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Abstract
This study aims to reveal student’s perspective, particularly those studying in postgraduate programs, on the requirement to have a minimum obtained score of TOEFL prior to graduation in higher education, in this case Universitas Brawijaya, one of the Indonesian leading universities. The research is descriptive with quantitative data, comprising TOEFL scores taken between January to September 2016, and qualitative data, consisting of the answers of 22 respondents to a questionnaire regarding the implementation of the policy. Based on the findings, it is found out that as many as 98% of 238 TOEFL testees at the university fail to obtain the required minimum score, which is 500. Moreover, the questionnaire reveals that the students’ perspective is divided into threefold, that is, positive, negative, and neutral perspectives. The positive side is mainly grounded on their thoughts on the advantages of TOEFL itself, despite the nature of why TOEFL was created. Meanwhile, the negative perspective revolves around academic and ideological reasons, starting from the fact that the policy contributes to the delay of their graduation process to the extent to which language Indonesia serves as the national language in Indonesia.
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1. INTRODUCTION

*English in International Relationships*

Enforcement of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) since 2015 is certainly inevitable. At present, all countries in Southeast Asia, including Indonesia, will open wider access to a wide range of economic and human resources previously blocked by various immigration and customs rules. Thus, the flow out of the product in the form of goods and services and labor are expected to occur profusely. More and more goods, services, and labor from other countries will enter Indonesia, which of course, will compete to win the heart of consumers and business owners or the Indonesian capital.

With the entry of foreign workers to Indonesia, socio-cultural structure of the society will change, be it positively or negatively. The positive effect might be the willingness of Indonesian workers to improve the quality of work because now they compete both with their fellow citizens and with workers from other countries. Meanwhile, this is also potential to cause some negative effects, one of them in terms of language use. As foreign migrants come from many countries with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, a thick wall that would prevent us to communicate with each other may be formed. A language that can be used as a medium of everyday communication is indispensable. When we ask the question, "What is the language?" to the public, then the answer is almost always "English".

Selection of English as a language of daily communication among native Indonesia and foreign workers is currently regarded as natural. During this time, English has been widely accepted by the majority of the world as a unifying language, a language that can bridge the communication among diverse native languages and world population. Yunsirno (2010) states that although in terms of the actual number of speakers of Mandarin is far superior to English, English speakers spread much more evenly in the various countries of the world (see Table 1).

Table 1. Comparison in the Number and Distribution of Speakers of Mandarin and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Speakers across the World Population (first and second language)</th>
<th>Number of Countries Whose People Speaking the Language (first and second language)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1,197,000,000 people</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>335,000,000 people</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not to mention the aspect of civilization, in this case science and technology, that mostly starts in the American North with a predominantly English-speaking people, than anywhere else in the world. We, too, are getting the effects: all things technology can hardly separate them from the use of English in it. A portable computer (notebook) used for writing articles is one of them. We find it hard to not say the terms and variations of the terms in the computers in our daily lives, such as copy, copy-paste, delete, save, print, until recently when we could find a substitute for the word ‘file’ that is acceptable.

All of the above have supported the views and thoughts that the most appropriate language for cross-cultural interaction as the start of AEC 2015 is English, even in our own homeland. The fatal consequence of such thinking is confusion and anxiety in some of our communities, as they have not mastered English as a prerequisite for global competition.

*Minimum TOEFL Score Obtaining Policy at Universitas Brawijaya*

Universitas Brawijaya (UB) as one of the leading universities in Indonesia is aware of the vital position of English in international affairs. Therefore, UB also requires each student, both in the S1, S2, and S3\(^1\), to get TOEFL certificate as an indicator of English mastery. As stated in the UB Academic Handbook (2015), students of postgraduate program are required to have a TOEFL certificate as a requirement of graduation with a minimum score of 500.

