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ABSTRACT

Abstract: In response to the implementation of Merdeka Belajar (Freedom to Learn)-Kampus Merdeka (Independent Campus), this study aimed to investigate the perceived impacts of Freedom to Learn-Independent Campus (henceforth FLIC), on pre-service Teacher Professional Identity (henceforth, TPI) development. A qualitative research method by using a thematic analysis was used to analyze the data. Homogeneous online focus group discussions with three different groups of participants joining FLIC program were conducted to collect the data. There were twelve pre-service teachers who joined FLIC program involved in this study. The findings were elaborated under three themes. The themes were becoming and being didactical teachers, becoming and being pedagogical teachers, and the affordances of FLIC program for TPI development. The findings of this study offered some contributions, implications, and suggestions for further studies.

Keywords: freedom to learn-independent campus; pre-service teachers; professional identity development; merdeka belajar-kampus merdeka; guru pra-jabatan; pengembangan identitas profesional

Correspondence Address:
Lemmuela Alvita Kurniawati
English Language Education
Universitas Kristen Duta Wacana
E-mail: pipitkh@staff.ukdw.ac.id

Merdeka Belajar (Freedom to Learn)-Kampus Merdeka (Independent Campus) or FLIC, is a policy and educational innovation program launched by Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture in 2020. Initiated by the Minister of Education and Culture, FLIC is aimed to respond to the needs for Industrial Revolution 4.0 in higher education (Widiyono, Irfana, & Firdausia, 2021). Industrial Revolution 4.0 requires higher education graduates to become productive graduates in future economies as well as active and adaptive citizens in future societies (World Economic Forum, 2020). To be able to achieve this, as asserted by the World Economic Forum (World Economic Forum, 2020), higher education students should be better equipped with four key skills, i.e., global citizenship, innovation and creativity, technology, and interpersonal skills. By designing FLIC program, Indonesia’s Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology expects that the future graduates develop their hard and soft skills as well as competencies in order to be more adaptive in future economies and to meet the social needs (Suhartoyo et al., 2020; World Economic Forum, 2020).

The main objective of FLIC is to prepare higher education students to enter the professional world and to provide more opportunities to be more competitive and adaptive in the global job market (Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2020). To achieve this, FLIC has four strategies. One of them is the right for students to study outside their department and university for three semesters. Through this, students are better facilitated in improving their competencies, hard skills, and soft skills needed in the global job market (Purwanti, 2021). FLIC consists of eight forms of learning activities done outside the department and university, i.e., (1) internship, (2) student exchange program, (3) entrepreneurship, (4) teaching assistantship in education institutions, (5) independent project, (6) village development program, (7) research, and (8) humanitarian program (Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2020). In this study, operationally, FLIC programs refer to three forms of learning activities, i.e., the village development program, internship, and teaching assistantship.

Previous studies have suggested the definition of TPI. TPI development is considered as a dynamic, abstract, and multidimensional process that is difficult to define as there might be no clear-cut and complete descriptions of professional identity (Astuti, 2016; Behin, Esmaeili, & Assadollahi, 2018; Izadinia, 2013; Meilhami, 2021; Richardson & Watt, 2018; Werbińska, 2016). Richardson & Watt (2018) proposed TPI as the degree a teacher is committed to her/his career and labels her/himself personally and professionally as a teacher. Sharing a similar view, Day (2011), argued that TPI represents how teachers make sense of themselves and the image they present to other people. den Brok et al. (2013) proposed a related view about TPI, noting that TPI can be identified by asking questions, such as “who am I as a teacher?” and “what kind of teacher I want to become?” TPI is also defined as an integration of teachers’ past-present experiences during micro-macro teaching and their beliefs that might affect their future career as a teacher (Chong, Low, & Goh, 2011). A more recent study defined TPI as a
process of phenomenological self-development influenced by experiences in the present and past (Olsen & Buchanan, 2017). In this study, operationally, TPI is defined as a teacher’s phenomenological self-development in association with his/her teaching profession.

