

INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS (IMC) IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDONESIA

Estaswara H.*

Abstract: IMC has been globally accepted as well as in Indonesia. Not just on practical aspects, but in academic domain since widely taught as a subject of undergraduate program in Indonesia. While literature review shows that conceptualization of IMC from various international publications still marked pros and cons, but a lesser amount of publications involve educators as one of stakeholders. Actually, educators are *avant-garde* of IMC deployment to the next generation and their authority in defining IMC in the classroom. In order to recognize the development of IMC thought, acceptance, and its variations of meaning, it is important to analysis the IMC syllabus as a manifestation of educator thought. To get widely perspective, these results should be compared and linked with perceptions of educators who teach IMC or other relevant subjects. Therefore, this study aims to determine how educator' perceptions of IMC concept that has been built over time in various international publications, and how IMC defined in syllabus as a manifestation of educator' understanding. This study uses mixed method, where the perception of educators measured quantitatively by conducting survey of 51 respondents. Meanwhile, syllabus analyzed qualitatively. Both results are then compared and linked to answer research questions.

Key words: IMC, Syllabus, undergraduate program, educator

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2016.14.1.07

Article's history:

Received October 27, 2016; *Revised* November 19, 2016; *Accepted* November 30, 2016

Introduction

IMC (Integrated Marketing Communications) has been developed more than three decades since it was first introduced in the scientific article in late 80s and early 90s. Literature review shows that development of IMC concept initially much influenced pros and cons, although eventually began appearing similarity on the basic ideas of IMC. While it appears a lot of agreement on IMC conceptualization, if not all of ideas yet, IMC as a relatively new concept admittedly still leave many conceptual issues that lack in consensus, such as leadership issue, organizational structure, evaluation of IMC program, and basis compensation for advertising agencies (Kitchen and Schultz, 2009; Swain, 2004; Estaswara, 2008).

In addition, the other facts explain that IMC teaching programs in various universities around the globe, including in Indonesia, are rapidly growing, which are, academically can be said to reflect a high interest in IMC. In Indonesia, IMC widely taught in undergraduate program. However, development process of IMC concept published in a various international scientific journals, view sparsely

* **Helpris Estaswara**, Faculty of Communications, Universitas Pancasila

✉ Corresponding author: the.estaswara@yahoo.com

appointed IMC educators or lecturer. However lecturers are one of the stakeholders that responsible for education of IMC practitioners in the future. Further, their role is also crucial because lecturer have the authority to define IMC in the teaching-learning process in front the classroom according to what they know (Kerr et al., 2008; Estaswara, 2015). Therefore, importance to know the perception of lecturers on IMC and the conceptual issues that is still debatable.

Based on above, this study aims to answer: (1) The perception of educators about IMC and conceptual issues that is lack in agreement; (2) Understanding of educators on IMC that is based from syllabus; (3) Gap between perception of lecturers on IMC and what is stated in syllabus; and (4) Gap among what is thought by lecturers in Indonesia compared with state of the art of IMC concept.

Literature Review

In order to get the whole picture associated with the conceptualization of IMC, it is important to go back over the development history of IMC thinking in academia that began to emerge in 90s with the origin of first IMC definition in 1989 as starting point of IMC conceptualization process. Based on its development, IMC conceptualization in general can be divided into two generations of thinking. The first generation understands the extent of the integration of IMC simply on promotional mix elements. While second generation, more advanced by involving the integration of all departments within the corporation.

IMC idea of first generation leave basic premises related to messages, media, communication elements, as well as audience. This idea is built starting from the first IMC definition that was initiated by Schultz and Northwestern University as requested by 4As in 1989 (Mazur and Miles, 2007; Kliatchko, 2005; Schultz, 2003; Kitchen et al., 2004) to IMC conceptualization proposed by Duncan (Kliatchko, 2005, 2008). IMC first generation is still external focus on managing various elements of marketing communications (promotional mix) in an integrated manner. This thinking was emerged as response academics to the condition of agency in '80s (Schultz, 2010). In fact, the idea of IMC was originally come out from agency that began to lose their market as result of the shifting of their client budget, to be precise, extensively spend on *bellow-the-line* activities rather than in mass media advertising. For that reason, agency income began to decline. Client chose *bellow-the-line* activities because at that time optical scanner has been used in many supermarkets, so the quantification of sales and buying habits can be implemented. Therefore, programs such as sales promotion throughout event marketing are considered more effective rather than advertising. On the other hand, the effectiveness of advertising in mass media began questioned. These conditions forced agency to rescue their billing. Thus, was born the idea to expand its business by providing *bellow-the-line* services to its clients. From then on, the agency is not only provides advertising and media buying, but combined them with *bellow-the-line* activities. This concept is known as full service agency (Schultz and Schultz, 2004; Schultz, 2010; Eppes, 1999). Moreover, IMC initially had many names,

