International Journal of English Language Studies
ISSN: 2707-7578
DOI: 10.32996/ijels
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijels

IJELS
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

An Analysis of Instructional Design Model and Students' English Achievement

Andi Tenri Ampa[1] ✉ Syamsiarna Nappu[2] and Muhammad Basri D[3]
[12]Makassar Muhammadiyah University, Indonesia
[3]Indonesia Muslim University, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: Andi Tenri Ampa, **E-mail**: anditenri.ampa@unismuh.ac.id

| ABSTRACT
Teaching English in Indonesia should get attention to face the era of globalization. The initial survey shows that students still face problems or difficulties in learning English, especially productive skills. So, the study aimed to investigate the kinds of instructional design models (IDM) conducted by lecturers, to expose the stages of IDM, and to describe the learning achievement of the students' English productive skills. The subjects of this study were lecturers who taught English productive skills, namely speaking and writing skills, and the fourth semester students who had programed these courses. The procedures were (1) a preliminary survey of learning problems, (2) designing research instruments, (3) validating instruments, (4) collecting data through instruments, and (5) analyzing and interpreting the results of data analysis. The instrument was a questionnaire that aimed to obtain information from lecturers, while the test aimed to measure the achievement of students' English productive skills. The results showed that the lecturers used several kinds of IDM with various stages, and the students' English achievement was in good classification for speaking skills and fair for writing skills. Therefore, the lecturers were considerably required to choose the kinds and various stages of IDM in their teaching and learning processes.

| KEYWORDS

Design, English achievement, model, Instructional

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 02 August 2023 **PUBLISHED:** 17 August 2023 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijels.2023.5.3.4

1. Introduction

English in Indonesia is still a foreign language, so it is commonly learned and used in an academic environment, for example, in the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Meanwhile, in this globalization era, the interaction among nations with different languages makes the language of unity more important to master. English is a language that must be possessed by everyone if he wants to exist and gain progress because it is an international language which can be used in almost all aspects. For students who take part in student exchange programs with other countries, English language skills are very necessary. For students who continue their Masters's or Doctorate programs abroad, their ability to speak English is absolutely needed. So, English plays a very important role in education. However, the reality still shows that students who have been learning English still find problems and get difficulties in using this language, especially in productive skills (Ampa & Akib, 2018).

Therefore, lecturers should make an effort to help learners use English well. One of the ways to improve the English teaching and learning process is the use of an instructional model, which means that the lecturers should have various models of instruction and be able to apply them in the teaching and learning process in classroom interaction. The intended instructional design is the entire process of analyzing needs and learning objectives and developing teaching techniques and learning materials to meet the students' needs. It includes the learning packages, teaching activities, and evaluation activities of learning outcomes. Besides, this research will cover how English is used as a medium of instruction in the classroom.

A description of the instructional model used by lecturers in the teaching and learning process is very necessary in relation to the students' learning achievements, especially in English skills. Thus, the research questions are formulated as follows:

1. What kinds of instructional design models are used by the lecturers in carrying out the learning process in the classroom?
2. What stages of the instructional design model are used by the lecturers in carrying out the learning process in the classroom?
3. Based on the instructional design model, how is the students' learning achievement of English productive skills?

Designing an instructional model is a form of instructional system that is mostly done in the context of updating the education system, with the intention that the system can meet the demands of students' needs and the development of science and technology. The main goal is to increase the productivity and efficiency of the learning process. However, a systematic approach to instructional activities is carried out in different ways. Thus, this research aims to investigate the kinds of instructional design models used by English lecturers in the teaching and learning process as well as how the students' achievement.

The design deals with a shape that is the first step in the development phase for each product. Design can be used for a variety of application processes and principles for the detection of an application, a process or a system in detail that is appropriate for discussing its physical point (Merchant, 2018). The aim of the designer is to look for models or associations from companies which will then design learning, communication and content to help transfer knowledge about educators and students, formulation of learning objectives, and discussion of media-based "training" to assist in the transition. As a discipline, design learning has historically and traditionally been based on cognitive and affective domains (Reiser & Dempsey, 2007).