For those who do not use English in everyday communication, meeting these requirements will be troublesome. Most postgraduate students are professionals who have been working for many years and have long left school as the only source of formal English education. If their jobs do not require them to speak English, the language skills will simply stop developing. As a result, most of the S2 and S3 students will find it difficult to be qualified for the TOEFL certificate.

---

\(^1\) S1 is Four-year Undergraduate Degree, S2 for Masters, and S3 for Doctoral
Salam et al. (2012) conduct a study to determine the extent to which students at the University of Tanjongpura can qualify for TOEFL certificate prior to graduation, with a minimum score of 420 in order to follow the final exam. The results of the study mention a decrease in the number of students who were able to achieve a score between 370 and 420, while the number of students who achieve a score under 370 increased in 2007 to 2012.

Meanwhile, Khathir (2015) in his study mentions that Syiah Kuala University policy requires students to have a minimum TOEFL score of 475 (out of the previous 450) and it shows the opposite result—there was a low number of students able to achieve a score of 450, so 475 was something even more difficult for them. Furthermore, Khathir (2015) highlights that the policy was not supported by the number of TOEFL preparation classes, so the opportunity for students to get adequate preparation before TOEFL was very small.

Considering the afore-mentioned explanation, the researchers wants to know whether the policy of TOEFL score is appropriate for UB students. However, the researcher plans to see this problem from the standpoint of students, before assessing the overall policy. Therefore, the problem in this research is as follows: What is the students’ perspective on TOEFL policy at UB?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

TOEFL and Its Benefits

Test of English as a Foreign Language or TOEFL is a test of English proficiency among the most familiar for academics at schools and universities. TOEFL is the copyrighted work and a nonprofit corporation called the Educational Testing Service (ETS), which was established in 1947. In addition to TOEFL, there are other kinds of tests of English proficiency used throughout the world, i.e. the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) and International English Language Testing System (IELTS). However, among the three, TOEFL is the most popular, and many in the community uses the term to refer to all types of English language proficiency tests.

According to its usefulness, TOEFL is often used to determine a person’s ability to speak English. The results of the measurement typically used by many international universities to determine the extent to which new students can speak English and, therefore, to follow the material presented during the study (“The TOEFL Test”, n.d.).

Moreover, in its official statement, TOEFL is very often used by the immigration office as a basis to issue a residence permit or visa, by professional associations and agencies certifying expertise to measure English proficiency for one’s professional involvement in the future, and by individuals who want to know their level of English language skills (“Who Accepts TOEFL”, n.d.). TOEFL is also used as a condition for acceptance of a prospective students willing to study in a country whose population uses English as its official language (“What is the TOEFL”, n.d.).

From the above, it clearly shows that TOEFL is basically used as a graduation requirement of a student in completing the study. TOEFL only serves as a tool to measure a person’s ability to speak English and / or as a condition to continue the study to university uses English as its official language. It is not stated in the information that TOEFL is used as a determinant of in one’s graduation at universities.

Thus, it can be concluded that the TOEFL should only be a tool to measure the English language proficiency of a student without relating it to any graduation requirement.

Public Policy

Policy is primarily a decision made to provide solutions to the problems faced to achieve the expected goals. According to Carl J Federick (in Agustino, 2008:7), policy is a “series of actions / activities proposed by a person, group, or government in a particular environment where there are obstacles (difficulties) and opportunities to the implementation of the proposals of the policy in order to achieve certain goals.” Meanwhile, according to James E Anderson (in Islamy, 2009:17), policy is “a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern.” It can be concluded that any decisions taken always have a goal, and in practice, they should consider all conditions that might occur.

The formulation of public policy is the main function of every government in running public services. The notion of public policy itself according to Anderson (in Islamy, 2007:19) defines public policy as a “series
of actions with a specific purpose followed and implemented by the offender or a group of offenders in order to solve specific problems.” This means that any decisions taken by the government must have a goal. This objective is based on particular considerations. To implement the decision or policy should be supported by a particular group or even society as a driver of implementing the policy.