such as “*whole egg*” (Young – Rubicam) or “*orchestration*” (Ogilvy – Mather), before recognized as IMC in academic domain (Schultz, 2010).

Scope of first generation of IMC thinking can be said limited to the management of external marketing communications element. Although it is seemed look like traditional marketing communications, but idea of integration has given a different perspective. When viewed from basic elements of communication discipline, first generation of IMC has contributed new ideas related to the integration of messaging, media and marketing communication elements, and audience. *Firstly*, communication message in the IMC is *one voice, one look, or one spirit* (Schultz, 2003; Nowak and Phelps, 1994; Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008). That is, message harmonization of all promotional mix elements. Therefore, similarity in meaning as the form of communication effectiveness can be achieved. *Secondly*, associated to the use of media communication should be multi-channel or integrate all media either traditional or Internet-based. Although the idea of media integration is not straightforward disclosed in early IMC concept development, but it is extremely linked to understanding the integration of all marketing communications elements. This idea was later called *classless* or *seamless* of marketing communications elements (Schultz, 2003; Burnet and Moriarty, 1998; Duncan and Caywood, 1996; Duncan and Everett, 1993; Nowak and Phelps, 1994; Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008; Swain, 2004; Fill, 2002). *Lastly*, audience in IMC was initially not into focus, although later developed idea that IMC should begin from understanding the audience and ends with the audience or also known as audience-focused.

First generation of IMC described in the definitions proposed by Schultz and his colleagues at early development of IMC concept until 1993. Other thinkers sought to add, strengthens, develops and correcting (Kitchen and Schultz, 2009; Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008; Burnet and Moriarty, 1998; Duncan and Caywood, 1996; Duncan and Everett, 1993; Nowak and Phelps, 1994; Kitchen et al., 2004; Swain, 2004; Holm, 2006; Fill, 2002; Estaswara, 2008). Other IMC thinker who shows different ideas is Duncan. His thoughts on IMC, although at some level IMC supports the ideas of first generation, but more stress on brand value, dialogue, stakeholders, and relationship building (Duncan and Everett, 1993) which is actually core idea of second generation of IMC.

Second generation of IMC is different at scope from initial ideas of IMC. The difference lies on internal corporate involvement in implementation of effective IMC program. The basic ideas of IMC as viewed from communication perspective related to message, channel and communication elements, as well as audience has been improved and expanded. *Firstly*, idea of message that is not limited to the message integration. More specifically, the message is should be the brand message or known as brand communication (Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008). The objective is to building a superior brand value, and finally brand equity can be achieved. In contrast, building valuable brand in any case must involve role and responsibility of internal, all corporate stakeholders, and also cross-functional (Duncan, 2002; Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008; Madavaram et al., 2005). *Secondly*,

departing from these ideas, the audience in the IMC is not only prospect, consumers and customers, but all stakeholders, both internal and external (Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008; Duncan, 2002; Schultz and Schultz, 2004; Estaswara, 2008; Madavaram et al., 2005). *Thirdly*, IMC use communications technology through consumer database to build mutually beneficial relationship over the years with the customer so that it can be used as the basis for financial evaluation (Schultz and Schultz, 2004; Kitchen and Schultz, 2009; Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008; Estaswara, 2008). Moreover, IMC requires dialogue or interactivity (Duncan, 2002). *Lastly*, communication elements that are used include all forms of corporate communications, both internal and external (Madavaram et al., 2005).