Several experts have designed various instructional models. Donmez and Cagiltay (2016) have categorized IDM as many as 33 IDs and stated that instructional design strategies are needed to provide effective instructional design and to achieve more successful learning outcomes (Khalil & Elkhider, 2016). Instructional Design (ID) is a system that includes procedures for developing education and training programs in a consistent and reliable way (Gustafson & Branch, 2002b). In addition, Şimşek et al. (2013) defined ID as the development of a functional learning system based on a systematic approach to meeting the requirements of certain target groups, whereas Branch (2010) described ID as a systemic process for developing education and training programs in a consistent and reliable manner, but a complex process with creativity, activity, and interactivity. Furthermore, Branch & Kopcha (2014) stated that IDs that provide tools for the process of visualization, direction and management aim to develop high-quality teaching and learning. In general, ID models are usually adaptations of five phases, namely analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation (Seels & Glasgow, 1998). The generic ID model is also referred to as the ADDIE model, which includes a set of useful criteria and continuous revisions to the implementation of instructions (Gustafson & Branch, 2002a).

The other studies, such as Siregar (2018), found that there is an influence of instructional design models on social studies learning outcomes. In addition, Fauzi et al. (2016) found the influence of learning models and problem-based learning on students' achievement. Suardi et al. (2014); Nugraha & Arief (2019) examined the effect of the cooperative learning model on learning outcomes in reading English in terms of the achievement motivation of grade XI students. The results show that there were differences in learning outcomes in English reading between students who took cooperative learning models and students who followed conventional learning models for students who had high and low achievement.

From the discussion of the related research, it was concluded that, in general, the researchers only implemented the learning model and measured the effect of the models on learning outcomes. This research aims to study the instructional design models used by lecturers in universities, especially at Makassar Muhammadiyah University, as a reference in designing teaching materials that fits the needs and characteristics of students as we know that English is known and used in almost all the world. In Indonesia, English is one of the subjects studied starting from elementary school level up to college. Therefore, students need to have good English achievement.

2. Material and Methods

Research on learning achievement has been widely studied by researchers (Ambarwati & Baron, 2018). The study was conducted to find the extent of learning models and learning motivation on English learning achievement. The results concluded that there is a significant influence of the use of learning models on English learning outcomes. This is evidenced by the acquisition of Sig. = 0.004 <0.05 and Fh = 8,967.

Another paper dealt with examples of the success of students in acquiring productive skills in English. It aimed to identify the learning success of the students for both speaking and writing skills and their learning career problems. The participants in the

study consisted of 30 students. For data collection, the speaking and writing tests were successfully used. By using a mean number, they were analysed. Pronunciation, vocabulary, structure, fluency and self-confidence were the variables assessed for speaking abilities, while the core concept, organization, supporting content, word usage, spelling, and grammar and punctuation were those for writing abilities. The research findings show that the students still achieved speaking abilities in the average category (49.33 percent), but most of them achieved low category achievement in writing abilities (34.00 percent) (Ampa & Akib, 2019).

Furthermore, there are many IDMs that have been developed by experts, but this study selected 9 IDMs that allowed lecturers at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar to use, namely ADDIE (Quigley, 2019), ASSURE (Smaldino et al., 2008), Kemp (Morrison et al., 2010), Gagne (Gagne et al., 1992), Dick & Carey **(**Pappas, 2015), ARCS (Keller, 1987), DDDE (Delhi, S. (2016), ICARE (Byrum, 2013), and CCCC (Van Merriënboer & Kirschner, 2018) IDMs. The steps of the IDMs were included in the questionnaire items to be given to lecturers to be answered. Thus, IDMs used by lecturers were able to be described to what extent they had been used. Furthermore, the students taught by the lecturers were tested to what extent their English learning achievement.

This research used a descriptive method in which there were 15 lecturers and 150 students involved as the research samples. The research instruments used were a questionnaire for lecturers and a test for students. The questionnaire aimed to know the kinds and stages of IDMs used by the lecturers in teaching by using the Likert scale (5 for always, 4 for usually, 3 for often, 2 for sometimes, and 1 for seldom), and the test was used to know the students' English achievement focusing on the English productive skills.

The subjects of the research were the lecturers who had taught English productive skills (speaking and writing) for at least 10 years; and the students who attended or programed the courses at English Education Program at Makassar Muhammadiyah University. Furthermore, data obtained from the speaking and writing tests were analysed with the rubrics in table 1 and 2, and then the mean score was based on the classification score in Table 3 below:

Table 1. Rubric for speaking skill

No	Comprehension	Content	Pronunciation	Fluency	Grammar & vocabulary	Score
1	Makes few mistakes understanding questions, responses, and questions are mostly clear.	The students present most of the ideas that are supported by additional information.	Pronunciation and intonation generally accurate, error do not cause misunderstanding	Speaks fluidly, few to no breaks, fluent and spontan-eous, but occa-sionally needs to search for expressions or compromise on saying exactly what he/she wants to.	Strong grammar and a varied and relatively complex vocabulary	4
2	Interaction takes place despite some mistakes when asking and answering	The students present some ideas that are supported by additional information	Some students' ideas proposed are accom-panied by addi-tional details or clarification.	Speaking in a soft voice but not really clear, flat facial expression, and less.	Moderately strong grammar and a vari-ed but basic vocabulary	3
3	Allows crucial mistakes, apparent solutions, poor grammatical questions, and misunderstanding	The ideas are not support-ed by addi-tional infor-mation or explanation.	Speaks somewhat fluidly, with frequent short and a few long breaks.	Speaking in a soft voice but not really clear, flat facialexpress-ion, and less.	Basic grammar and not-varied basic vocabulary	2
4	Interaction doesn't occur; the question is not known, the answers are vague.	Questions and answers don't have any relation-ship with the task.	Control of the the sound system is so weak that comprehension is difficult	Does not speak fluidly, short and longbreaks. Speaking is almostinaudible, no facial exp-ression and communication.	Poor grammar and minimal vocabulary	1

Source: https://www.rcampus.com/rubricshowc.cfm?code=UX3BB58&sp=yes&

Table 2. Rubric for writing skill

Content	Grammar	Vocabulary	Spelling&punctuation	Score
Main ideas are related to the topic and are reasonably clear	There may be minor grammatical errors that do not interfere with the main ideas	Adequate range, occasional errors of word form/ choice/ usage but meaning not obscured	Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, paragraphing but meaning not obscure, obscured	4
Main ideas are related to the topics	May contain major grammatical errors that compromise its comprehensibility	Limited range, frequent errors of word choice/ form/usage, meaning confused and obscured	Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, paragraphing may distract the readers	3
Main ideas are only marginally related to the topic, or it is difficult to identify	Grammatical errors may be numerous and major to the extent that the text cannot be easily read	Essential translation, little knowledge of English Vocabulary	Errors consistently distract the readers	2
The writing does not address the topic or lacks main ideas	Major errors abound, causing the readers major comprehend-sion difficulties	Mostly translation, very weak, not enough to evaluate	Errors cause serious comprehension problems	1

https://www.scribd.com/document/396993320/Writing-Rubric-Pet

Table 3. Classification score for speaking skill

Score	Letter grades	Classification
3.51-4.00	A	Excellent
3.01-3.50	B	Good
2.51-3.00	C	Fair
2.01-2.50	D	Low
<2.00	E	Very low

3. Results and Discussion

RQ 1: What kinds of instructional design models are used by the lecturers in carrying out the learning process in the classroom?

There are nine instructional design models used by the lecturers in preparing the teaching and learning process in the classroom. The results of data analysis of the questionnaire indicated that of the 9 IDMs, there are 3 types of IDM that have the greatest use by lecturers, namely the ASSURE model with a percentage of usage reaching 81.56%, then DDDE with a usage level of 80.66%, Dick & Carry IDM reaching a usage level of 78.27%, while 3 kinds of IDM are at the moderate level of use, namely Gagne IDM (75.70%), Kemp IDM (70%), and 4C IDM (63.67%). The less used IDMs are ADDIE, ARCS and ICARE IDMs, the levels of use are 56.00%, 52.33% and 44.53%, respectively. Those data can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. The kinds of instructional design model

No	Kinds of Instructional Design Model (IDM)	Percent
1	ADDIE-Analysis, Design, Develop, Implementation, Evaluation (Quigley, 2019).	56.00

2	ASSURE-Analyze, State the objectives, Select method, media and materials, Utilize method, media and materials, Require learner's participation, Evaluation and revise (Smaldino et al., 2008).	81.56
3	KEMP-Determine the goals, Identify characteristics of learners, Clarify course content, Define instructional objectives, Ensure that content for each instructional unit, Design instructional strategies, Plan the instructional message, Develop evaluation instruments, and Choose the appropriate resources (Morrison et al., 2010).	70.33
4	GAGNE-Gain attention, Inform the objective, Recall prior learning, Present the content, Provide learning guidance, Elicit performance, Provide feedback, Assess performance, Enhance retention and transfer (Gagne et al., 1992).	75.70
5	DICK AND CAREY-Identify the objectives, Complete instructional analysis, Determine entry behaviors and learner characteristics, Write performance objectives, Develop criterion-referenced, Develop the strategy, Choose materials and activities, Carry out formative and summative evaluation **(**Pappas, 2015).	78.27
6	ARCS-Attention, Relevance, Confidence, Satisfaction**:** Active participation, Use of humour, Conflict, Variety, Real world examples (Keller, 1987).	52.33
7	DDDE-Design, Decide, Develop, Evaluate (Delhi, S. (2016).	80.66
8	ICARE-Introduction, Connection, Application, Reflect, Extend (Byrum, 2013).	44.53
9	CCCC-Learning Task, Supportive information, Procedural information, Part-task practice (4Components IDM), (Van Merriënboer & Kirschner, 2018).	63.67

RQ2: What stages of the instructional design model are used by the lecturers in carrying out the learning process in the classroom?