Public policy is a decision made by both central and local governments in the form of legislation; it is in line with the statement by Nugroho (2011: 104) that public policy can be grouped into three categories as follows:

a) Public policy at the macro or general or basic level, such as the 1945 Constitution, legislations or government regulations in lieu of certain acts, government regulations, the Presidential Decree, and regional regulations.

b) Public policy as a medium or explanatory execution, such as regulation, Circular Letter of the Minister, the Governor Regulation, the Mayor Regulation, and may be the joint ministerial and regent or mayor decree.

c) Public policy as microeconomic policies that govern the execution or implementation of the above policies, such as regulations issued by public authorities under ministers, governors, and mayors.

Thus, it can be concluded that any laws made by the central government to local governments can be referred to as a public policy useful for the whole of both government and the public interest.

The Objective of Public Policy
Government formulates a policy based on specific objectives. Just as expressed by Nugroho (2011: 110-111) that public policy is the decision of the state authorities aimed to organize public lives. The purpose of public policy according to Nugroho, among others:

a. Distributive versus absorptive
   1) Distributive is a policy objective, either directly or indirectly to allocate state resources to the community, including allocation, re-allocation, and redistribution.
   2) Absorptive is a policy objective to absorb the resources to the state.

b. Regulative versus de-regulative
   1) Regulatory policies have a nature to limit and regulate.
   2) De-regulative are policies that are freed.

c. Dynamism versus stabilization
   1) Dynamism is a policy that aims to mobilize national resources to achieve certain progress.
   2) Stabilization is a policy that aims to limit or regulate the too-quickly dynamics so as not to damage the system, either political system, security system, economic system, or social system.

d. Strengthening state versus strengthening communities / markets
   1) Policies that strengthen the state mean that the policy encourages a greater state role.
   2) Policies that strengthen the market meaning that the policy is to encourage the public role or the market mechanism to be greater than the state.

Some of the goals described above reflect that policies are created with the different purposes for the sake of the public interest, so decision makers in deciding public policy should be oriented to the public interest. As expressed by Islamy (2007: 12) that:

“Most citizens put much hope on the public administrator, expecting that they always give their best service to the public, to become a public servant who always consider the interests of the public; thus, the public administrator needs to have ‘the spirit of publicans’. They must have what is called as administrative and political responsibility, so they can work under such good professional role. If the public interest is the center, then making a responsible public administrator who is always trying to improve their professionalism is obvious. Thus, the measurement of which can be used to indicate whether public administrators are already ‘public’ or not is the administrative decisions they make—whether the decisions are in line or contrary to the public interest.”

The Evaluation of Public Policy
Evaluation of a public policy is carried out in the process and after the implementation is done. The importance of the evaluation process is to see how far a program or an activity has been successfully accomplished. This is in accordance with the opinion of Anderson (in Winarno, 2008:166) which states that
“in general, evaluation of the policy can be regarded as the activities regarding estimates or judgments on the substance of the policy, implementation, and impact of the implementation of the policy”.

The executor and beneficiary of the policy will certainly feel the impact of the policy. For that, policies made must be beneficial for all parties and do not overlap. This is supported by the opinion of William Dunn in Agustino (2008: 187) which says that:

"Evaluation is the production of information about the values or benefits of the policy outcomes. When they are beneficial for the assessment of problem solving, the results contribute to the goals and targets for the evaluators, in particular, and other users in general. It is said to be useful if the policy evaluation functions is met. One of the functions of policy evaluation is the need to provide valid and credible information regarding the performance of the policy."

Further, Anderson as quoted by Paskarina (2007: 7) reveals that:

"Policy evaluation emphasizes on the estimation or measurement of a policy, including materials, implementation, achievement of objectives, and the impact of the policy. Evaluation can also be used to identify the factors that influence the success or failure of a policy, so the results of the assessment can be used as a decision whether the policy will be continued, modified, enhanced, or terminated."