Second generation of IMC is already more advanced, both in terms of the scope of study, message, channel and communication elements, as well as audience. IMC leading thinkers in the second generation is Schultz and colleagues (2004), Kliatchko (2005, 2008) and Duncan (2002). IMC second generation more strategic by placing brand, customer and relationship with involve all stakeholders in achievement of its effectiveness. However, IMC still leaves conceptual issue. Some disadvantages are still prominent to this day is the difficulty for implementation (Kitchen and Burgman 2010). Biggest challenge is integrating cross-functional within the company. It takes an active role of top management to lead the implementation of IMC. This implies also the position of IMC is supposed to play a central role in internal communications (Sheehan and Doherty, 2001; Swain, 2004; Moriarty, 1994; Eagle and Kitchen, 2000; McArthur and Griffin, 1997). This understanding ultimately requires organizational structure that fits the needs of IMC. Idea on organizational structure is also still an academic debate (Pettegrew, 2001). Other challenge arises related to the measurement of IMC effectiveness. Given the ultimate IMC goal is the creation of brand value which is calculated from financial return as a form of ROI on communication technological investment via the utilization of customer database (Schultz and Kitchen, 1997; Swain, 1994; Schultz and Barnes, 1995; Semenik, 2002; Kitchen and Schultz, 2009; Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008). Financial evaluation issue is another challenge because IMC is generally not seen as an investment, but as a “cost center” in accounting calculation and subject to reductions (Kitchen and Schultz, 2009). The last issue is basis compensation for agencies as the agent of IMC implementation (Eppes, 1999; Swain, 2004), while conceptually, IMC should come from and led by companies in which position of ads agency is simply as implementers (Kitchen and Schultz, 2009; Kliatchko, 2005 and 2008; Estaswara, 2008; Swain, 2004).

Research Methodology

This study use mixed method approach. *Firstly*, to determine perception of IMC educators using survey. Citing Kim et al. (2004) many studies on IMC has been focused on perception. Referring Swain (2004), a key issue in the process of implementing IMC is differentiation in perception. Therefore, the perception in this study is seen as a manifestation of IMC thinking by lecturers in Indonesia. Based

on studies conducted by Kim et al. (2004), Swain (2004), as well as Kitchen and Li (2005), has been developed instrument adapted to IMC concepts that has been built over the years. Thus, this research combines a variety of instruments that have been employed before. Samples of this study obtained via Internet survey of 15 Faculty of Communication in Jakarta. Number of respondents who filled questionnaires was 51 lecturers who teach IMC or other relevant subjects wherein the response rate in this study was 34%.

Secondly, conducted syllabus analysis with the main data is IMC syllabus from 15 Faculty of Communication, which are Universitas Indonesia (UI), Universitas Pancasila (UP), Universitas Esa Unggul, Kalbis Institute, Atmajaya University, Universitas Mercu Buana, President University, Universitas Bina Nusantara, Kwik Kian Gie Institute, London School of Public Relations (LSPR), Institute Teknologi Komunikasi dan Pemasaran (ITKP), Universitas Bunda Mulia, Interstudi, and Universitas Sahid. The course syllabus obtained by asking lecturers, either directly (face-to-face) or via e-mail. This research method is identical to what has been worked by Kerr et al. (2008) in their research. The difference is, Kerr et al. (2008) using 10 stage as methodological process, whereas this research is only eight stages. Two steps removed, that is “train coders” and “pre-test and revision”, because in this research all stage conducted by writer itself, so it requires no training for coder. In addition, the process of “pre-test and revision” is not used because coding is completed by researcher where in a study conducted by Kerr et al. (2008), this stage is assumed not important as well (Estaswara, 2015).

Undergraduate program in Faculty of Communication at various universities in Jakarta are chosen as samples in this research because it is assumed to represent Indonesia. It is given that Jakarta is trend-setter for development of IMC and Communication Studies in Indonesia.

Result Discussion

Based on validity test of 56 item questionnaire with 7-bipolar adjectives scale is calculated using *Product-Moment Correlation* is valid (Significant at 0.01). While reliably questionnaire also tested through *Alpha Cronbach* show reliable ($\alpha = 0.945$). Furthermore, respondent information of the 51 lecturers, there were 68.8% who teach IMC and the rest teaching other relevant subjects, such as Marketing Communications and Promotions. Experience teaches IMC courses were generally less than 10 years of as much as 52.9% and 47.1% has teaching experience over 10 years. Total of 70.6% respondents claimed to have written IMC articles more than 5 times, while the rest of respondents (29.4%) also do the same but less than 5 times. *Lastly*, perception of lecturers stated that the IMC is crucial to undergraduate students in Indonesia (96.1%).