TPI development is an ongoing process consisting of three phases, i.e., before pre-service, pre-service, and in-service (Olsen & Buchanan, 2017). The first phase refers to the events that happened before pre-service education and the reasons for choosing teaching as a profession. The second phase refers to teacher education before a professional teaching profession and the last stage refers to a teacher’s professional career. Among the three phases, the second phase is critical and the most effective phase for TPI development as various teacher education programs happen in this phase and facilitate the development of pre-service TPI (Izadinia, 2013). Similarly, teacher education programs occur in different communities of practice wherein pre-service teachers might develop and negotiate their TPI (Meihani, 2021). In this study, the communities of practice refer to the three forms of learning activities in FLIC program, i.e., the village development program, internship, and teaching assistantship. The three forms of learning activities in FLIC program were expected to give impacts on pre-service TPI development.

Recognition of pre-service TPI development can be seen through some previous studies investigating pre-service TPI development in other countries (Chong et al., 2011; Erkan, 2020; Evisen, 2021; Haghighi Irani, Chalak, & Heidari Tabrizi, 2020; Izadinia, 2013; Kanno & Stuart, 2011; Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey, & Peak, 2018; Yuan & Lee, 2015). However, in the Indonesian context, there seem to be only a few numbers of studies investigating pre-service TPI development at different educational levels (Koh, 2015; Riyanti, 2017).

In a similar manner, in recent years, a number of studies on FLIC program in higher education in Indonesia have been conducted (Fuadi & Aswita, 2021; Haris, Elly, & Tjajiyaningsih, 2021; Krishnapatria, 2021; Purwanti, 2021; Siregar, Sahirah, & Harahap, 2020; Sudaryanto, Widayati, & Amalia, 2020; Widyono et al., 2021; Yusuf, 2021). Nonetheless, to the best of our knowledge, there seem to be no previous studies investigating the perceived impacts of FLIC on pre-service TPI development. Based on the rationales, this study seeks to answer a research question, how the pre-service teachers perceived the impacts of FLIC on their professional identity development. In the light of this, this study investigated the perceived impacts of FLIC on pre-service TPI development.

METHOD

This section discussed the research design used in this study, research participants and settings, ethical considerations, and data collection and analysis.

Research Design

This study used a qualitative method to answer the research question by using a Thematic Analysis (TA) of the data collected from online FGDs. This method was chosen as it searched for rich data from a phenomenon that happened within specific social settings, such as schools and classrooms (Creswell, 2012; Phakiti & Paltridge, 2018). Moreover, complex details, such as feelings, emotions, processes, thoughts, and beliefs towards a phenomenon could be revealed through this method (Gray, 2014). In this study, a qualitative method was used to investigate their perceptions of the impacts of FLIC on pre-service TPI development. In addition, the interpretivism paradigm was used as the theoretical perspective in conducting this study. Interpretivism believes that the aspects of the social world are unique, individual, and qualitative (Creswell, 2007; Gray, 2014). It focuses on uniqueness and individualized experiences that cannot be generalized. Consequently, this study sought individual perspectives of and how the participants constructed meaning on the impacts of FLIC on pre-service TPI development.

Research Participants and Settings

Conducted in a private English language education department in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, this study involved twelve pre-service English teachers joining FLIC conducted by the department or the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. The twelve participants are students of the English language education department at a private university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia joining FLIC program. At the time of the data gathering, nine participants were in the fifth semester and three participants were in the seventh semester of the 2021/2022 academic year. The criteria in selecting the participants were the participants’ willingness to participate in the study (Gray, 2014; Phakiti & Paltridge, 2018), time availability to participate in a Focus Group Discussion (FGD), and the provision of rich data about the perceived impacts of FLIC on their professional identity development.

Of the twelve participants, five in the fifth semester were joining FLIC village development program, four in the seventh semester were joining the internship in a school or English language training center, and three in the seventh semester were joining a teaching assistantship program. FLIC village development and internship were two programs funded, designed, and conducted by the department, whilst the teaching assistantship program was funded, conducted, and organized by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. These participants who joined FLIC program had passed the fundamental teaching subjects, i.e., Language Teaching Methodologies and Learning Psychology in the fourth semester. Therefore, the pre-service teacher participants had been introduced to the foundations of teaching and learning.
The three forms of learning activities in FLIC program were all conducted in Yogyakarta in five different places. FLIC village development program was carried out in Girimulyo village, Kulon Progo Regency, Yogyakarta. Having developed partnership with formal schools and language training centers, one of the four participants of FLIC internship was doing the internship in a prominent language training center in Yogyakarta and the rest of them was doing the internship in a private senior high school in Yogyakarta. Organized by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, three participants of FLIC teaching assistantship were assigned to a state junior high school in Yogyakarta.

