evaluated to answer the proposed research questions. In addition, two curricula documents –the 2017 curriculum of the English Education Department and the 2013 curriculum– were also gathered and analyzed to complete the syllabi analysis.

Data Analysis Procedure

In mapping the knowledge of reading skills taught in each course and identifying its connection to the 2013 ELT Curriculum for secondary and high school levels, data were analyzed inductively through three levels of qualitative analysis: meaning unit, category cluster, and category interpretation (Maschi *et al*., 2019; Tutty*et al*., 1996). At the meaning unit phase, data within the syllabi were coded and classified into distinct units, such as course description, objectives, learning materials, and assessment. Then, the units were clustered into categories and subcategories before classifying them into themes or patterns and identifying their connection. In the last step, those categories were interpreted into two themes: knowledge level and interconnectedness between courses and the ELT curriculum for secondary education.

The categories and subcategories were related to identifying those three courses and texts embedded in the course. The categories included the following courses: *Reading for General Purposes, Reading for Academic Purposes,* and *Critical Reading and Writing*. The subcategories included text identification: text structure, text types, and comprehension level. These categories and subcategories were then interpreted into two themes: knowledge mapping in each course and course alignment with the 2013 ELT curriculum. The discussion of course content and its interconnectedness with EFL reading in the ELT curriculum for secondary education was structured under these two themes.

FINDINGS

Context Information

An environmental analysis highly affects how a course is designed and whether it is usable (Macalister & Nation, 2011; Tessmer, 1990); the assigned lecturers in the Department of English Education at Jambi University would consider the environmental factors in designing syllabi for Reading courses. Located in the developing province of Jambi, Indonesia, most students enrolling in Jambi University come from villages and small cities. As Indonesia has more than 700 local languages rich in dialects and linguistic varieties (Widodo, 2016), some local languages also exist in this province. Thus, many students speak one or more local languages besides the national lingua franca (NLF), *Bahasa Indonesia*. Students' exposure to English depends merely on the pedagogical practices at schools and the availability of the Internet in their areas because English is a foreign language, and its native speakers scarcely visit this province. Therefore, English proficiency levels of school graduates varied when they enrolled in the English Education department.

In the 2020/2021 academic year, 83 students were registered in the first semester, and 137 students were in the third semester in the Department of English Education. They spoke at least one local language and spoke English during classroom learning. Many students had lower English proficiency and were familiar with teacher-centered learning when studying at high schools in rural areas (document of English Education Department, 2020). As EFL reading at the tertiary level in Indonesia requires students to efficaciously self-regulate their learning of English texts from multiple genres and sources (Masduqi, 2014; Cahyono &Widiati, 2006), the reading courses were designed to improve students' reading proficiency and transform their learning approach into learner-centered. Thus, the syllabi for the courses construe the course's goals into learning plans.

Knowledge Mapping in Three EFL Reading Courses

The 2017 ELT Curriculum offered a series of reading courses: *Reading for General Purposes, Reading for Academic Purposes,* and *Critical Reading and Writing*. Three syllabi of those reading courses had similar structures: course description, course objective, learning materials, and assessment. The course description reveals the name and code of the course, target learners, required textbooks, and a brief description of the course. Course objectives include the

expected learning outcomes regarding character building (attitudes), general and specific skills at higher education, and reading knowledge. These objectives are stipulated in the*KerangkaKurikulum Nasional Indonesia* or KKNI (Framework of Indonesian Curriculum for Higher Education). Learning materials and assessments have met the criteria of instruction stipulated in the 2017 ELT Curriculum.

These three courses aimed to develop students' reading skills and transfer the knowledge of EFL reading instructions applicable to secondary school. These courses are differentiated by text structure, comprehension level, and text type. The structures include short-functional texts, genre-based texts, and standardized test-related texts. These courses targeted the mastery of literal, inferential, and critical comprehension.

Reading for General Purposes. This course is a prerequisite for two other reading courses: *Reading for Academic Purposes* and *Critical Reading and Writing.* This course emphasizes high-frequency vocabulary development, the application of reading processes, and literal comprehension. Specifically, this course focuses on developing students' literal reading comprehension, including word recognition, contextual word meaning, text structure, references, main ideas and peripheral ideas, skimming, and scanning. Students are expected to empower bottom-up and top-down processes to achieve thorough comprehension. The focus of this course indicated that students should apply text structure theory as they learn to comprehend texts organized from explicit to more peripheral information through skimming and scanning (Cahyono &Widiati, 2006). This course also introduces students to short-functional texts and genres of expository, narrative, and descriptive writing, with a text readability range of up to 5000 words.