The stages of the instructional design model used by the lecturers in preparing the teaching and learning process in the classroom are indicated in Table 5.

Table 5. The stages of instructional design model

No.	Kinds of Instructional Design Model	N	Alw 100	Usl 80	Oft 60	Smt 40	Sld 20	%
1	1) Analyzing initial abilities, learning difficulties, and learner characteristics, with the aim of determining the objectives to be achieved from the end of the lesson,	15	0	0	1	3	11	26.67
	2) Designing a Lecture Plan (SAP),	15	4	2	2	4	3	60.00
	3) Developing learning materials and exercises according to learning objectives, making learning media, such as images, audio, video, etc.	15	3	4	3	2	3	62.67
	4) Applying all learning materials that have been designed,	15	6	4	3	2	0	76.00
	5) Conducting learning evaluations at each meeting and at the end of the teaching and learning process	15	2	2	4	4	3	54.67
								56.00

2	1) Analyzing initial abilities, learning difficulties, learner characteristics,	15	0	0	5	4	6	38.67
	2) Stating the learning objectives,	15	6	4	4	1	0	80.00
	3) Choosing media, methods and learning materials,	15	8	4	3	0	0	86.67
	4) Using IT-integrated media and materials,	15	9	5	1	0	0	90.67
	5) Activating the learners,	15	11	4	0	0	0	97.33
	6) Conducting evaluation and providing feedback.	15	12	3	0	0	0	96.00
								81.56
3	1) Identifying teaching problems and determining the goals for designing learning programs.	15	4	4	0	3	4	73.33
	2) Knowing the students' characteristics.	15	4	3	0	2	3	64.00
	3) Determining the content of the Constitutional Court and the components of the task.	15	10	3	2	0	0	90.67
	4) Stating the purpose of teaching,	15	0	0	7	5	3	45.33
	5) Ordering the material content logically.	15	0	2	9	4	2	44.00
	6) Designing teaching strategies to achieve learning objectives.	15	12	3	0	0	0	96.00
	7) Planning teaching messages.	15	10	3	2	0	0	30.67
	8) Developing an evaluation instrument to assess the achievement of learning.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.0
	9) Providing feedback to support teaching and learning activities.	15	9	4	2	0	0	89.33
								70.33
4	1) Providing a stimulus to attract students' interest in learning by conveying new ideas to stimulate students' minds.	15	0	2	4	4	5	44.00
	2) Delivering learning objectives and conveying assessment criteria.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
	3) Linking students' initial knowledge with new knowledge that will be learned.	15	11	2	2	0	0	92.00
	4) Presenting the material clearly according to the learning objectives.	15	13	2	0	0	0	97.33
	5) Providing guidance to students who are experiencing difficulties.	15	14	1	0	0	0	98.66
	6) Engaging students with interesting activities, so they can evaluate their knowledge or performance.	15	5	3	2	3	2	68.00
	7) Providing feedback.	15	9	4	2	0	0	89.33
	8) Assessing performance - Test their knowledge against defined criteria.	15	9	6	0	0	0	92.00
	9) Using appropriate memory content retention strategies.	15	0	0	5	6	4	41.33