Ethical Considerations

In this study, ethical considerations were critical and taken into account. At the beginning of the FGD session, the researchers informed the purpose and nature of the study to make the participants aware of the topic to decide their voluntary participation (Creswell, 2012) as well as the potential risks and benefits of participating in this study in order to maintain the voluntary and intended participation (Gray, 2014). Additionally, the participants were informed that their identities would remain undisclosed to protect their confidentiality during data presentation and research publication (Gray, 2014; Phakiti & Paltridge, 2018). If they agreed and were willing to participate, they could state their agreement orally at the beginning of the FGD session. However, if they did not agree and were not willing to participate, they could leave the FGD session.

Data Collection and Analysis

Online data collection method by using FGDS with the participants joining each FLIC program was used in this study. Due to the Covid-19 global pandemic and physical distancing regulations for qualitative data collection (Lobe, Morgan, & Hoffman, 2020), the FGDS were conducted online by using a licensed video conferencing platform. To that end, the participants who had all finished FLIC program that they joined for one semester were invited to an online FGD. The online FGDS were conducted for about 1.5 to 2 hours in order to develop in-depth and interactive discussions. Each online FGD consisted of 4-5 participants to ensure that they would feel comfortable to share their experiences, opinions, feelings, thoughts, and actions (Onwuegbuzie, Dickinson, Leech, & Zoran, 2009). Three online FGDS were conducted for three different FLIC programs, i.e., FLIC village development, internship, and teaching assistantship programs. Homogeneous online FGDS were carried out to ensure the participants have a comfortable discussion atmosphere to encourage them to generate shared experiences and respond to each other’s opinions (Galloway, 2019). During each online FGD, the participants were to share how their TPI developed during their participation in FLIC programs.

The data resulting from the online FGDS were transcribed by using word document software and coded. A TA method was used to perform a set of data analysis from the verbatims. This study used the TA method to analyze the quantitative data because the method helps teacher-researchers and educational researchers analyze qualitative data collected from natural classroom settings (Xu & Zammit, 2020). The data were coded. Then, themes across the data set and related to the research question were generated (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The themes were generated based on shared topics about the research question (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

To validate the accuracy of the findings, this study used member checking. We asked the participants to check the accuracy of the findings and report. The participants were asked if the themes were accurate, the description was complete, and the interpretations of the themes were representative (Creswell, 2012). If there were some inaccurate themes and or interpretations or incomplete parts of the descriptions, the participants reported and discussed this with the researchers.

FINDINGS

The online FGDS were conducted three times for three different groups of FLIC learning activities. The online FGD with FLIC village development program involved five pre-service teachers: Daya (Male/M), Indra (M), Krisna (M), Bayu (M), and Senja (Female/F). Four pre-service teachers, Aruna (F), Chandara (F), Dayana (F), and Eleena (F), were involved in the online FGD for the internship. The online FGD for the teaching assistantship program was conducted by involving three participants: Arshavi (M), Vita (F), and Rona (F). All names were pseudonyms. To answer the research question, the transcripts were identified and coded based on the concepts. The relationships between codes were analyzed and generated into themes. The emerging themes generated from the research question can be seen in table 1.

| Theme 1 | Becoming and being didactical teachers |
| Theme 2 | Becoming and being pedagogical teachers |
| Theme 3 | The affordances of FLIC program for TPI development |
Becoming and Being Didactical Teachers

The participants joining FLIC village development program and the internship asserted that before joining the program, they considered themselves as teachers who transferred knowledge to the students, made sure the students understood the subject matter, and motivated the students in the learning process. There was a change in the way they saw themselves after placement in each program. They perceived themselves as didactical teachers who tended to focus on orchestrating teaching and learning activities in class. Bayu, one of the participants of FLIC village development program, said:

