

ENGLISH CURRICULUM IN INDONESIA: HIGHLIGHT

Misdi, S.Pd., M.Pd.

Department of English Education University of Swadaya Gunung Djati

misdirina@gmail.com

<https://misdi.weebly.com>

2. 1. National Educational Curriculum (Experienced) in Indonesia

This section of this part provides evidences that Indonesia was hardly reached its own educational curriculum. This history of Indonesian national curriculum implies that the concept of student-centred learning as the characteristics of teaching for empowerment is hardly heard.

Indonesia had already changed its national curriculum several times. These changes were made in response to the needs and challenges in each period. It was in 1537 that education activity in Indonesia formally began as Portugal occupied the country. Under Portugal's colonials, education policy had already began even though it was implemented locally, i.e. the school was only built the centre of the colony such as in Ambon, eastern part of Indonesia (Aziz, 2008). Later on, education activity that was run throughout the country began in 1900. In this era of education, the schooling operation was connected to ethical policy when the Dutch occupied Indonesia. But the goal of education policy under the Dutch's occupation was not different from that before. It was just to secure economic interest of the colonial-no educational at all.

After the independence of the country, the government especially Indonesian Ministry of Education concerned with curriculum. During the early birth of the national curriculum, there were some reforms. Curriculum reform began soon after Indonesia gained independence. The first was the 1947 curriculum which was implemented in 1950s. The curriculum was still continued by the Dutch and the five principles of national ideology (Pancasila) was introduced to the students as the main basis of national education. The curriculum 1947 emphasized on personality, national character building and course content which related to everyday life. Students in this curriculum era were treated as objects where teachers were centrally source of learning. Later on, the government revised curriculum in 1952 and was recognized as the 1952 curriculum since it was implemented in that year.

In the beginning era of President Soeharto, the government set up the 1968 curriculum. This 1968 curriculum concentrated on the promotion of cognitive aspect and thinking skill among the students. Here, the foreign language was introduced. The government revised the curriculum again in 1975 and called it as the 1975 curriculum. This curriculum was designed based on the strategy called management by objective. Here, the learning objective was defined as the central of the curriculum development for the students to achieve. It covered detail points of learning activity like general and specific instructional

objectives, learning material, teaching media, and learning evaluation. Teachers-centred learning was mostly employed in its implementation shown from how the teachers constructed their general and specific instructional objectives. Mostly ten years later, the government introduced new curriculum in 1984 and it was therefore, recognized as the 1984 curriculum. Different from the previous curriculum, this curriculum emphasized on the process skill approach; meaning that teaching is to teach the students how to learn. The interesting point of this curriculum was by introducing credit system for high school students to finish the study (Aziz, 2008).

Due to the enactment of the Law No. 22, 1999 and its replacement (The Law No. 32 2004) about autonomy, education is decentralized to the local, provincial and district government. In this era, new national curriculum was released. It was the 2004 curriculum. The 2004 curriculum or competence based curriculum (Hamida, 2008) was operated nationally based on the government regulation no. 25/2002. The government delegated the authority in education activity to the local boards of education, even to the schools or teachers. Not only student-centered learning was shouted but the learning environment was also appreciated. Since there were some constraints in the implementation among the school teachers, the revision was made. The government then revised the curriculum. The coming revised curriculum was the 2006 curriculum which was popularly called school based curriculum-Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan -KTSP (Satriani, Intan, Emilia & Gunawan, 2012). In this new revised curriculum, the 2004 curriculum was still flavored; but the school or teacher is open to modify and improve the national curriculum due to the school characteristics, students' background, and the interest of stakeholder. The 2006 curriculum was the student-centered approach (Dharma, 2008). Both students' needs and environmental awareness were easily seen in learning. This curriculum, in short, was acknowledged as the empowering curriculum, especially the teachers.

In advanced, the implementation of the 2006 curriculum or school based curriculum is not yet satisfactory in Indonesia. But in general, this curriculum was claimed as the best curriculum whom Indonesia ever had (Wachidah, 2013). This curriculum was developed to create better atmosphere of learning activities for the learners (Satriani, Intan, Emilia & Gunawan, 2012). Through this curriculum, the school teachers felt flexible to create, modify, and develop instructional design based on the need of the school stakeholders (Dharma, 2008). Decentralized curriculum was desired and clearly adopted in this era. Recently, this curriculum was again modified to make it matched toward the international trends of the education, e.g. facing the standard of PISA and TIMMS. This was made in a response to the global demand-critical learning approach toward the 21st century learning paradigm (Kemendikbud_RI, 2013).

The development of the student-centeredness-based curriculum as discussed earlier is clearly presented in the following table 1.1.

