

READINESS TOWARDS OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION IN BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Sariwati Md Shariff
Noryati Ahmad
Mashitah Mohamed Esa
Shatina Saad

Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to determine the readiness level among academics towards outcome-based education (OBE) implementation for business management degree programs in a local public institution of higher learning. The secondary objective was to determine the new students' perceptions towards OBE implementation in the faculty in July 2010. Two different survey questionnaires using 5-point Likert scale were distributed to these two groups at the end of the semester. Findings of the study revealed that there was an average OBE awareness and compliance level among the academic staff. Based on the students' feedback, there was weak awareness on OBE that emphasized on student-centered learning. The results were expected as this was the first phase of the OBE curriculum implementation. Implications of the study showed that there were areas for continual improvement to further promote and enhance understanding and awareness on OBE among the staff and students; as well as to enforce and strengthen OBE implementation for the coming Part Two semester in January 2011. This is particularly important so as to achieve the planned program educational objectives, program and course outcomes in the new OBE curriculum design as enforced by the university and Malaysian Qualifications Agency.

Keywords: Outcome-based education, student-centered learning, curriculum design, learning outcomes

INTRODUCTION

In Malaysia, the access and opportunities for life-long learning and education is one of the national key result area (NKRA) strategy where every citizen is given opportunity and support to upgrade one's knowledge and skills and life-long learning (MoHe, 2006; 10MP, 2011) The education policy in Malaysia emphasize on developing Malaysian citizens who are knowledgeable and competent, with high moral standards, and are responsible and capable of achieving high level of personal well-being as well as being able to contribute to the betterment of the society and the nation at large (Education Act, 1996; 10MP, 2011). In October 2010, the Malaysian government has launched transformation plans such as: Government Transformation Plan (GTP), Economic Transformation Plan (ETP), National Key Economic Areas (NKEA) and National Key Results Areas (NKRA) to transform Malaysia to become a high economy nation and to develop the human capital. The educational sector is also compelled towards realization of the national's directives: to produce quality graduates that are able to meet the global market demands and employers requirements (MoHE, 2011).

Greater attention is now focused on educational reforms towards higher quality, accountability and evaluation of education outcomes as returns of investments made in education; and towards generation of knowledge economy and higher order learning and economic efficiency. For the last decade (1998-2008), countries such as USA, UK, Australia and Singapore have developed various forms of outcome-based education (OBE) (Burns & Squires, 1987; McNeil, et al.; Zepke and Leach, (2007). Hence, the topic on OBE is important as this is the new trend in education, and part of the National Strategic Higher Education Plan (*PSPTN*) in Malaysia. The Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) had directed that higher education curriculum in the country need to be reviewed and reformed immediately to develop human resources who can think critically, present and manage ideas creatively, innovative to benefit themselves and society; able to comprehend issues in the context of societal realities; risk takers, team players; have zest for entrepreneurial commitments; professionals with managerial skills and life-long learners (MoHE, 2011; MoHE, 2006; Module, 2006). This is a challenge for all institutions of higher learning in Malaysia to be competitive and to become an education hub in this region.

Under the portfolio of MoHE, the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) was set up under MQA Act 2007 whom established the Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF). MQF is the Malaysian quality and certification standards for its education system. This framework underpins 7 principles, namely: 1) recognition for qualifications; 2) recognition of awarding sectors; 3) levels of qualifications; 4) learning outcomes; 5) credit and academic load; 6) flexibility of movement; 7) educational pathways for individual development in lifelong learning (MQF, 2007; MoHE, 2006). These criteria are to be used for all academic qualifications awarded by recognized higher education providers and for program accreditation purposes. In other words, MQA is now the accreditation and quality assurance body in Malaysia. All higher educational programs must now be accredited under this framework; and that these program must account for its learning and educational outcomes. Therefore, the Faculty of Business Management of this public university had transformed the curriculum structure for all its ten degree programs towards OBE curriculum design which had been approved by MQA in July 2010.