When I taught in a service-learning program with my lecturer, it was my second year of college. I always repeated explaining the materials to the students until they understood. I never used games to motivate or relieve the tension in the classroom. I focused on making the students understand what I teach. [Bayu/M]

After he joined FLIC village development program and experienced teaching English for community-based practitioners, he realized that, as a teacher, he should have had full control of the class to facilitate the learning process.
I taught community-based practitioners in Girimulyo. The participants are all older than me. They were not very engaged in speaking activities. Maybe, it was because I was too serious, and I did not know the strategy. As time went by, I realized that in teaching community-based practitioners, I should have positioned myself as an orchestrator who orchestrated the class activities. I guided all the activities in the class. The results, the students could practice using the expressions and they were more engaged. [Bayu/M]

Highlighting Bayu’s view, Eleena believed that being an ideal teacher was becoming a mentor and being able to make the students understand the subject matter. She said:
Before joining the internship, I saw myself as a mentor who guided students not only in academic matters, but also in non-academic matters. By being a mentor, I became their friends, and they could easily follow my explanations and instructions. [Eleena/F]

After joining the internship, Eleena asserted the need to manage her classes by not only explaining the subject matters, but also providing guided practice and assigning tasks. She highlighted that a teacher-centered class was considered as the most effective for her case.
Based on my experiences teaching in the school where I was doing my internship, becoming a mentor was not enough as I needed to think of the most appropriate approach for my class. A teacher-centered approach was considered as the most suitable approach in handling the students. The teachers explained the subject matters, provided guided practice, and assigned the tasks for the students. A student-centered approach would not work there. During this online learning, if a student-centered approach had been implemented, I believe that students would have not learned anything from school. [Eleena/F]

Becoming and Being Pedagogical Teachers

Most pre-service teachers mentioned that before they joined FLIC program, they focused on transferring knowledge to the students to make them understand the subject matter and clarifying students’ misconceptions on the subject matter. Then, after they joined FLIC program, they perceived themselves as pedagogical teachers who used communication skills to decide the appropriate teaching techniques for their students. Vita and Rona who joined the teaching assistantship program, for example, stated that before they joined FLIC program, they perceived that the most important teaching element for teachers was subject matter knowledge. They shared an agreement that being a qualified teacher should master the subject matter knowledge. They explained the content until they understood, and I repeated it over and over again to make sure she understood. [Vita/F]

After joining FLIC program, she stated that by having good communication with her students, she could find out the challenges that the students had during the learning process and provide an alternative solution.
We had a Reading Club every Thursday. At the beginning, there were many students, but almost the semester, there were only 2 or 3 students left. I was wondering why. I asked them why they did not come to the Reading Club. Some said they had difficulties with the internet connection. Others said they had problems with the scheduling. Then, I tried to find the best method for Reading Club. I remembered my lecturers gave us recorded videos, so the students can understand the explanations and instructions asynchronously. Then, I recorded myself so the students might be able to watch my video when they could not join the synchronous session. Communication with students is very important, it helps to find the solution in teaching. [Vita/F]

In a similar tone, Rona asserted that before joining FLIC program, the awareness of misconceptions in teaching was the most imperative element in teaching. She said:
In the interview, after joining FLIC program, she claimed that being an effective teacher was trying to understand what problems the students faced in working on the project and giving a proper solution to the problem.

When the students were assigned to make a short story, most of them performed plagiarism. Once, twice, three times, I returned their assignment. Then, I asked them what the problem was in making a short story. They said they did not know how to make one. My friends and I, then, made an example of a short story and explained the elements in the short story. At the end, with the teachers’ guidance, they successfully made one. I felt so happy and proud of this. [Rona/F]

Sharing a similar view, Chandara, one of the participants who joined the internship, argued that before joining FLIC program, as a pre-service teacher, she highlighted the importance of transferring knowledge to make the students understand the subject matter as well as developing the students’ character education.

I think it’s important for teachers to master the subject matter and be able to transfer the knowledge to the students. Character education is another important aspect in teaching that teachers should pay attention to. [Chandara/F]

She admitted that after she joined FLIC program, specifically the internship, she saw TPI differently. She claimed that from the internship, she realized teachers should have had good communication skills to better understand the students’ issues and to decide the proper technique for them.