								75.70
5	1) Identifying learning objectives that describe skills, knowledge or attitudes,	15	10	4	1	0	0	92.00
	2) Performing identification of what students should remember.	15	0	0	4	6	5	38.67
	3) Analyze learning and identify general characteristics of students, including skills, previous experience and what will be taught,	15	0	2	5	4	4	46.67
	4) Describing the criteria that will be used to assess student performance.	15	8	4	3	0	0	86.67
	5) Developing Assessment Instruments,	15	10	2	3	0	0	89.33
	6) Developing Learning Strategies,	15	2	2	8	3	0	64.00
	7) Developing and Selecting Teaching Materials,	15	9	5	1	0	0	90.67
	8) Designing and Conducting Formative Evaluation,	15	12	1	2	0	0	93.33
	9) Designing good test items,	15	5	6	4	0	0	81.33
	10) Designing and Conducting a Summative Evaluation (end)	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
								78.27
6	1) Providing statements that can attract the attention of students interested in learning,	15	4	5	6	0	0	77.33
	2) Designing material related to practical applications in real life to motivate students.,	15	0	0	4	5	6	37.33
	3) Convincing students that they can successfully achieve their goals so that they will have greater motivation,	15	1	3	3	4	4	50.67
	4) Presenting satisfying material so that students will feel proud and satisfied with what they have achieved during learning.	15	1	2	2	4	6	44.00
								52.33
7	1) Getting to know students, determining the contents, activities, learning procedure policies, learning objectives,	15	0	1	3	7	4	41.33
	2) Designing the content, the methods used, the learning media,	15	11	2	2	0	0	92.00
	3) Developing text, media: graphics, images, video/audio, etc.	15	9	4	2	0	0	89.33
	4) Evaluating the learning process towards the end of the lesson.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
								80.66
8	1) Describing the context that includes learning in modules,	15	1	4	4	3	3	56.00
	2) Introducing facts, concepts, principles, and/or processes needed by students,	15	0	3	3	4	5	45.33
	3) Providing activities that allow students to apply the knowledge they have acquired and connect to real-world assignments.	15	0	2	5	3	5	45.33
	4) Asking students to take the time to apply metacognitive processes as they articulate what they have learned,	15	0	0	2	7	6	34.67

	5) Giving students the opportunity to express their learning experience through optional learning activities.	15	0	0	5	6	4	41.33
								44.53
9	1) Designing concrete, authentic tasks in learning according to the sequence of practice, learning objectives,	15	1	1	4	4	5	45.33
	2) Providing information that supports learning and the performance of non-repetitive aspects of learning tasks,	15	0	0	3	7	5	37.33
	3) Providing information which is a prerequisite for learning, namely embedding procedural information in rules,	15	5	3	3	4	0	72.00
	4) Providing exercises that aim to improve all aspects of skills.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
								63.67
10.	1) Conveying statements or facts that may conflict with what you know or believe to be true is aimed at attracting attention,	15	0	4	3	3	5	48.00
	2) Using practical exercises in real life so that students become more motivated,	15	9	5	2	0	0	94.67
	3) Giving confidence to students that they can succeed in learning,	15	4	3	3	5	0	68.00
	4) Presenting a direct relationship between satisfaction and motivation level.	15	4	4	2	4	1	68.00
								69.67

Those data prove that lecturers use various steps from IDM in planning the teaching and learning process. The steps that are always used are illustrated in the table above, such as 'Delivering learning objectives, providing exercises that aim to improve all aspects of skills, evaluating the learning process towards the end of the lesson, designing and conducting the summative evaluation. These steps are always done by 15 lecturers. Furthermore, the usual steps done by lecturers are such as providing guidance to students who are experiencing difficulties, activating the learners, presenting the material clearly according to the learning objectives, and using practical exercises in real life, so that students become more motivated.

Table 5. The stages of the instructional design model

No.	Kinds of Instructional Design Model	N	Alw 100	Usl 80	Oft 60	Smt 40	Sld 20	%
1	1) Analyzing initial abilities, learning difficulties, and learner characteristics, with the aim of determining the objectives to be achieved from the end of the lesson,	15	0	0	1	3	11	26.67
	2) Designing a Lecture Plan (SAP),	15	4	2	2	4	3	60.00
	3) Developing learning materials and exercises according to learning objectives, making learning media, such as images, audio, video, etc.	15	3	4	3	2	3	62.67
	4) Applying all learning materials that have been designed,	15	6	4	3	2	0	76.00
	5) Conducting learning evaluations at each meeting and at the end of the teaching and learning process	15	2	2	4	4	3	54.67
								56.00