OBE new business programs

Outcome-based education (OBE) refers to defining, focusing and organizing an educational system that focus clearly on the essentials for all students to be able to do successfully at the end of their learning experience. This means, starting with a clear picture of what is important for students to be able to do, organizing the curriculum, instruction, and assessment to make sure this learning ultimately happens (Spady, 1994; OBE Manual, FPP, 2008). The Faculty of Business Management offers ten degree programs, namely: Marketing, Transport, Human Resource, Operations Management, International Business, Finance, Economics, Islamic Banking to mention a few. These ten programs are also offered across the thirteen states throughout the nation. Presently, the faculty had more than 5,000 students in its main campus with an academic strength of more than 200 lecturers. The faculty (main campus) had started its first phase of OBE implementation for its business management programs in July 2010. It took the faculty 16 months to transform the curricular structure of its programs towards OBE curricular design in compliance with the new MQA and MOHE requirements. Prior to this, the faculty was in the midst of doing curriculum review together with invited industry players in the round-table dialogs and gathering information through alumni survey. The OBE processes started firstly, defining the program educational objectives (PEOs) and the program outcomes (POs) for all the business management degree programs shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Program Educational Objectives- Program Outcomes

Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	Program Outcomes (POs)
<u>Three years after graduation, the business graduates will be:</u>	
1. Competent business practitioners who diligently apply their business knowledge and skills with continuous enhancement in lifelong learning.	1, 2, 7
2. Business practitioners who are team players and problem solvers with effective human, ICT and communication skills .	3, 4, 5
3. Business practitioners who explore new opportunities and demonstrate leadership skills,	8, 9
4. Socially responsible business practitioners with high moral conduct.	6

While PEOs are broad goals describing expected graduates’ achievements in their career after 5 years of graduation; program outcomes (POs) are statements of what students should achieve upon completion of the program. Referencing to the 9 MOHEs’ learning outcomes (LO) (MoHE, 2011), the faculty envisioned the POs for its Business Management programs as shown in Table 2. OBE curricular planning process emphasized on how best to facilitate the desired outcomes; the curriculum, instructional materials and assessments are created to support the intended outcomes (Spady, 1988). Students must demonstrate their skills through challenging tasks such as: writing project proposals, completing a project, analyzing case studies, doing presentations. OBE principles also emphasize on higher level of thinking. OBE involves students in a complete course of learning. Clarity of focus on course outcomes (COs) and learning outcomes (LOs) are utmost priority (Spady, 1994). COs are as what students will be able to do upon the completion of the program. Learning outcomes (LOs) must be specific, understandable, measurable, assessable and student-centered statements as to what a student will be able to do at the end of a period of study. Hence, the learning outcomes (LOs) are generally stated from three dimensions (Blooms, 1956): cognitive (C), psychomotor (P) and affective (A). While curriculum is important, its

delivery is equally important (Jantan Jaffar, 2010). Teaching staff formed the frontline of this OBE transformation; academic staff must focus on innovative curricula delivery. Hence, adoption of problem-based learning and active learning are encouraged to promote the development of communication, problem-solving and self-directed learning skills. OBE trainings, meetings and briefings were done simultaneously for the academic staff throughout the year. The faculty adopted the new OBE educational approach in July 2010 upon attaining the MQA approval; and this was the beginning of the transformation OBE journey.

Table 2: Program Outcomes- Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of the degree BM programs, the students would be able to: (POs)	MoHE Learning Outcomes (LOs)
Apply business management fundamentals. (PO1)	Knowledge (LO1)
Apply systematic approach in solving business problems. (PO2)	Practical skills (LO2)
Use appropriate methodologies in gathering and analyzing information pertinent to decision-making. (PO3)	Thinking & scientific skills (LO3)
Demonstrate effective communications skills in business environment. (PO4)	Communication skills (LO4)
Work in a team. (PO5)	Teamwork skills (LO5)
Analyze and critique business decision within ethical framework. (PO6)	Values, ethics & moral (LO6)
Relate current events in their specialized area. (PO7)	Lifelong learning (LO7)
Integrate entrepreneurial skills in business decisions. (PO8)	Entrepreneur skills (LO8)
Exhibit leadership skills. (PO9)	Leadership skills (LO9)

OBE Survey Study

OBE implementation started in July 2010 with a new cohort of Part One students. A total of 233 students and 22 lecturers were involved. Students were briefed on OBE, PO, CO and LO during the first class meeting with their respective lecturers and entrance survey form was given to each student. Likewise, an exit survey was done during the last class at the end of the semester. A focus group meeting was also held with the lecturers to acquire feedback pertaining to the new OBE programs. The first survey was distributed in early October 2010 to lecturers involved in teaching the first semester with OBE design. Questionnaire was developed by the researchers based on literature review and OBE information. There are 4 sections in the questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale: with (1- no knowledge (or strongly disagree), and 5 – clearly understood (Or strongly agree). The 4 sections were namely: knowledge on OBE, curriculum design in OBE, readiness for OBE implementation and respondents' profile.