The result of the survey on the meaning of IMC in general is accordance with the ideas of second generation of IMC. However, some of IMC ideas are not understood differently related to the idea of IMC as a strategic business process where corporate vision should be aligned with the brand vision and communicated

to all stakeholders. Another idea that is understood in different way related to the effectiveness of IMC in changing consumer behavior, establishing mutual benefit relationship in the long term and creating customer loyalty.

That various conceptual issues are still debatable, this study found evidence that IMC educators as respondents still differing views associated with the idea of leadership in implementation of IMC and method for IMC evaluation. While the idea of organizational structure still found difference in perception. Although number of the respondents stated that *quick response organization* or *flat organization* as the most appropriate structure (58.6%), but this quantity cannot be considered as significant to similarity in understanding. Given this study wanted to find similarity basis, so if there is majority of respondents who agree with the ideas of the IMC can be said to be significant or statistically must more than 80%. Likewise, idea of compensation base for ads agency based on management fees is still found no similarity (64.7%).

Idea of who is leader in implementing IMC that should be top management has not become a consensus in this study. Respondents believe that is necessary to structure a joint committee involving all department of company (39.2%). The department should run the IMC program is still perceived differently, although 49% of respondents view Marketing Communications Department as responsible for the implementation of IMC. Furthermore, evaluation method of IMC program is still being debated with the finding of differing views. A total of 41.2% said that IMC should be evaluated based on consumer behavior change rather than brand equity, repeat sales or financial return of investment.

Based on the 15 syllabus studied, generally keep using IMC or translation in Indonesian as a name of subject of study. The results of analysis also show that IMC syllabus is limited to the first generation of IMC thinking. Material about brand as a message of IMC is lack of taught, while IMC message should be *one voice* and *one look* is already concerned. In addition, relationship with customers through IMC program and utilization of customer database is not the focus of teaching. Learning subject is generally limited to the how to manage integration of promotional mix elements. The use of traditional media and new media has become the focal point of instruction, but only within the scope of external applied. *Lastly*, IMC that is focused on consumer in accordance with the needs of today's market has become a subject in the IMC course of undergraduate program.

IMC that is understood by lectures in this study have adopted many of the ideas in the second generation of IMC. Ideas adopted are message in IMC should be the message of the brand to build a superior brand value anchored in consumer perspective and relatively different from competitors. Brand communication is conducted with the principle of *one voice*, *one look* and *one spirit* that involves all internal parties. However, the position of IMC is still understood less strategic. It is because, internally, IMC implementation simply as the responsibility of Marketing Communications Department, but the ambiguity in meaning, that is must involve other department by creating a *joint committee* as an area for coordination. IMC

also limited focus on prospects, customers, and customers and does not involve stakeholders. In fact, internal stakeholders involved in the development of brand identity, as well as being the brand ambassador as efforts to built a harmonious relationship in the long term between company, brand and customer. While communication technology and customer database employment have been conceived but it is not perceived as responsibility of IMC to use it in efforts to create customer buying habit, especially evaluation of financial returns. IMC is still considered as a “cost center” rather than an investment.

There is still no consensus on IMC understanding of lecturers in Indonesia in formulating the internal role of IMC and its potential to establish relationships with all stakeholders in order to creating brand equity. Internal role of IMC is still limited to the traditional marketing communication function and brand has not perceived as an internal matter. Not surprisingly, crucial role of top management has not been focus of attention. Moreover, IMC evaluation method based on ROI (Return on Investment) associated with communications technology investments and effort to build customer loyalty in order to create a superior brand value is still arguable issue.

Interestingly, lecturer understanding of IMC obtained via surveys is different from what is taught in the classroom if we look evident from IMC syllabus analysis. From the analysis of syllabus, IMC concept taught reflects first generation of IMC. Although there is concern about the consumer, but focus of instruction is limited to the integration of various elements of promotional mix management and its practice. Internal role and function of IMC are not discussed as well as the importance of brands in IMC. While the extent of the communication media used is simply in media mix of promotional programs, even though has been focusing on online media. Evaluation of IMC program is not even discussed and effectiveness of IMC only measured from the outcome of communication messages. There also no explanation on brand value as well as financial returns. IMC is still understood as a cost center rather than investment.