2	1) Analyzing initial abilities, learning difficulties, learner characteristics,	15	0	0	5	4	6	38.67
	2) Stating the learning objectives,	15	6	4	4	1	0	80.00
	3) Choosing media, methods and learning materials,	15	8	4	3	0	0	86.67
	4) Using IT-integrated media and materials,	15	9	5	1	0	0	90.67
	5) Activating the learners,	15	11	4	0	0	0	97.33
	6) Conducting evaluation and providing feedback.	15	12	3	0	0	0	96.00
								81.56
3	1) Identifying teaching problems and determining the goals for designing learning programs.	15	4	4	0	3	4	73.33
	2) Knowing the students' characteristics.	15	4	3	0	2	3	64.00
	3) Determining the content of the Constitutional Court and the components of the task.	15	10	3	2	0	0	90.67
	4) Stating the purpose of teaching,	15	0	0	7	5	3	45.33
	5) Ordering the material content logically.	15	0	2	9	4	2	44.00
	6) Designing teaching strategies to achieve learning objectives.	15	12	3	0	0	0	96.00
	7) Planning teaching messages.	15	10	3	2	0	0	30.67
	8) Developing an evaluation instrument to assess the achievement of learning.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
	9) Providing feedback to support teaching and learning activities.	15	9	4	2	0	0	89.33
								70.33
4	1) Providing a stimulus to attract students' interest in learning by conveying new ideas to stimulate students' minds.	15	0	2	4	4	5	44.00
	2) Delivering learning objectives and conveying assessment criteria.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
	3) Linking students' initial knowledge with new knowledge that will be learned.	15	11	2	2	0	0	92.00
	4) Presenting the material clearly according to the learning objectives.	15	13	2	0	0	0	97.33
	5) Providing guidance to students who are experiencing difficulties.	15	14	1	0	0	0	98.66
	6) Engaging students with interesting activities, so they can evaluate their knowledge or performance.	15	5	3	2	3	2	68.00
	7) Providing feedback.	15	9	4	2	0	0	89.33
	8) Assessing performance - Test their knowledge against defined criteria.	15	9	6	0	0	0	92.00
	9) Using appropriate memory content retention strategies.	15	0	0	5	6	4	41.33
								75.70
5	1) Identifying learning objectives that describe skills, knowledge or attitudes,	15	10	4	1	0	0	92.00
	2) Performing identification of what students should remember.	15	0	0	4	6	5	38.67
	3) Analyze learning and identify general characteristics of students, including skills, previous experience and what will be taught,	15	0	2	5	4	4	46.67
	4) Describing the criteria that will be used to assess student performance.	15	8	4	3	0	0	86.67
	5) Developing Assessment Instruments,	15	10	2	3	0	0	89.33

	6) Developing Learning Strategies,	15	2	2	8	3	0	64.00
	7) Developing and Selecting Teaching Materials,	15	9	5	1	0	0	90.67
	8) Designing and Conducting Formative Evaluation,	15	12	1	2	0	0	93.33
	9) Designing good test items,	15	5	6	4	0	0	81.33
	10) Designing and Conducting a Summative Evaluation (end)	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
								78.27
6	1) Providing statements that can attract the attention of students interested in learning,	15	4	5	6	0	0	77.33
	2) Designing material related to practical applications in real life to motivate students.,	15	0	0	4	5	6	37.33
	3) Convincing students that they can successfully achieve their goals so that they will have greater motivation,	15	1	3	3	4	4	50.67
	4) Presenting satisfying material so that students will feel proud and satisfied with what they have achieved during learning.	15	1	2	2	4	6	44.00
								52.33
7	1) Getting to know students, determining the contents, activities, learning procedure policies, learning objectives,	15	0	1	3	7	4	41.33
	2) Designing the content, the methods used, the learning media,	15	11	2	2	0	0	92.00
	3) Developing text, media: graphics, images, video/audio, etc.	15	9	4	2	0	0	89.33
	4) Evaluating the learning process towards the end of the lesson.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00
								80.66
8	1) Describing the context that includes learning in modules,	15	1	4	4	3	3	56.00
	2) Introducing facts, concepts, principles, and/or processes needed by students,	15	0	3	3	4	5	45.33
	3) Providing activities that allow students to apply the knowledge they have acquired and connect to real-world assignments.	15	0	2	5	3	5	45.33
	4) Asking students to take the time to apply metacognitive processes as they articulate what they have learned,	15	0	0	2	7	6	34.67
	5) Giving students the opportunity to express their learning experience through optional learning activities.	15	0	0	5	6	4	41.33
								44.53
9	1) Designing concrete, authentic tasks in learning according to the sequence of practice, learning objectives,	15	1	1	4	4	5	45.33
	2) Providing information that supports learning and the performance of non-repetitive aspects of learning tasks,	15	0	0	3	7	5	37.33
	3) Providing information which is a prerequisite for learning, namely embedding procedural information in rules,	15	5	3	3	4	0	72.00
	4) Providing exercises that aim to improve all aspects of skills.	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.00

								63.67
10.	1) Conveying statements or facts that may conflict with what you know or believe to be true is aimed at attracting attention,	15	0	4	3	3	5	48.00
	2) Using practical exercises in real life so that students become more motivated,	15	9	5	2	0	0	94.67
	3) Giving confidence to students that they can succeed in learning,	15	4	3	3	5	0	68.00
	4) Presenting a direct relationship between satisfaction and motivation level.	15	4	4	2	4	1	68.00
								69.67

RQ 3: Based on the instructional design model, how is the students' learning achievement of English productive skills?