The objective of this survey was to determine OBE knowledge and awareness level among the lecturers and their readiness for OBE implementation. It consisted of 4 sections namely: knowledge on OBE, curriculum design in OBE, readiness for OBE implementation and respondents' profile. A second separate survey was carried out later using a questionnaire from the Academic Affairs Department that was given to the same groups: the academics and students in end of October 2010. It was a simple questionnaire survey that consisted of 12 questions. The objectives of survey are to assess the entrance/exit forms and to gauge their perceptions after OBE implementation in their classes.

Lecturer's readiness for OBE

OBE began with new Part One students with three identified course codes: MGT417 (IT in Business), ECO415 (Economics) and MGT420 (Principles and Practice of Management). Entrance and Exit survey forms were distributed to the students before and after the semester ended. Eleven out of 22 lecturers (50%) responded to the first survey. Table 3 showed the percentage breakdown on lecturers' perceptions on OBE knowledge: overall mean score 4.08 (average 67%). Only 50% of the respondents understood OBE evaluation and OBE benefits. The other 50% respondents were unclear on outcomes evaluation using rubrics (item 28); and respondents perceived that students were not active in class, not prepared (read) before class and not making their own notes. Refer to Table 3.

Table 3: Lecturer's Perceptions on OBE Knowledge

Section A: OBE Knowledge	α	Mean Score	Std Dev	% Agree (scale 4 & 5)
OBE Requirements	0.928	4.34	0.866	77%
OBE Approach	0.965	3.91	0.825	63%
OBE Objectives	0.985	4.30	0.681	87%
OBE Evaluation	0.905	4.10	0.957	58%*
OBE Benefits	0.982	3.75	0.907	50%*
Overall mean score		4.08	0.847	Avg. 67%

Likert scale: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Unsure, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree

The lecturers demonstrated 73% understanding level on OBE curriculum design with mean scores (3.67–3.95) throughout the 11 subsections in Section B. Data for student learning time (SLT) had to be rejected due to low reliability ($\alpha = 0.031$) since there were only 2 items and respondents were unsure on those items. Detailed analysis showed that only 36% of the lecturers could recall the faculty program educational objectives (PEOs) and 27% of them could remember the program outcomes (POs). Forty percent of respondents were unsure of the course objectives. Overall, the respondents had good understanding on Course Outcomes (COs), Learning Outcomes (LOs), Cognitive Level (CL), Psychomotor Level (PL) and Affective Level (AL). See Table 4.

Table 4: Lecturer Understands on OBE Design

Section B: OBE Curr. Design	α	Mean Score	Std Dev	% Agree (scale 4 & 5)
Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	0.871	3.91	0.766	80%
Program Outcomes (POs)	0.835	3.88	0.814	82%
Course Objectives	0.783	3.88	0.884	63%*
Course Outcomes (COs)	0.901	3.95	0.633	81%
Learning Outcomes (LOs)	0.888	3.82	0.738	72%
Cognitive Level (CL)	0.885	3.89	0.721	82%
Psychomotor Level (PL)	0.857	3.67	0.801	70%
Affective Level (AL)	0.908	3.77	0.730	71%
Student Centered Learning (SCL)	0.858	3.71	0.708	73%
<i>Student Learning Time (SLT)</i>	<i>0.031</i>	<i>3.59</i>	<i>1.078</i>	<i>64%</i>
MoHE Soft Skills (SS)	0.955	3.79	1.071	67%
Overall mean score		3.81	0.864	Avg. 73%

Likert scale: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Unsure, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree

The lecturers were averagely-ready (61%) for OBE implementation (overall mean score 3.56). The first 3 items (I am prepared for OBE, I understood OBE-SCL teaching and design) showed consistent low mean scores 3.27, 3.09, 3.18 respectively with 36% of the lecturers were really ready for OBE teaching. Only 55% of the respondents were confident with OBE-SCL teaching delivery methods (item 4 mean score 3.55). Lecturers agreed that more time was needed to understand this new curriculum structure. Despite their willingness to try this new concept, they needed motivation to do so (mean scores 4.18, 3.82 and 4.00 respectively). This was a good sign that these lecturers were positively adapting new changes towards OBE implementation. See Table 5. Overall, the lecturers were satisfied with their current teaching delivery (mean score 3.82). They also indicated that more training, briefings, communication and information on OBE and SCL should be provided (overall mean scores 4.23, 4.51).