It can be concluded that evaluation is intended to assess the effectiveness of public policies in order to be accountable to their constituents—this means the extent to which the purpose is achieved as well as to see how far the gap between expectations with reality, because basically every public policy holds the risk of failure.

There are three major approaches in policy evaluation (Suharno, 2010:243-246), which is described as follows.

1. Pseudo evaluation is an approach that uses descriptive methods to produce valid information about the results of the policy, without further questioning about the value and benefits of the policy outcomes for individuals, groups, and communities targeted on a wide scale. The assumption of this approach is that the value or utility of a policy outcome will be self-evident, and will be measured and perceived directly by individuals, groups, and communities.

2. Formal evaluation is an approach that uses descriptive methods to produce valid information about the results of the policy while the evaluation of the results is based on the policy objectives that have been set and formally announced by policy makers and administrative personnel. This approach assumes that the goals and targets that have been announced formally constitute the most appropriate measure for evaluating the merits or value of a policy.

3. Decision-theoretic evaluation is an evaluation using descriptive methods to produce valid information and accountability on policy outcomes, assessed explicitly by the perpetrators of the policy. This evaluation aims to link the results of policies with the values of the perpetrators of the policy. This approach is divided into two variants, namely evaluability assessment and multi-attribute utility analysis. As in this study, the researcher used a formal evaluation under the variant of retrospective evaluation approach in the form of monitoring or evaluation of a policy implemented after a certain period. This evaluation is based on the existing information about the policy runs, which relates directly to the output and impact of the policy.

The impact of a policy has multiple dimensions and all must be considered in the evaluation process. According to Winarno (2002: 171-174), there are at least five dimensions that must be addressed. These dimensions include:

a. The impact on public issues and on those involved.

b. Policies may be having an impact on the circumstances or groups beyond the targets or policy objectives.

c. Policies may be having an impact on present and future circumstances.

d. Evaluation also includes other elements i.e. direct costs incurred to finance programs of public policies.

e. There are also indirect costs borne by society or some members of the public because of public policy.
Evaluating the impact of a program or public policy obviously needs criteria for measuring the success. Regarding the policy performance in generating information, there are criteria for evaluation of the impact of public policy as follows:

1. **Effectiveness**
   According to Winarno (2002:184):
   "The effectiveness comes from the word effective, which implies the achievement of success in achieving the goals set. It is always associated with the relationship between the expected results and the actual results achieved." Based on the opinion, it can be concluded that if the greater the achievement of objectives of an organization, the greater the effectiveness it has.

2. **Efficiency**
   According to Winarno (2002:185):
   "Efficiency relates to the amount of effort required to produce a certain level of effectiveness. Efficiency is the synonym of economic rationality, i.e. the relationship between effectiveness and effort; the latter is generally measured in monetary costs. Efficiency is usually determined by calculating the cost per unit of a product or service. Policies that achieve the highest effectiveness with the smallest cost are called efficient."
   If the targets to be achieved by a public policy are very simple, while the cost incurred through the policy process is too large compared with the results achieved, this means the policy work is a waste and not feasible.

3. **Adequacy**
   According to Winarno (2002:186):
   "Adequacy in public policy can be said that the purpose achieved is already adequate in many respects. Adequacy relates to how far a level of effectiveness to satisfy the needs, values, or the opportunity for problems to occur. It is still associated with the effectiveness by measuring or predicting how far the existing alternatives can satisfy the needs, values, or the opportunity to resolve problems that occur."
   These problems may occur on a policy that we can classify them simply in one type. This means that before a policy is approved and implemented, there should be a proper analysis on the suitability of methods implemented and the goal to be achieved.

4. **Responsiveness**
   According to Winarno (2002:189):
   "Responsiveness in public policies can be interpreted as a response of an activity, which means the response of the public toward the implementation of a policy. Responsiveness regards to how far the policy can satisfy the needs, preferences, or the value of certain community or groups. The success of the policy can be seen by the public's response to implementation, after first predicting the effects if the policy is implemented, as well as the public response after the impact of the policy has begun to appear in the form of support or rejection."
   Criteria of responsiveness are important because, even if the analysis can satisfy all the other criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity), it is still considered fail if it does not respond to the actual needs of the 20 groups that should benefit from the policy. Therefore, the criteria of responsiveness reflect real needs, preferences, and values of certain groups against the criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, and equity.