The students' learning achievement of English productive skills included five variables for speaking skills, namely: comprehension, content, pronunciation, fluency, dan grammar & vocabulary, while for writing skills, the variables are clarity, accuracy, precision/logic, relevance, and depth. The results of the speaking and writing test given to students show the mean scores in Tables 6 and 7. Data in Table 6 show that the achievement of students' speaking skills is at the average level of "good" for the 5 aspects measured. However, comprehension and content aspects are at an excellent level. While data in Table 7 show the results of the students' writing skills test that are at a moderate average value (2.91). However, from the five aspects measured, the aspects of 'clarity, accuracy and precision' are in a 'good' classification.

Table 6. Students' English Speaking Achievement

Aspects measured	Mean score	Classification
Comprehension	3.57	Excellent
Content	3.51	Excellent
Pronunciation	3.40	Good
Fluency	3.15	Good
Grammar & vocabulary	3.35	Good
Mean score	3.40	Good

Table 7. Students' English Writing Achievement

Aspects measured	Mean score	Classification
Clarity	3.24	Good
Accuracy	3.10	Good
Precision/Logic	3.05	Good
Relevance	2.63	Fair
Depth	2.55	Fair
Mean score	2.91	Fair

In accordance with the main objective of this study is to find an overview of the instructional design model used by lecturers at Makassar Muhammadiyah University in designing teaching and learning processes in the classrooms, especially in English productive skills. There are 9 kinds of IDM used by lecturers with different percentage levels. First, ASSURE-IDM (Smaldino et al., 2008). At IDM, the lecturers emphasize the use of IT as a learning medium. Of the 15 lecturers, they generally say that they always used IT in the teaching and learning process. Second, DDDE-IDM (Delhi, 2016), namely the design of the teaching and learning process, started with designing content, methods and media and then developed text, media including graphics, images, video/audio, etc. After that, the lecturers evaluate the teaching and learning process. Third, Dick and Carrey-IDM (Pappas, 2015), a step that is always taken by all lecturers at IDM, is designing and conducting summative evaluations. However, other steps, such as identifying learning objectives, developing and selecting materials, and developing assessment instruments, are always carried out by lecturers. Furthermore, the steps in GAGNE-IDM (Gagne et al., 1992) which are always carried out by lecturers are linking students' initial knowledge with the material to be studied, determining learning objectives, presenting material clearly, providing guidance on difficulties faced by students, and providing evaluation and feedback. The fifth is KEMP-IDM (Morrison et al., 2010). The steps taken by the lecturers at IDM are determining teaching strategies to achieve goals and

developing assessment instruments and feedback on learning activities. Whereas in CCCC-IDM (VanMerriënboer & Kirschner, 2018), only 1 step is always used by lecturers, namely providing exercises which aim to improve the skills aspect. The other steps are also used frequently, but not as often as the other steps.

The results of this study also show that the IDM steps were still sometimes used by lecturers, even rarely used in designing teaching materials, such as: analyzing students' initial abilities, learning difficulties, learning characteristics, and what students must remember before designing learning. In addition, lecturers also do not provide opportunities for students to apply the metacognitive processes they have learned and do not involve the information that supports learning and performance from non-repetitive aspects of the learning task.

Furthermore, the learning achievement in English skills (speaking and writing skills) is measured by each of the 5 variables, namely comprehension, content, pronunciation, fluency and grammar & vocabulary for speaking skills and the clarity, accuracy, precision/logic, and relevance and depth for writing skills. The results show that comprehension and content in speaking skills were better than pronunciation, grammar and fluency accuracy. Meanwhile, in terms of writing skills, clarity and accuracy of writing were better than other elements, such as logic, relevance, and depth.

4. Conclusion

The lecturers at the English Department of Makassar Muhammadiyah University used IDMs, namely: ASSURE IDM, D3E IDM, Dick & Carry IDM, Gagne IDM, Kemp IDM and 4C IDM. The less used IDMs are ADDIE, ARCS and ICARE IDMs. And then, the achievement level of students' speaking skills is good, but that of their writing skills is fair. It is fruitful to recommend selecting and using the IDMs which are suitable for the language skills to be taught.