Table 5: Readiness in OBE Implementation

Readiness in OBE Implementation ($\alpha = 0.733$)	Mean Score	Std Dev	% Agree (scale 4 &5)
I am prepared for OBE-SCL for my course that I am teaching	3.27	0.905	46%*
I understood OBE-SCL teaching-learning concepts	3.09	1.044	27%*
I understood OBE-SCL curriculum design.	3.18	1.079	36%*
I have confidence using OBE-SCL teaching delivery techniques.	3.55	0.522	55%
I need more time to understand OBE-SCL.	4.18	0.751	82%
I need motivation to appreciate OBE-SCL.	3.82	1.079	73%
I am willing to try to adopt OBE- SCL in my teaching.	4.00	0.632	82%
I feel there is no difference in OBE-SCL with my current teaching deliveries.	3.55	1.128	64%
I am confused about OBE-SCL.	3.18	1.079	73%
I am happy with my current teaching delivery	3.82	0.874	73%
Overall mean score	3.56	0.909	Avg. 61%

Likert scale: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Unsure, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree

The findings revealed the training needs of the lecturers; therefore, the faculty should organize more OBE-SCL training programs (Table 6).

Table 6: OBE Information and Trainings

OBE-SCL Information ($\alpha = 0.957$)		Mean Score	Std Dev
1	I feel the faculty needs to provide more OBE-SCL information.	4.18	0.751
2	I feel there should be more OBE - SCL briefings from the faculty in meetings.	4.09	0.831
3	I need more knowledge or information on OBE - SCL.	4.36	0.809
4	I feel there should be more communications on OBE - SCL.	4.36	0.674
5	I feel there should be more OBE-SCL documentations.	4.27	0.647
6	I feel there should be OBE-SCL procedures and circulations.	4.18	0.751
7	I feel there should be OBE-SCL information in UiTM webs.	4.18	0.751
8	I feel there should be OBE-SCL information from UiTM.	4.18	0.751
	Overall mean score	4.23	0.746
OBE-SCL Trainings ($\alpha = 0.916$)		Mean Score	Std Dev
1	I need more training on OBE-SCL concepts.	4.36	0.674
2	I need more real applications on OBE-SCL.	4.64	0.505
3	I need more coaching in instructional delivery in SCL (Student Centered Learning).	4.64	0.674
4	I need more to attend workshops on OBE-SCL.	4.36	0.674
5	The faculty should organize academic visits with OBE implementations.	4.45	0.688
6	The faculty needs to invite practitioners to give more talks on OBE-SCL.	4.55	0.522
7	I need trainings on Blooms Taxonomy and OBE evaluations.	4.55	0.522
	Overall mean score	4.51	0.608

Likert scale: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Unsure, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR OBE-SCL

Development of an individual or a student involves learning, thinking, doing and feeling. Learning involves interaction processes: the learner and the surroundings, and also the inner mental acquisition and elaboration process in the individual (Knowles, 1980; Merriam and Cafferella, 2008). The learning environment is important to ensure effective learning occurs. Based on this study, the lecturers agreed that the learning environment (overall mean score 4.09) was important so as to make OBE-SCL sustainable in class. Class size, class rooms, facilities and big number of students were of concern. Time management and students' learning pace of the students were also perceived as important for OBE learning environment as shown through the mean scores (above 4.0). Student readiness and motivation for SCL were areas that the faculty need to take into consideration: student's study load, exposure to OBE teaching-learning concepts on self-directed learning (SDL) and student learning time (SLT). The

lecturers also perceived that more information on OBE-SCL should be given and briefed to the students. All the items listed under learning environment in Table 7 showed high mean scores (above 4.0) for learning environment.