... from the internship, I learned that as teachers, we have to understand the students well. In the first month of my internship at school, every morning when I entered the class, the students looked unmotivated. I found out that most of them fell asleep and were not ready to learn “serious” contents. Then, from that experience, I changed the way I started the class. I started the class with an ice-breaking game. From that moment, the students became enthusiastic about joining my class. [Chandara/F]

In a similar tone, Senja, before she joined FLIC village development program, claimed that as a teacher, she did anything she could to make the students understand her explanations. She asserted:

I Told My Students That They Must Have Understood What I Explained. I Forced Them to Have A Clear Understanding Of The Subject Matter By Explaining The Materials And Giving Them Practice. My Students Saw Me As A ‘Killer’ Teacher Because I Demanded Them To Understand Every Single Thing I Explained. [Senja/F]

After she experienced teaching kids in an elementary school during FLIC village development program, she reflected that teaching was not only explaining the subject matter, but also using proper techniques to provide an effective learning environment for the students.

At the beginning of my placement in an elementary school, I felt stressed out because I could not handle the students. They were very noisy and active. They were running around the class while screaming. It was crazy. As I reflected on this experience, I figured out an effective technique to teach them. I implemented fun-based learning in my class, and it worked well. I asked the students to play games and sing together during my class. [Senja/F]

**The Affordances of FLIC Program for TPI Development**

FLIC program facilitated pre-service teachers in shaping and reshaping their TPI development. Arshavi, one of the participants in the teaching assistantship, argued that he managed to solve motivation problems for 7th grade students by using his communication skills. He learned to be a teacher who facilitated learning as opposed to a knowledge transmitter. He said:

... when we entered the class, the 7th grade students were doing nothing. It was supposed to be an English class, but the teacher did not come. We, my friend and I, asked what they have learned with the teacher, then we decided to give them practice under the topic being discussed previously. The students seemed reluctant to discuss the topic, it was about “Time”. They said that the topic was difficult and not interesting. After we discussed their problems, then we designed a game about “Time”. We used this application in one of the subjects we took in the previous semester. We were surprised to see they were enthusiastic in joining the game. They even asked for more. [Arshavi/M]
As for Aruna who joined the internship, the TPI development was enacted through her teaching experiences dealing with the 12th grade students who got increasingly bored doing the assignments in the middle of the semester. She said:

At the beginning of the semester, they were excited to meet us, the interns. They were diligent in doing the assignments and cooperative in class. In the middle of the semester, only a few of them did the assignments, attended the class, and were motivated in joining the class activities. I was wondering why it happened. Then, I asked them to evaluate my teaching by writing down what they liked about me and what I could improve. From the evaluation, I could figure out what to do next to make them happy to learn again. [Aruna/F]

In a similar view, Krisna, one of the participants in the village development stated that by developing good communication with the school and students, he managed to teach young learners. He said:

I had butterflies in my stomach when I taught elementary school students. I just did not know what to do with small students. Then, I had a lot of discussions with the teachers and the head of the school. I learned a lot from them. I also asked the students their problems and their wants. Also, I learned to teach young learners in Language Teaching Methodologies subject, and I tried to relate what I have learned previously with the situation. Now, I'm always ready to teach kids. [Krisna/M]

**DISCUSSION**

**Becoming and Being Didactical Teachers**

The excerpts from Bayu and Eleena indicated that there was a process of negotiating identity seen before and after they joined FLIC program. Their initial perception of TPI was subject matter teacher who transferred knowledge, clarified misconceptions, and developed effective tasks for the students (Beijaard, Verloop, & Vermunt, 2000). During FLIC program, they were exposed to school and class experiences which sharpened their instructional skills and shaped their TPI (Kanno & Stuart, 2011). The pre-service teachers made progress in teaching by integrating their prior knowledge acquired from their teacher education into the classroom condition. A new identity as ‘the orchestrator’ of the class was endorsed through their teaching practice and personal reflection (Yuan & Lee, 2015). In addition, this affirmed the previous research findings that pre-service teachers developed their identity from subject matter teacher to didactical teacher during placement in a community of practice (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Beijaard et al., 2000; Ercan, 2020).