This course was structured into two parts: short-functional texts and genre-based texts. Short-functional texts involve topics of city life, notices, advertisements, news, and college-related issues. These topics engaged students' familiarity with real-life tasks as the texts resemble events or issues in daily life. This course introduced students to expository, descriptive, and narrative texts, which are linguistically simplified in terms of text-related grammar and vocabulary. The texts facilitated students to develop literal comprehension by employing bottom-up and top-down processes. The texts also propelled students to engage in the text by activating their text structure recognition.

Reading for Academic Purposes. This course is a prerequisite for the latter reading course: *Critical Reading and Writing*. This course emphasizes low-frequency vocabulary development, the application of reading processes, and inferential comprehension in subject-specific texts. Specifically, this course focuses on developing students' Reading inferential comprehension, which includes contextual word meaning, text structure, inferences, implied main ideas and peripheral ideas, summary, and synthesis. The reading texts are supplemented with text-related grammatical rules. Students are expected to integrate top-down and interactive processes to get inferential comprehension. This course also introduces students to genres of argumentation, comparison, cause and effect, and problem solution with the text readability range between 5000-6000 words.

This course was structured into genre-based texts and standardized test-related texts. Genre-based texts facilitated students' learning about how arguments, comparisons, and cause-effect statements are organized in the texts. These texts are supplemented with the teaching of text-related grammar and vocabulary. Standardized test-related texts refer to texts commonly used in standardized English language proficiency tests, such as TOEFL and IELTS. However, this syllabus did not teach subject-related texts necessary for dealing with academic texts related to their major. The texts facilitated students to develop inferential comprehension through the application of top-down and interactive model processes. The texts also propelled students to engage in the texts. They activate their text structure recognition and metacognition strategies when they predict the text in advance and address questions while reading to generate constructive reading comprehension ((Pammu et al., 2014; Anderson, 2002).

Critical Reading and Writing. This course integrates reading and writing skills at an academic level. This course emphasizes low-frequency vocabulary development, the application of reading processes, and critical comprehension in published texts or articles. Specifically, this course focuses on developing students' critical reading comprehension, including text organization, inferences, implied main ideas and detailed ideas, synthesis, and research-based texts. The reading texts are supplemented with writing activities. Students are expected to amalgamate top-down and interactive processes to gain critical comprehension. This course also introduces students to genres of argumentation, comparison, and contrast, as well as cause and effect, with a text readability of at least 7000 words.

Based on the syllabus obtained, this course was structured into genre-based and research-based texts. Genre-based texts facilitated students' learning about how argument, comparison, and cause-effect are organized in the texts, supplemented with text-related grammar and vocabulary. Research-based texts refer to published articles in international journals. This course requires students to produce genre-based essays and synthesize research-based articles. This course also introduced students to the organization of published articles.9 Some published articles on English pedagogy were supplemented to introduce students to various research in English pedagogy. The expected learning outcomes were that students' reading competence of academic texts increased. The texts facilitated students' development of critical comprehension by applying top-down and interactive model processes. Students learned to associate their prior knowledge with metacognition strategies when dealing with research-based texts.

The syllabi from these three courses have addressed the expected learning outcomes stipulated in the 2017 ELT curriculum. The outcomes included knowledge gain and development of skills. In the knowledge gain outcomes, students were expected to comprehend English language theories and effective oral and written communication techniques in real-life, academic, and professional contexts. In the skill development outcomes, students were expected to be able to convey oral and written communication in daily, job-related, and academic situations. It was expected from the three courses that students' reading comprehension develops well. They are expected to possess literal, inferential, and critical comprehension after they learn from these courses and be able to apply their reading skills in real-life, job-related, and academic contexts.

The knowledge mapping among these three reading courses lacks coherence. This lack of coherence involvesreading instruction gaps, overlapping genres, and academic text difficulty. The gap pertains to text types introduced in each course. The genres overlap due to the introduction of similar genres in the two courses. Academic text difficulty is related to introducing research journals in one course.