5. **Accuracy**
   According to Winarno (2002:184):
   "Accuracy refers to the value or worth of the program’s objectives and the strong assumptions underlying these objectives. The criteria are used to select a number of alternatives to be recommended to assess whether the results of the recommended alternative is a viable choice. The eligibility criteria are associated with substantive rationality, because the criteria deal with the substance or instrument of interest to realize that goal."
   Based on the afore-mentioned explanation, policy evaluation in this study is an assessment of the implementation of policies by an organization or government, by evaluating aspects of the impact of
policies, which include effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, responsiveness, and accuracy of the policy from the standpoint of the public or the community as the policy target.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

To examine the requirement of TOEFL score prior to graduation at UB from the perspective of students, the researcher chose to use descriptive research with quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data was taken from the data of TOEFL score of students taking the test in English Service Centre of the Faculty of Administrative Science (PPB FIA UB). PPB FIA UB was chosen as the location of the data source because PPB FIA UB frequently organizes TOEFL for students. The postgraduate students who take TOEFL in PPB FIA UB come from various faculties in UB, thus diversity in samples can be reduce subjectivity of research results due to too homogeneous sample origin.

Meanwhile, qualitative data was obtained by distributing questionnaires to TOEFL participants in PPB FIA UB. The questionnaire contained two questions. The first question is “If TOEFL has become one of the graduation requirements for students, what is the minimum score of TOEFL the students must have?” and second question is “Please, provide your opinion about the policy that require students to take TOEFL prior to graduation.” Respondents were given the opportunity to respond freely to those two questions.

Total population of the study was 481 participants in PPB FIA UB from January to September 2016. Data was analysed using the Slovin formula as follows:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

in which:
\[ n = \text{number of sample} \]
\[ N = \text{number of population} \]
\[ e = \text{error tolerance} \]

With error tolerance (e) by 5%, a figure of 237.530 or 238 (rounding up) as the number of samples in this study was resulted. Then, using a standard reference of graduate students of S2 and S3 at UB (TOEFL score of 500), the number of participants who can meet and cannot meet the minimum value will be calculated and discussed.

Meanwhile, the qualitative data was taken from 22 respondents taking TOEFL in October 2016. October was chosen as the time of data collection since the researcher only had the opportunity to meet the respondents in October, after the research instrument was prepared. The data obtained would be copied, then interpreted in terms of whether respondents were agree, disagree, or in a neutral position against the existing opinion.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned in the previous section, there are two types of data collected in this study, namely quantitative data and qualitative data. From raw data processing, the results are as follows.

**TOEFL Score of Postgraduate Students at UB**

Quantitative data in this study is the TOEFL score of graduate students at UB. By using a TOEFL score of 500 as the main reference to determine whether a student pass or fail, data taken from respondents is as follows.
Table 2. TOEFL Score of Postgraduate Students

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum passing grade</td>
<td>≥ 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum TOEFL score</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum TOEFL score</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students passing TOEFL</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students failing TOEFL</td>
<td>233 (98%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 2 is rather unbelievable as the majority (98%) of respondents failed to meet the requirement of passing TOEFL score. Meanwhile, it can be seen that only five (5) respondents (2%) that successfully met the requirement. From the data presentation, we can conclude several things. First, the TOEFL minimum score set by the UB is still too high for postgraduate students. In fact, if it refers to the minimum score requirement desired by overseas campus, taking the United States as the main benchmark (TOEFL Score, n.d.), it can be concluded that a prospective student on US universities should have a minimum TOEFL score of 500 to 600. Thus, the TOEFL score of participants in PPB FIA UB is still very far from the capabilities required by campuses abroad.