This study shows difference meaning of IMC between survey results compared with syllabus analysis. A significant difference lies in understanding of internal role of IMC. Inequalities still found on internal functions of IMC, causing taught not to discuss about this. The role of brand in IMC associated with internal support is still debatable. Understanding on how IMC implemented internally in order to build “*living the brand*” aligned with the corporate vision and mission is still blurred. Likewise, the idea of stakeholder involvement in IMC as well as investment of information and communication technology and the development of a mutually beneficial relationship in the long run between the company, brand and its customers as well as evaluation of IMC program also remains a topic that has not understood similar. Based on above analysis, it is not surprising that there is an inconsistency between what is understood by lecture compared with the IMC syllabus for undergraduate program.

IMC Syllabus of undergraduate program in Indonesia is not aligned with the thought of IMC that have been widely proposed in international journal since today. IMC Syllabus can be said simply reflects first generation of IMC. Interestingly, understanding of lecturers on IMC can be said approaching second generation of IMC thinking and more advanced than what is stated in the syllabus. But, there is seem no effort to construct a syllabus in accordance with ideas that have been built in the second generation of IMC. The main cause, there is still variety of agreement on the idea of internal aspects of IMC and its role and function. This ultimately makes the understanding on crucial of internal role and function of IMC is lack in agreement among lectures.

Conclusion

Lecturers in Indonesia understand IMC and taught undergraduate program still in the first generation of IMC thinking. Internal aspects of IMC are room for debate that led to a blurring understanding on the crucial role of internal IMC. As a result, understanding of lecturers in Indonesia on IMC leave many conceptual problems associated with brand, communications and information technology investment, consumer database, and evaluation method linked to financial return, as well as basis for agency's compensation. The finding in this study can be confirming the IMC understanding of lecturers in Indonesia and the extent of IMC adoption in undergraduate education in Indonesia today.

References

- Burnett J.J., Moriarty S., 1998, *Introduction to marketing communications. An integrated approach*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Duncan T., Everett S., 1993, *Client perceptions of integrated marketing communications*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 33(3).
- Duncan T., Caywood C., 1996, *The concept, process and evolution of Integrated Marketing Communication*, [In:] Thorson E. and Moore J. (Eds). *Integrated communication: A synergy of persuasive voices*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Duncan T., 2002, *IMC: Using advertising and promotion to build brands*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Eagle L., Kitchen P., 2000, *IMC, brand communications, corporate cultures*, "European Journal of Marketing", 34(5).
- Eppes T.E., 1999, *Rebirth of an agency: Challenges and implications of operating in an IMC framework*, "Journal of Integrated Marketing Communications", 1998-1999.
- Estaswara H., 2008, *The implementation process of IMC and its future prospect in business practice in Indonesia: an exploratory comparative study toward four profession groups*, "International Journal of Communication Studies", 1(1).
- Estaswara H., 2015, *Integrated Marketing Communications (IMC): Extended Version or New Idea?* "Journal of Global Academic Institute Education & Social Sciences", 1(2).
- Fill C., 2002, *Marketing communications—Contexts, strategies and applications*, Financial Times Prentice Hall: Harlow.