Table 7: Learning Environment for OBE-SCL

Learning Environment for OBE – SCL ($\alpha = 0.946$)		Mean Score	Std Dev
1	Concern about big class size (40 or more students).	4.55	0.688
2	Students readiness for SCL (Self learning).	4.00	1.000
3	Students motivation for SCL.	3.82	0.874
4	Classroom size and arrangement for SCL.	4.09	0.944
5	Facilities accommodating for SCL.	4.00	0.894
6	Study load on students (more than 20 credit hours).	4.00	1.000
7	Variances among students (learning pace).	4.27	0.647
8	Availability of teaching materials / updated OBE Course Files.	4.00	0.894
9	Time management among students.	4.00	1.183
10	Concern on completion of syllabus.	3.82	1.168
11	Students' briefings on OBE-SCL.	4.27	0.786
12	More information/knowledge on OBE-SCL.	4.27	0.647
Overall mean score		4.09	0.818

Likert scale: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Unsure, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON OBE

Since OBE was still in the infant stage in the faculty, there were tendencies of inconsistencies in the teaching-learning processes; lecturers needed more OBE trainings programs, OBE promotions, learning new teaching methodologies such as transforming roles towards facilitating rather than teaching. Furthermore, continual amendments are still needed in terms of actual practicability, suitability and achievement on the course outcomes-learning outcomes during the execution of the teaching processes. Likewise students also need to know about OBE and student-centered learning. They also need time to adjust to the new system, in particular to encourage student-centered learning. Hence, the second survey was carried out using the questionnaire from the Academic Affairs Department of the institution. OBE was introduced and implemented for four courses for semester 1 July 2010, namely: Principles and Practices of Management, Information Technology in Business, Economics and Economics for Accountancy students. Total of 16 lecturers (73%) and 231 students returned the questionnaires. Table 8 below shows a comparison between the lecturers and students' perceptions on OBE. Introduction on the entrance and exit survey forms were being carried out. The entrance and exit forms enlisted the course outcomes for each course and aimed to gather information on learning achievement or change after the course was completed. However, the perceptions and execution of entrance (item 1) and exit forms (item 12) were not well understood by both groups as mean scores were low (3.19, 3.03 and 2.81 and 2.94 respectively).

Table 8: Perceptions on OBE

Items	Lecturers'	Students'	
	Perceptions	Perceptions	
	Mean score	Mean score	
1	Entrance survey carried out.	3.19	3.03
2	OBE-SCL awareness among students.	2.56	2.81
3	CO alignment with PO.	3.31	3.41
4	Lesson plans are creative.	3.81	3.48
5	Use of SCL method of teaching.	3.38	3.25
6	SLT- Actual Plan.	2.08	2.55
7	Soft skills enhancement on students.	2.60	3.11
8	Assessments alignment to CO.	3.69	3.49
9	Preparation of assessments based on rubrics.	2.75	3.11
10	Assessments based on Table of Specs for final exam questions.	3.31	3.14
11	Students portfolio.	1.13	2.87
12	Exit survey carried out.	2.81	2.94
No of Respondents		16	231

Likert Scale: 1- Strongly Disagree; 2- Disagree; 3- Unsure; 4- Agree; 5- Strongly Agree

Analysis showed low mean scores on OBE-SCL awareness (items 2) for both groups (mean scores 2.56 and 2.81) and SLT-Actual Plan (item 6, mean scores 2.08, 2.55). This implied low understanding and awareness on OBE, SCL and SLT since this was the first time OBE was being introduced. It seemed also, that both lecturers and students were not confident or unsure with CO and PO (item 3, mean score 3.31 and 3.41 respectively even though copies of CO-PO matrices and course information were given to the students. Likewise, item 5 on use of SCL methods of teaching, results also showed low mean scores: 3.38 and 3.25 based on lecturers and students perceptions respectively. As for lesson plans are creative (item 4), both lecturers and students perceived as acceptable (mean score 3.8, 3.48 respectively).