Second, internal and external factors may also cause the low TOEFL scores. Internal factors are factors that come from within the participants themselves, such as their English ability at the time of the examination, the extent to which participants work to improve English skills before taking the examination, and others such as nervousness, or the location of the examination room. If the participants already know long before that one of the graduation requirements is to have a minimum TOEFL score of 500, we can assume that they have prepared it from the beginning to take the test—for those who have realized that their English skills are not good enough, they will even work harder. They have at least two years (for S2 students) and three years (for S3 students) to prepare. However, based on the data presented in Table 2, it appears that the participants are not ready for TOEFL. Moreover, all participants take the TOEFL shortly before graduation, usually before final examination of their thesis or dissertation. Thus, they do not really use their time during their study to prepare for TOEFL requirement.

One of the external factors that influence the TOEFL score of participants (Table 2) is the requirement to pass TOEFL with a minimum score of 500. From the data presented, conclusion can be drawn that the participants were quite distressed with the policy and did not prepare well to meet the requirement. This is because they realized that they would not be able to complete the study—signing themselves for graduation ceremony—before they got the minimum score. Participants who did not pass felt even more depressed by the fact that they had fulfilled all graduation requirements, unless the requirement of minimum TOEFL score. This way, they chose to find a quick way to be able to immediately fulfill the score requirement, for example by taking TOEFL frequently in different places, with expectation that their test scores would increase. However, English proficiency cannot be improved in such a short time. Failures to meet the minimum score normally increased their burden, so when they took TOEFL in PPB FIA UB, the participants felt nervous as they were overshadowed by the failures.

Meanwhile, on the other hand, another external factor that determines the success of a test is the room atmosphere. As far as the observation, the implementation of TOEFL in PPB FIA UB is relatively loose because at the time of test there is only one supervisor. This one and only supervisor is not always in the examination room because he is also an administrative officer, so he goes in and out of the examination room to prepare for administrative matters relating to the implementation of the test. Under such atmosphere, comfortable and air-conditioned room, test-takers can actually be more comfortable. However, consideration of the first external factors, that they must pass this test to be able to graduate soon, seems to affect the outcome of the test, as shown in Table 2.

With the data presented in Table 2, the university shall reconsider the policy of TOEFL score. Two ways, at least, can be done by UB. First, the university lowers the minimum TOEFL score as a graduation requirement; second, the university changes the policy of taking TOEFL simply as a suggestion to equip graduates with minimum TOEFL score, or to remove altogether the policy in regard that TOEFL score is a personal right that should not be regulated by the university. If the latter is taken, UB should not have to worry about how to materialize its vision “to be a world-class university based on entrepreneurship” as
“world-class” does not always correspond to simply mastery of English by the academic community. However, the discourse on whether or not each academic individual in UB shall master English my need even a more comprehensive discussion, which will not be addressed in this study.

Students’ Perspective on the Implementation of Minimum TOEFL Score at UB

Qualitative data for this study came from questionnaires given to 22 respondents. The questionnaire contains two items, namely (1) “If TOEFL has become one of the graduation requirements for students, what is the minimum score of TOEFL the students must have?”; and (2) “Please, provide your opinion about the policy that require students to take TOEFL prior to graduation.”

The first question was open-ended, and there were three types of answers given by the respondents. The first was the answer on the minimum TOEFL score, the second was the answer in the form of a sentence, and the third was not answering or leaving the space blank in the questionnaire.

In the first answer, the minimum score mentioned by respondents ranged between 400 and 550. There were three (3) respondents answered 400, the other three (3) answered 450, one (1) person put the figure of 475, and eight (8) people put the figure of 500. The respondents’ answers are interesting when associated with the data in Table 2, which states that 98% of respondents failed to qualify a minimum score of 500, while the majority of respondents (8) continued to believe that 500 should be the minimum score to be fulfilled. Normally, one who fails to meet a target, especially if it is a repeated failure, will reduce the target as to begin to reach the target set. Then, from that lower point, one will begin targeting something greater or higher gradually. However, in this case, the respondents did not want to lower the target by mentioning the minimum score under 500. Thus, it can be concluded that the respondents continue to believe that the TOEFL minimum score set by UB is correct, or that the policy is not wrong. If the respondent cannot meet the minimum requirement, then the fault lies not in the policy, but on the respondents.