There is a reading instruction gap in course content not only between *Reading for General Purposes* and *Reading for Academic Purposes* but also between *Reading for Academic Purposes* and *Critical Reading and Writing*. Although *the Reading for General Purposes* course introduced genre-based texts, it only focused on three genres –expository, narratives, and descriptive texts. Those genres were not taught in the *Reading for Academic Purposes* course or

used in standardized test texts. In the latter course, students were introduced to more academic genres, such as texts of comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and argumentation. Since students only learned short-functional text and three genres in the former course, introducing standardized test-related texts in the latter course can cause difficulty because they did not learn those text types in previous courses. Theintroduction of articles from worldwide scholarly journals in *the Critical Reading and Writing* course widens the exposure to texts. However, it may be too far because third-semester students have not yet learned about research methods, and the *Reading for Academic Purposes* course does not introduce a text type of academic peer-reviewed scientific writing.

In addition, genres introduced in the *Reading for Academic Purposes* course overlapwith those in *the Critical Reading and Writing* course. Text types of comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and argumentative were taught in the former and latter courses. Descriptive texts introduced in *the Reading for General Purposes* course were also taught in the *Critical Reading and Writing* course. However, it is understandable that the latter course required students to write essays in those genres. This re-teaching of those genres to facilitate students' writing tasks may be problematic for students' workload and time allotment because they were forced to be able to write four essays representing each genre during the first half of the semester.

Last, introducing published articles from international scholarly journals as academic texts caused comprehension difficulties for students. Technical terms, lexical complexity, and research contexts were complicated and hard to digest for students whose English proficiency was at an upper intermediate level. The students also have yet to be exposed to research reports. English pedagogy and research methodology courses were offered in the fourth and fifth semesters, whereas the *Critical Reading and Writing* course was offered in the third semester. Thus, assigning students to review and write a summary for the articles seemed problematic due to students' paucity of research knowledge and English pedagogy.

Although the three courses display discrepancies in knowledge mapping, these courses do show parallels or continuation in text readability, text structure, and comprehension level. As college-level reading requires students to read longer texts than those in secondary education, these courses stratify text readability from 5000 to 7000 words. This coherence is reflected in the introduction of text structure. The general reading introduced short-functional and some genre-

based texts, whereas the academic and critical readings concerned more academic text genres and high-stake test-based genres. In addition, comprehension level was also stratified from literal to inferential and critical comprehension. The general reading focused on developing students' literal comprehension of short-functional and genre-based texts; the academic and critical reading course required students to empower their inferential and critical analysis of the academic texts and texts used in standardized language proficiency tests. The contents of these courses showed an alignment with the instruction for EFL reading in secondary education.

Reading courses' alignment withthe 2013 Curriculum of Indonesia

As stipulated in the 2017 ELT Curriculum, the EFLTEP aims to yield competent graduates who can pursue careers as an English teacher in secondary education institutions, a novice language researcher, and individuals who work in or establish an English language-based entrepreneurship. As teachers in secondary schools, EFLTEP students need to understand English pedagogy and meet the demands of the 2013 ELT curriculum, a national curriculum for secondary education level in Indonesia.

The 2013 ELT curriculum stipulates that at the secondary education level, the classroom's learning experience and the mastery of the language serve as resources for students to engage in real-life communicative occasions and to learn in interactive and integrated pedagogy (Widodo, 2016). Relating to teaching reading skills to secondary school students, EFL readings were focused on short-functional texts and the introduction of text types such as narratives, descriptive, procedural, and expository. These texts represent real-world occasions with linguistic modification for the language use. Since the EFL reading was introduced from Grade 7 to Grade 12 at the secondary level, the text structure and types were arranged from basic to intermediate language proficiency. These texts mostly activate the bottom-up reading process; however, the top-down process was introduced for Grade 11-12 students about inferences and connection to students' prior knowledge. In addition, EFL reading focused mostly on literal comprehension.

The three courses were organized in terms of text structure, types or genres, and comprehension level. At the secondary level, four English language skills were not taught discretely; they were taught as an integrative subject named English. However, this stratification of skills at the university was aligned with the stratification based on the 2013 ELT curriculum.

Knowledge mapping in *Reading for General Purposes* and *Reading for Academic Purposes* covers real-world tasks. It is aligned with the reading skills needed for secondary-level English language teachers. *Reading for General Purposes* course offered text types that facilitated students' literal comprehension and the development of reading skills like contextual word meaning, text structure, references, main ideas and peripheral ideas, skimming, and scanning.Although text types introduced in *Reading for Academic Purposes* were not taught at secondary schools, the texts emphasized the development of reading skills such as contextual word meaning, inferences, implied main ideas and peripheral ideas, and summary, which were taught in Grades 11-12. A knowledge discrepancy in text genres was shown between these courses and the English subjects. English subjects should have introduced explanation and discussion genres, mostly used in college-level reading texts (Murtiningsih&Hapsari, 2018).