The lecturers perceived low soft skills development (mean score 2.61) as these were new students in semester one of their study; likewise students perceived the same too (low mean score 3.11). Next, the lecturers had low perceptions towards assessments based on rubrics (item 9, mean score 2.75); however this contradicted with assessments were aligned with CO (item 8, mean score 3.69). It could possible means that either the rubric assessment forms (or formats) were not accessible, or being used, or not user friendly. Last but not least, low mean scores for students' portfolio (mean score 1.13, 2.87) implied the absence of student portfolio; apparently this process had not been carried out during the semester.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The faculty had just implemented OBE for Part One in July 2010 involving 22 lecturers, 231 students and three courses. This was only the beginning of the OBE cycle. Having and implementing a new system with new OBE curriculum design, staff, students and the processes needed time to appreciate and understand; likewise the OBE system needed time to mature and to be stable. For the next coming semester in January 2011, the OBE curriculum programs would proceed to Part Two, that would involved more than forty lecturers across ten degree programs in the main campus, and also across the branches throughout Malaysia, as well as more than seven course codes would be affected. Some of the immediate plans that had been planned are: more OBE trainings, OBE road shows, OBE meetings and discussions, OBE rubrics implementation, setting the OBE final examination papers, and last but not least, the OBE monitoring among academics. There were rooms for continual improvements for the next OBE implementation in 2011. The faculty had yet to draft guidelines and quality procedures for OBE teaching-learning and assessments. In addition, it also needed to strategize its ICT and database system to collate all information and analysis data for its OBE measurements and assessments. The faculty had yet to carry out analysis on the exit survey analysis on the first three course codes, and to formulate the student's portfolio programs.

Compliances and enforcement among the academics to use the correct documents and forms, rubrics assessments and timely submission of records and survey forms also required attention. More briefings, information and notices are needed, to be promoted, communicated and carried out to the students as well as staff to inculcate, motivate and encourage student-centred learning (SCL) and student-learning time (SLT). OBE is a journey of continual learning and a continuous cycle with commitment from all sides: the management, the academics and students. Learning from making mistakes, learning from others, learning by doing it; learning by sharing and discussing with others; these are part of OBE journey and OBE experiences. OBE incorporated more accountability in designing course curriculum, delivering the course contents (teaching), achieving the planned desired course outcomes (learning), fair and objective assessments (rubrics), attaining the program course outcomes (results) and realizing the program education outcomes (outputs). This would produce graduates who are prepared for the job market and meet the industry needs. Through OBE implementation, the academic staff had developed an awareness of new educational concepts, MoHE directions and higher standards from an academic staff, greater inner self-reflection on individual teaching and learning, self-accountability towards student's learning; and to improve one's teaching performance. The OBE processes embedded itself the learning experiences among all academics.

CONCLUSION

There is now an emerging emphasis towards outcome-based education focusing on learning processes and attaining results (Alam Sher Malik, 2009; Zepke and Leach, 2007). Institutions of higher learning in Malaysia are transforming their undergraduate curricula into OBE. The aims of education are now broad-based to meet national, social and economic objectives on human capital development and national agenda (MoHE, 2011). Degree programs should aim towards the development of lifelong learning, generic skills and the capabilities to take effective actions in changing circumstances, to work effectively with others and continue to learn from one's experiences (MQA, 2007). Learning is growth oriented,

developing confidence, responsibility and expanding one's potential to take a future role within the organization (Burns and Squires, 1987). OBE curriculum design adopts students focus, continual improvement approach, management review and taking actions towards achieving its educational objectives and outcomes, in synch with quality assurance system requirements and approach. An effective learning results when 1) the program is based on the needs of learners, 2) these needs form the basis of educational objectives, 3) knowledge is external to the learners, 4) objectives are the basis for organizing learning experiences, 5) the emphasis of learning effort is on the individual learner (Tyler, 1949; Houle 1961). What matters most is to produce outputs with quality graduates that are knowledgeable, skillful, having the soft skills and possess positive attributes that meet the Ministry of Higher Education and Malaysia Qualifying Agency requirements for program accreditations and certifications; satisfying the graduates' needs; and achieving the nation and market needs for the future. As quoted: the Malaysian education system should offer a curriculum that develops and promotes thinking, and appreciating wisdom; education is a process of constant and perpetual self-improvement (Omar, M and Abdul Majeed, A.B. 2010). The study concluded that even though the readiness level for OBE stood at average, the Faculty of Business Management is forging ahead with outcome-based education implementation with more concerted trainings towards producing professional and versatile graduates for the job market as well as for human capital development and nation-building.