In the second answer, as many as five (5) respondents gave answers by writing the sentence as in Table 3.

Table 3. Respondents’ Answers to the Item on the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Code</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Nothing, as I disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>If it is an absolute requirement, then there must not be a minimum score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>No minimum score, based on ability of each individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>I cannot provide any answers as I disagree with the policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we pay a closer look at the respondents’ answers, it appears that the five (5) respondents disagreed with the minimum score requirement. More specifically, one respondent (R3) answered with “do not know”. The answer may be assumed simply that R3 did not know or recognize the existence of a minimum score on TOEFL. Two things may cause it. First, R3 really did not know anything about the minimum (or maximum) score for TOEFL, R3 had never taken TOEFL before, or R3 never recognized the existence of a minimum score on the TOEFL. For the latter, it is normal because TOEFL score is only used to measure one’s English proficiency. Any scores from the test refer to the current English proficiency of test-takers. In a guide to understand TOEFL (“Interpret Scores”, n.d.), mentions that TOEFL score ranges between 310 to 677 (for the Paper-based Test as that taken by the respondents in this study). There is no meaning in particular that the score of 350, for example, refers to the ability of a specific type. Indeed, the definition of “minimum score” in this study is not determined by the creator of the TOEFL itself, but by policymakers at the university. The researcher believes that this minimum score as a requirement for graduation is based on the score set by many campuses abroad that use English as the main medium of learning.

Then, R4 and R19 rejected the policy of minimum TOEFL score required for graduation. Because they rejected the policy, it is understandable that they did not want to disclose the minimum score to be achieved by the participants of the test. Meanwhile, the last two of the respondents, i.e. R7 and R8, despite having the same opinion with R4 and R19 regarding their disagreement on this policy, expressed it indirectly by saying that there should not be a minimum score and suggested to accept the score as a representation of one’s
English mastery. Therefore, this is in accordance with the main purpose of TOEFL, which is to measure the English ability of the participants. Moreover, in the context of UB students, not all students are willing to continue their study or to work in countries that require high English proficiency, so any scores should be sufficient as a basis for them to recognize their potential and to improve their English proficiency in the future if necessary. In addition, relying on an English course in one semester to improve the English proficiency of students is almost impossible, except for a group of students who, since the beginning, have high English proficiency.

For the next question that is more open, in the sense that the respondents are free to express their opinion in the form of words, phrases, or sentences, answers can be divided into three types—a positive view, negative view, and neutral.

The positive view, which implies the agreement of respondents to the policy, can be seen in Table 4.

**Table 4. Positive View of Respondents toward the Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Code</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>To know my English proficiency and I hope I can communicate with students and lecturers from other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>As a graduation requirement, so students graduate have the English mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>TOEFL is needed to measure my English proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>I agree, as in the world of work, English is very important. Thus, with TOEFL, we will improve our English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the examples of positive views by respondents in Table 4, the reason behind their agreement was that they thought that TOEFL scores could be a reference to continue their study or to have a better career. For example, R5 conveyed that good English skills could be of capital for the participants to exchange ideas with students or lecturers abroad. In addition, R15 mentioned that good English skills, characterized by an adequate TOEFL scores, would deliver someone to a better career. R15 also mentioned that the minimum TOEFL score as required by the university could spur students to more actively improve their English skills.

Meanwhile, the negative view of respondents, which implies their disagreement of the policy, is shown in Table 5.