- Holm O., 2006, *Integrated marketing communication: From tactic to strategy*, "Corporate Communications", 11(1).
- Kerr G., Schultz D., Patti C., Kim L., 2008, *An inside-out approach to integrated marketing communication: An international analysis*, "International Journal of Advertising", 27(4).
- Kim I., Han D., Schultz D., 2004, *Understanding the diffusion of integrated marketing communications*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 44(1).
- Kitchen P.J., Schultz D.E., 1999, *A multi-country comparison of the drive for IMC*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 39(1).
- Kitchen P.J., Brignell J., Li T., Jones G.S., 2004, *The emergence of IMC: A theoretical perspective*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 44(1).
- Kitchen P.J., Li T., 2005, *Perceptions of integrated marketing communications: A chinese ad and PR agency perspective*, "International Journal of Advertising", 24(1).
- Kitchen P.J., Schultz D.E., 2009, *IMC: New horizon/false dawn for a market place in turmoil*, "Journal of Marketing Communication", 15(2).
- Kitchen P.J. Burgmann J., 2010, *Integrated marketing communication*, [In:] Sheth J.N. and Malhotra N.K. (Eds.), Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kliatchko J., 2005, *Towards a new definition of integrated marketing communications (IMC)*, "International Journal of Advertising", 24(1).
- Kliatchko J., 2008, *Revisiting the IMC construct. A revised definition and four pillars*, "International Journal of Advertising", 27(1).
- Madhavaram S., Badrinarayanan V., McDonald R.E., 2005, *Integrated marketing communications (IMC) and brand identity as critical components of brand equity strategy*, "Journal of Advertising", 34(4).
- Mazur L., Miles L., 2007, *Conversations with marketing masters*, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- McArthur D., Griffin T., 1997, *A marketing management view of integrated marketing communications*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 37(5).
- Moriarty S.E., 1994, *PR and IMC: The benefits of integration*, "Public Relations Quarterly", 39(3).
- Nowak G.J., Phelps J., 1994, *Conceptualizing the integrated marketing communications' phenomenon: An examination of its impact on advertising practices and its implications for advertising research*, "Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising", 16(1).
- Pettegrew L.S., 2001, *If IMC is so good, why isn't it being implemented?: Barriers to IMC adoption in corporate America*, "Journal of Integrated Communications", 11(2000).
- Semenik R.J., 2002, *Promotion and integrated marketing communication*, Canada: Thomson Learning.
- Schultz D., Barnes B., 1995, *Strategic Advertising Campaigns*, Lincolnwood, Illinois USA: NTC Business Books.
- Schultz D.E., Kitchen P.J., 1997, *Integrated marketing communications in us advertising agencies: An exploratory study*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 37(5).
- Schultz D.E., 2003, *The next generation of integrated marketing communication*, "Interactive Marketing", 4(4).
- Schultz D.E., Schultz H.F., 2004, *IMC-The Next Generation*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schultz D.E., 2010, *New, newer, newest: Evolving stages of IMC*, "Journal of Integrated Marketing Communications", 2010 edition.

Sheehan K., Doherty C., 2001, *Re-weaving the web: Integrating print and online communications*, "Journal of Interactive Marketing", 15(2).

Swain W.J., 2004, *Perceptions of IMC after a decade of development: Who's at the wheel and how can we measure success?*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 44(1).

ZINTEGROWANE KOMUNIKACJE MARKETINGOWE (IMC) W SZKOLNICTWIE WYŻSZYM W INDONEZJI

Streszczenie: Zintegrowana komunikacja marketingowa została przyjęta na całym świecie, również w Indonezji, jest ona przedmiotem nauczaniem w programie studiów w Indonezji, nie tylko ze względu na jej aspekty praktycznej. Aby uzyskać szeroki pogląd, wyniki te powinny być porównane i związane ze spostrzeżeniami nauczycieli akademickich, którzy prowadzą zajęcia z IMC lub innych pokrewnych przedmiotów. Dlatego też, niniejsze badanie ma na celu określenie, jak postrzegana jest koncepcja IMC przez dydaktyków. W badaniu wykorzystano metodę mieszaną, gdzie percepcję dydaktyków zmierzono ilościowo prowadząc badanie 51 respondentów. Tymczasem program nauczania poddany został analizie jakościowej. Oba wyniki są następnie porównywane i powiązane w celu udzielenia odpowiedzi na pytania badawcze.

Słowa kluczowe: IMC, sylabus, program studencki, dydaktyk

印度尼西亞高等教育中的集成營銷通信 (IMC)

摘要：IMC已被全球接受以及印度尼西亞。不僅在實踐方面，而且在學術領域，因為廣泛教授作為本科課程在印度尼西亞的主題。雖然文獻綜述表明，來自各種國際出版物的IMC的概念化仍然具有顯著的利弊，但較少量的出版物涉及教育者作為利益相關者之一。實際上，教育者是前衛的IMC部署到下一代和他們在教室裡定義IMC的權威。為了認識到IMC思想，接受和意義的變化的發展，重要的是分析IMC教學大綱作為教育者思想的表現。為了獲得廣泛的觀點，這些結果應該與教授IMC或其他相關科目的教育者的看法進行比較和聯繫。因此，本研究旨在確定教育家對IMC概念的看法是如何在各種國際出版物中建立的，以及IMC如何在大綱中定義為教育者理解的表現形式。本研究採用混合法，通過調查51名受訪者對教育工作者的感知進行定量測量。同時，大綱分析定性。然後將兩個結果進行比較並鏈接到回答研究問題。

關鍵詞：IMC，教學大綱，本科課程和教育家