Acknowledgements: The research received a grant from Makassar Muhammadiyah University, Indonesia. Therefore, it is a must for the authors to express indebtedness and thanks.
Funding: This research received no external funding.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Ambarwati, E. A., & Baron, R. (2018). The Effects of Learning Model and Learning Motivation towards English Achievement. Inference: *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *1*(2), 85-92.
[2] Ampa, A. T., & Akib, E. (2019). The Students' Learning Achievement of the English Productive Skills. In Eleventh Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2018). Atlantis Press.
[3] Branch, R. M. (2010). Instructional design: The ADDIE approach. Instructional Design: The ADDIE Approach. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09506-6.
[4] Branch, R. M., & Kopcha, T. J. (2014). Instructional Design Models. In Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5.
[5] Byrum, D. (2013). Instructional Module Development Using the I CARE Model with Novice Designers. In R. McBride & M. Searson (Eds.), Proceedings of SITE 2013--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference (pp. 5016-5022).
[6] Delhi, S. (2016). DDD-E Model. https://prezi.com/z94bus1gpoqp/ddd-e-model/
[7] Donmez, M., & Cagiltay, K. (2016, November). A review and categorization of instructional design models. In E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education (pp. 370-384). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
[8] Fauzi, Kl. (2016). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa pada Materi Pencemaran Lingkungan di SMA Negeri 1 Bendahara Aceh Tamiang (The Effect of Learning Models on Students Learning Outcomes on Environmental Pollution Material at Public Senior High School 1, Bendahara Aceh Tamiang. *Jurnal Pendidikan Biologi (Journal of Biology Education),* 6 (1).
[9] Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1992). Principles of instructional design. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
[10] Gustafson, K. L., & Branch, R. M. (2002a). Survey of Instructional Development Models. Fourth Edition. http://doi.org/10.1007/BF02763388.
[11] Gustafson, K. L., & Branch, R. M. (2002b). What is Instructional Design? In R. A. Reiser & J. A. Dempsey (Eds.), Trends and issues in instructional design and technology. Upper Saddle River, Merrill/Prentice Hall. http://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-386531-1.00002-8.
[12] Keller, J. M. (1987). Development and use of the ARCS model of instructional design. Journal of instructional development, 10(3), 2-10.
[13] Khalil & Elkhider, (2016). Applying learning theories and instructional design models for effective instruction. US National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health. 40(2):147-56. doi 10.1152/advan.00138.2015.
[14] Merchant, R. (2018). The Meaning of Design. https://medium.com/google-design/the-meaning-of-design-44f1a82129a8.
[15] Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., Kemp, J. E., & Kalman, H. (2010). Designing effective instruction. John Wiley & Sons.
[16] Nugraha, Y., & Arief, Z.A. (2019). Pengaruh model pembelajaran kooperatif dengan kemandirian belajar terhadap hasil belajar bahasa Inggris (The influence of cooperative learning models with independent learning on English learning outcomes. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan* (Journal of Educational Technology), 4(2), 73-84.
[17] Pappas, C. (2015). 9 Steps To Apply the Dick and Carey Model in eLearning. https://elearningindustry.com/9-steps-to-apply-the-dick-and-carey-model-in-elearning.

[18] Quigley, E. (2019). ADDIE: 5 Steps To Effective Training. https://www.learnupon.com/ blog/addie-5-steps/
[19] Reiser, R.A., Dempsey, J.V. (2007). Trends and Issues in Instructional Design (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, Pearson Education,
[20] Seels, B., & Glasgow, Z. (1998). Making instructional design decisions. Merrill.
[21] Şimşek, U. (2013). The Effects of Cooperative Learning Methods on Students' Academic Achievements In Social Psychology Lessons. I*nternational Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications. 4*(3), 5-9.
[22] Siregar, A.N. (2018). Pengaruh Model Rancangan Instruksional Terhadap Prestasi Belajar Peserta Didik Ips Ekonomi Di Kelas VII Mts.Muhammadiyah 22 Padangsidimpuan (The Influence of Intructional Design Model on Learning Achievement of Ips Economics Students in Class VII Mts. Muhammadiyah 22 Padangsidimpuan, Nusantara. Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial (*Journal of Social Sciences), (4),* 31-36.
[23] Smaldino, S.E., Lowther, D.L., & Russell, J.D. (2008). Instructional technology and media for learning (9th edition). Upper Saddle River, Pearson Education, Inc.
[24] Suardi, I. P., Marhaeni, A. N., & Dantes, N. (2014). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Stad terhadap Hasil Belajar Membaca Bahasa Inggris Ditinjau dari Motivasi Berprestasi Siswa Kelas XI (The Influence of STAD Type Cooperative Learning Model on the Learning Outcomes of Reading English in terms of Students' Achievement and Motivation of Class XI). Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan Indonesia (*E-Journal of Ganesha University of Education Graduate Program, Educational Research and Evaluation Study Program),4,*1-10.