**Table 5. Positive View of Respondents toward the Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Code</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>It is burdensome and makes study more difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>I agree not to use it as a requirement for graduation, as we are in Indonesia, we speak Bahasa Indonesia, and we have to appreciate our own language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>TOEFL scores shall not become the absolute measurement. If we want to study overseas, then yes, it is an absolute requirement. Yet, if we are studying in Indonesia, I think Bahasa Indonesia must become the requirement. That way, we put Bahasa Indonesia to be in the same position as other languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>I think it is irrelevant as graduation requirement. We have the thesis or dissertation. TOEFL and the success in doing it do not guarantee the success in the world of work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5, it appears that there are reasons for disagreement of respondents to UB policy, including the academic and ideological reasons. The academic reason indicated by the respondents concerned that the requirement of passing TOEFL would hamper their studies. As shown in Table 2, 98% of TOEFL participants among graduate students in the UB failed to qualify a minimum score. If the students did not take corrective measures, for example by taking specialized TOEFL courses, then this situation would not change and, of course, hamper their graduation. UB postgraduate students are mostly professionals who may have already
passed their golden years to take the time to learn English in order to meet graduation requirement, which is TOEFL. The students do not have time for TOEFL courses, as they are busy with their study and work at the same time. Therefore, it is understandable if they argued that the minimum TOEFL requirement would hamper their study and career.

A further reason that emerges from the data is ideological reason, namely their sense of nationality as Indonesian, with Bahasa Indonesia as the national language, as has been seen on the answer by R7 and R8. Later today, an advertisement delivered by the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs targets Bahasa Indonesia as an international language. In fact, Bahasa Indonesia is included in the school curriculum of elementary and secondary levels in 45 countries, one of which is Australia (Yanto, 2012). However, if TOEFL still becomes the main requirement of graduation on campus, the policy of the minister and the reality seems contradictory. Supposedly, as presented by R7 and R8, increasing ability on Bahasa Indonesia is more important than struggling with a minimum TOEFL score that is difficult to achieve by the respondents.

Furthermore, a neutral view of the respondents to UB policy was indicated by R2, R6, and R14, as shown in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Code</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Hope that I get some help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>If we do not pass the minimum TOEFL score, then what is the policy for us?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three respondents indicate neutral view, as they were not specific about their opinion. For example, R2 mentioned "Hope that I get some help", which was mere a prayer or hope than answering the item. In this case, it seems R2 hoped for an ease in meeting the minimum TOEFL score. If this is so, then implicitly R2 stated that the requirement was hard for R2; however, R2 had no other choice, as it was a way to pursue R2's ideals.

Meanwhile, R6 said “If we do not pass the minimum TOEFL score, then what is the policy for us?” seems to be more like a question. In this case, the question is directed to policymakers or campus managers, just in case R6 could never get the minimum score, while graduation was waiting. Thus, R6 implicitly stated that R6 worried about the academic degree and career.

Then, R14 did not provide an answer to the second question in this questionnaire. R14 also did not provide an answer to the first question related to the minimum score of TOEFL. This implies that R14 had no opinion toward the policy, or not too concerned with the campus policy.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions
From the data and the above discussion, it can be concluded that the policy of minimum TOEFL score for graduation requirement is seen as burdensome by UB postgraduate students as 98% of participants who take TOEFL in PPB FIA UB failed to meet the minimum score of 500. However, most respondents continue to believe that the minimum score of 500 is ideal for graduation requirement. This is supported by the majority of respondents who have a positive view on this policy, saying that this policy can help students to know their current English proficiency so they can take corrective measures for the future. Meanwhile, the majority of respondents have a negative view or disagree with the policy for academic reason (hampering the study) and ideological reason (Bahasa Indonesia should be the priority). One respondent choses a neutral view on this policy.

Recommendations
Based on the analysis and assessment done, the researcher recommends UB to (1) lower the minimum TOEFL score for postgraduate students, or (2) remove the policy and turn it merely as a recommendation to the students to measure their English proficiency without making it a graduation requirement.
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