In addition, the 2013 ELT curriculum develops students' communicative competence through short functional texts and genre-based texts at low-level thinking (Widodo, 2016). In contrast, the 2017 ELT curriculum facilitates students' communicative competence through genre-based academic texts at higher-level thinking. Some text types taught in the three courses are those stipulated in the 2013 ELT national curriculum. However, the courses' text readability and comprehension levels are more complex than those for secondary students. This is reasonable as the courses target adult learners whose English language proficiency is at least at the upper intermediate level and who are expected to be prospective English teachers in secondary education after graduation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study reveals that knowledge mapping in the three reading courses has addressed the targeted learning outcomes stipulated in the 2017 ELT department curriculum for English Education Study Program students. As explicitly informed in the syllabi, the courses have covered various readability levels, comprehension levels, and text types to equip students with sufficient reading skills and knowledge to handle college-level texts and text types at school. These courses indicated the parallels or continuation regarding text readability, text structure, and comprehension level. Discrepancies among courses were the need for more connectedness in some course content among three courses, the overlapping genres, and academic text difficulty.

However, the researcher acknowledges that the findings in this study are solely derived from the syllabi. This restricted the analysis and narrowed down the scope of the discussion. Besides, this study should have addressed students' needs, needs, and wants, which can enrich the discussion. Therefore, this researcher recommends that further research add research instruments for deeper analysis of the courses. Using interviews with the course instructors, questionnaires, and other course artifacts can give in-depth perspectives about the courses. Unfortunately, further study would be somewhat obsolete be conducted like these courses as the Department of English Education at Jambi University has renewed its curriculum and replaced the 2017 ELT Department Curriculum with the current one, the 2021 ELT Department curriculum, which incorporates reading and writing skills in 4 parallel courses: *Reading and Writing for General Purposes, Reading and Writing for Academic Purposes, Reading and Writing for Professional Purposes,* and *Extensive Reading and Writing.* Therefore, further study is recommended to explore how these courses of reading and writing connection were structured and associated with the integrated English subject at the secondary education level in the Indonesian context.

References

Ajideh, P. (2003). Schema theory-based pre-reading tasks: A neglected essential in the ESL reading class. *The Reading Matrix* 3(1), 1 – 14.

Akrom, M. A. (2015). *The Mirage of Curriculum Decentralization: A Case Study of Local Stakeholders' Involvement in School-Based Curriculum Development (SCBD) Policy Implementation in Indonesia.* Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, the United States

Anderson, N. (2002). The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning. Eric Digest, EDO. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED463659.pdf

Cahyono, B. Y. &Widiati, U. (2006). The Teaching of EFL Reading in the Indonesian Context: The State of the Art. *TEFLIN Journal vol. 17 (1),* 36-58

Carrel, P. L. (1985). Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(4), 727 – 751

Carrel, P. L., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E. (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

de Debat, E. V. (2006). Applying current approaches to the teaching of reading. *English Teaching Forum* 1, 8 – 15

Ena, O. E. (2013). *Visual analysis of e-textbooks for Senior high school in Indonesia.* Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, the United States

Goodman, K. S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Literacy Research and Instruction* 6(4), 126 – 135.DOI: 10.1080/19388076709556976

Gorsuch, G., & Taguchi, E. (2010). Developing reading fluency and comprehension using repeated reading: Evidence from longitudinal student reports. *Language Teaching Research* 14(1), 27 – 59.

Hoffman, J. V., Wilson, M. B., Martinez, R. A., & Sailors, M. (2011). Content analysis: The past, present, and future. In N. K. Duke & M. H. Mallette (ed.). **Literacy research methodologies (2nd ed.)**. New York: Guilford Press

Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: between the commitment to competence and the quest for higher test scores. *TEFLIN Journal vol. 18(1)*, 1-14

Macalister, J. & Nation, I. S. P. (2011). *Language Curriculum Design* (2nd Ed.) New York: Routledge

Maschi, T., Rees, J., Leibowitz, G., & Bryan, M. (2019). Educating for rights and justice: A content analysis of forensic social work syllabi. *Social Work Education,* 38(2), 177 – 197, DOI: 10.1080/02615479.2018.1508566