REFERENCES

- Alam Sher Malik, Outcome-based Education is the Way of the 21st Century. *New Sunday Times*.2009. March 15.
- Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*, New York: McKay.
- Burns, R. & Squires, D. (1987). *Curriculum Organization in Outcome-Based Education*. San Francisco: Far West Labor for Educational Research & Development.
- Cornford, I., and Athanasou, J. (1995). *Developing Expertise Through Training*. Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training, vol. 27, pp.10-18.
- De Jager, H.J. & Nieuwenhuis, F.J.(2005). Linkages Between Total Quality Management and the Outcome-Based Approach in an Education Environment. *Quality in Higher Education*. Vol.11, No. 3.
- Education Act, 1996*. MDC Publisher. Malaysia.
- Houle. C.O. (1961). *The Design of Education*. Jossey – Bass Publishers.
- Illeris, K. (2003). Work place Learning and Learning Theory. *Journal of Work place Learning*, Vol. 15, no.4, pp. 167-178.
- Jantan, Jaffar (2010). *ILQAM OBE Curriculum Design Manual*, UiTM. March 15, 2010.
- Knowles, M.S (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy*. (2nd ed.), New York: Cambridge Books.
- Knowles, M.S., Holton III E.F., and Swanson R.A. (1998). *The Adult Learner*. Houston Texas: Gulf Publishing Company
- Lampert, N. (2007). Critical Thinking Dispositions as an Outcome of Undergraduate Education. *The Journal of General Education*. Vol.56, No.1.
- Lizzio, A. And Wilson, K. (2005). Self-managed Learning Groups in Higher Education: Students' Perceptions of Process and Outcomes. *British Journal of Education Psychology*.
- Knemeyer, A.M., and Murphy, P.R. (2002). *Logistics internships: employer and students perspectives*. International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management, vol. 32. no.2, pp. 135-152.
- Maistre, C.L., and Pare, A. (2004). *Learning in two communities : the challenge for universities and workplaces*. Journal of Workplace Learning, vol. 16, no.1/2, pp.44-52.
- Malaysian Qualification Framework. Malaysian Qualifications Agency (2007). <http://www.mqa.gov.my>
- McNeil, H.P., Hughes, C.S., Toohey S.M., Dowton, S.B. (2006). An Innovative Outcomes-Based Medical Education Program Built on Adult Learning Principles. *Medical Teacher*. Vol.28, No. 6.
- Merriam S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Merriam S. B. (2001). *The New Update on Adult Learning Theory*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Merriam S.B., and Cafferella, R.S. (2008). *Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide*. (3rded.) San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

- Ministry Higher Education (2011); <http://www.mohe.gov.my>
- MoHE Report (2006). *Towards Excellence*. Ministry of Higher Education, UPENA. Universiti Teknologi MARA, M.
- MoHE (2011); <http://www.mohe.gov.my> portal.
- Module (*Modul Pembangunan Kemahiran Insaniah untuk IPTA*), 2006. (Translation: *Module for Soft skills Development for Public Universities, 2006*). MOHE. Universiti PUTRA Malaysia.
- Omar, Megawati and Abdul Majeed, Abu Bakar (2010). Time To Train Youngsters to Think. *NEW STRAITS TIMES*. 2010 June 6.
- Schon, D.A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Learner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spady, W. (1988). Organizing for Results: The Basis of Authentic Restructuring and Reform. *Education Leadership*. Vol.46, No 2.
- Spady, W. (1993). *Outcome-based Education*. Belconnen, ACT; Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- Spady, W. (1994). Choosing Outcomes of Significance. *Educational Leadership*. Vol,51, No.6, pp 18-22.
- Spady, W. (1995). We need more Educentric Standards. *Educational Leadership*. Vol.53, No.1, pp. 82-84
- 10 MP (Tenth Malaysian Plan); Economic Transformation Plan, National Economic Transformation Plan, National Key Economic Areas; National Key Results Area; *Prime Minister Initiatives*. <http://www.pmo.gov.my>
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zepke, N. and Leach, L. (2007). Improving Students Outcomes In Higher Education: New Zealand Teachers' Views On Teaching Students from Diverse Backgrounds. *Teaching in Higher Education*. Vol.12, No. 5-6, pp. 655-668.