**Becoming and Being Pedagogical Teachers**

Vita, Rona, Chandara, and Senja’s excerpts indicated that they experienced development of their TPI through FLIC program. The excerpts indicated how the pre-service teachers considered themselves as a subject matter expert who put so much emphasis on knowledge over pedagogical and didactical aspects (Beijaard et al., 2004, 2000; Ercan, 2020). When they were assigned to schools during FLIC program, they addressed the issues in the learning process and suggested possible solutions based on their pedagogical knowledge (Meihami, 2021). As seen in the excerpts, the pre-service teachers used their communication skills to investigate the issue in the learning process. Then, they used their pedagogical knowledge to provide proper solutions based on the students’ needs and interests. Another interesting finding can be seen from Vita’s excerpt. It indicated that in the community of practice, pre-service teachers negotiated their TPI by integrating their past and present experiences as the basis of the decision-making (Chong et al., 2011). In Vita’s case, she used her experience as a student in the class wherein her lecturer provided recorded videos to facilitate students who could not join the synchronous class sessions. She reflected on her experience, made meaning out of it, and made a decision based on her reflection (Olsen & Buchanan, 2017). In the light of this, the findings might be in line with Beijaard et al. (2004) that pre-service TPI development can be seen from how they transformed in perceiving themselves as a subject matter expert into a pedagogical expert.

Furthermore, from this finding, it was evident that most pre-service teachers tended to see themselves as pedagogical teachers compared to didactical teachers. As presented in the excerpts, they developed their TPI from subject matter teachers to pedagogical teachers. This finding aligns with Ercan’s study (2020) wherein the teachers used various methods and teaching techniques to facilitate learning (Beijaard et al., 2000).

**The Affordances of FLIC Program for TPI Development**

The pre-service teachers joining FLIC program perceived that FLIC facilitated their TPI development. Reflecting on his past experiences, Arshavi managed to analyze the problems faced by the students and offered a proper solution with the combination of her prior knowledge during her teacher education and her teaching experiences gained from the teaching assistantship. The pre-service constructed their TPI through their prior knowledge and experiences (Izadinia, 2013). Aruna also learned to become a reflective teacher by asking the students to evaluate how she taught. She gained awareness of the importance of evaluation in the teaching-learning process towards teaching improvement. This affirmed the previous research
findings that TPI development was not only based on experiences but also how teachers reflected on their experiences (Izadinia, 2013; Olsen & Buchanan, 2017). As for Krina, despite his fear of teaching young learners, he managed to overcome his fear by seeking advice from the school and teachers about how to teach young learners. From this finding, TPI development is influenced by some factors, i.e., contextual environment, cognitive knowledge, and relationship with colleagues, parents, and students (Izadinia, 2013).

Based on the findings, this study offers some contributions and implications. This study amplified the pre-service teachers’ voices on the impacts of FLIC on their TPI development which had not been studied as much as it should have been. As educational researchers might greatly accentuate the focus of the research on the implementation of FLIC in higher education and its policy, the findings of this study might provide contributions to the literature on the impact of FLIC on pre-service TPI development in higher education in Indonesia as, to the best of the researchers’ knowledge, there seem to be no studies on the perceived impacts of FLIC on pre-service TPI development. This study also suggested some implications. The findings show how pre-service teachers perceived the development of their TPI through joining FLIC program. As TPI development is imperative for pre-service teachers to better prepare them before they enter the teaching profession, teacher education could encourage the students to join FLIC program wherein they would improve their pedagogical and teaching competencies.

This study has some limitations. This study was conducted at the end of the academic year 2021/2022 when FLIC program finished, it investigated the pre-service TPI development in six months before they had their placement until they finished the program. Longitudinal studies could be conducted to investigate how the pre-service TPI development changes over time from the beginning of the teacher education. The findings of this study cannot be generalized as future researchers might not have the access to the same participants and context of the study. However, transferability might be possible allowing future researchers to make connections between the constructs of the study and their contexts. Consequently, future studies could investigate FLIC program and TPI development in their own contexts.
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