Masduqi, H. (2014). EFL Reading in Indonesian Universities: Perspectives and Challenges in Cultural Contexts. *Journal of Teaching and Education, 03(03)*, 385-397. ISSN: 2165-6266

Mickulecky, L., Clark, E. E., & Adams, S. M. (1989). Teaching concept mapping and university level study strategies using computers. *Journal of Reading* 32(8), 694 – 702

Mistar, J. (2005). Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in Indonesia. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Teaching English to the world: history, curriculum, and practice* (pp. 168 – 189). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Mohammed, Q., & Ab Rashid, R. (2017). Reading comprehension difficulties among EFL learners: The case of first- and second-year students at Yarmouk University in Jordan. *Arab World English Journal* (AWEJ) 8(3), 421 – 431. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no3.27

Murtadho, F. (2021). Metacognitive and critical thinking practices in developing EFL students' argumentative writing skills. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* vol. 10 (3), 656 – 666. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31752

Murtiningsih, S. R., &Hapsari, W. (2018). Teaching Reading to encourage critical thinking and collaborative work. In A. Burns & J. Siegel (eds.), *International Perspectives on Teaching the Four Skills in ELT: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63444-9_11

Nassaji, H. (2003). Higher-level and lower-level text processing skills in advanced ESL reading comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal* 87(2), 261 – 276

OECD (2019). *Program for international student assessment, results 2019*. Accessed on December 6, 2021, from http://www.oecd.org/pisa

Pammu, A., Amin, Z., &Maasum, T. N. R. T. M. (2014). Metacognitive reading strategies of less proficient learners: A case study of EFL learners at a public university in Makassar, Indonesia. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 118, 357 – 364

Saengpakdeejit, R., &Intaraprasert, C. (2014). Reading strategies in foreign language academic reading: A qualitative investigation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 4(12), 2599 - 2608

Saricoban, A. (2002). Reading strategies of successful readers through the three phase approach. *The Reading Matrix* 2(3), 1 – 15

Shabaan, K. (2006). An initial study of the effects of cooperative learning on reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and motivation to read. *Reading Psychology* 27, 377 – 403

Sulistiyo, U., Wulan, R., Al Arif, T. Z. Z., Efriza, D., & Anwar, K. (2021). A critical content analysis of English textbook for senior high school students in Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education, 8*(1), 84-98.

Sundari, H., Febriyanti, R. H., &Saragih, G. (2018). Using Task-based materials in teaching wiring for EFL classes in Indonesia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* vol. 7 (3), 119 – 124

Sunggingwati, D., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2013). Teachers' questioning in reading lessons: A case study in Indonesia. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* vol. 10 (1), 80 – 95

Tessmer, M. (1990). Environment analysis: A neglected stage of instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 38(1), 55 - 64

Tutty, L. M., Rothery, M., & Grinnell. R. M. (1996). Qualitative research for social workers. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon

Ulfiati, L. (2012). MOODLE and improvement of students' reading comprehension. In B. Y. Cahyono and N. Yanuar (ed.), **Englishes for Communication and Interaction in the Classroom and Beyond**. Malang: State University of Malang Press

Van Camp, D., & Van Camp, W. (2013). Using content reading assignments in a psychology course to teach critical reading skills. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* vol.13(1), 86-99

van Elsäkker, W. (2002). *Development of reading comprehension: The engagement perspective. A study of reading comprehension, vocabulary, strategy use, reading motivation, and leisure-time reading of third- and fourth-grade students from diverse backgrounds in the Netherlands*. Doctoral dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: A flexible methodology. *Library Trends, 55*(1), 22 – 45

Widodo, H. P. (2009). Key issues in teaching EFL/ESL intensive reading: a videotaped self-observation report. *The Journal of Effective Teaching* vol. 9 (3), 38 – 58.

Widodo, H. P. (2016). Language policy in practice: reframing the English language curriculum in the Indonesian secondary education sector (pp. 127 – 151). In Robert Kirkpatrick (ed.). **English Language Education Policy in Asia.** SpringerLink,

Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., &Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: a review of research (2011-2019). *Language Teaching,* 1-33

Nanda, D. W., & Azmy, K. (2020). Poor reading comprehension issue in EFL classroom among Indonesian secondary school students: Scrutinizing the causes, impacts and possible solutions. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 8*(1), 12-24. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v8i1.6771