Table 1.1. Curriculum and issues experienced in Indonesian education

Periods	Curriculum	Approach	Issues
1537	Portugal colonial curriculum	None	Colonial perspective
1900	Dutch colonial curriculum	None	Colonial perspective, education for feudalism
1947-1952	1947	The five principle-based curriculum	The first national curriculum, citizenship
1968-1975	1975	Management-objective	Instructional objective firstly used
1984-1994	1994	process approach/ meaningful approach	Credit points, Meaningful teaching-CBSA
1999-2004	2004	Competency-based curriculum	Decentralized based curriculum
2006	2006	School-based curriculum	Student-centered ; local awareness, students' needs; potential; learner empowerment
2013	2013	Scientific approach	Influenced by TIMSS & PISA, 21 st challenges, critical thinking/reasoning, independent learning, learner empowerment

2.2. English Teaching across Curriculum in Indonesia: An Empowerment Issue

English curriculum often ran for students' English mastery. The English curriculum ran in Indonesia moved from the teacher-centered to student-centered approach. English language teaching and learning has been implemented in schools since 1954 with its old curriculum. In the first period of its implementation, however, it was locally implemented. Grammar Translation Method (GTM) was mainly the teaching approach (Lie, 2007).

In the periods of 1968-1975, English was taught through the Audio Lingual Method (ALM) (Lie, 2007). The English was then well recognized as a foreign language which was considered as important in Indonesia. Thus, trainings were run to introduce Oral Approach (OA) in English learning. To this case, OA was regarded as the natural way to master English. Students by using this approach were invited to practice as much as possible; meanwhile the English teachers were forced to use Silent Way (SW) to facilitate students learning. Since problems arose during the implementation, teachers were then as central figures. Still in this period, as its growth of English, English became a compulsory subject to be taught for three years at Junior High Schools and for three years in Senior High Schools (Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011). Four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) were targeted (Lie, 2007).

Some critics were addressed as it was much influenced by the English-use rather than English-usage (see: Widdowson, 1978). In the advancement of the English curriculum development, a communicative English curriculum was introduced in 1984 in a response to the vast developing world which calling more English for business and correspondence. Students were invited to practice as much as they drilled in the Communicative Approach in English learning (Lie, 2007). However, as she explained further in her review, there was a poor implementation as the teachers failed in addressing “communicative” as the results of the lacks of English mastery itself and of understanding the method (Hamied, 1997 as cited in Lie, 2007). Consequently, communicative competence was barely pursued.

Meaning-based English curriculum was then released in 1994. It was hoped that students successfully learned in a **meaningful learning impact** (Lie, 2007). Friendly student-environmental topics were discussed in learning. Even the target was the same as the previous one – using communicative approach, the learning was not only about about the language itself but it was also intended to make it in context. However, due to the similar condition-lack of teachers’ knowledge competence, the textbook-teaching oriented made it hard for students to use English communicatively.

Toward millennium English learning, the government again lunched 2004 English curriculum namely Competency-based Curriculum (KBK) (Lie, 2007). In this English curriculum, students’ English competence was echoing. Students learned how to use English contextually. In this way, it was aimed the students acquired English skills better than in the previous curriculum. The students were also required to incorporate cultural understanding in their English learning. But, mostly, were the learning outcome still far from being fascinating (Lie, 2007; Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011; J. Nurkamto, n.d.). Students, for example, felts shy to speak (Mappiasse & Sihes, 2014) and was afraid of making mistakes (Tutyandari, 2005).

Just two years later, the curriculum was revised to the 2006 English curriculum (Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011). The general standard objectives of English language teaching at secondary schools in Indonesia are determined. The standard objectives of the English curriculum are as follows: (1) Developing communicative competence both in oral and in written in order to reach the level of informational literacy; (2) Raising awareness of the nature of English as a foreign language in order to compete with other countries in global community; and (3) Developing comprehension of the students about the relation between language and culture (Depdiknas RI, 2006 as cited in Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011).

The overall concepts of the English language curriculum in Indonesia emphasize on communicative competence. In this paradigm, the communicative competence refers to the ability to make effective communication-that is the ability to use language appropriately in social interaction (Shumin, 2002) which consists of grammatical, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and language components (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006). For the first time, the 2004 competency-based curriculum was implemented in language teaching. It is an approach to teaching which focuses on mastery of the skills or competencies needed in different domains (J. Richards, 2006). This 2004 curriculum was aimed to prepare and provide students readiness in competing with students from other countries (Lengkanawati, 2005). For the overall characteristics of the curriculum, Genre-based Approach (GBA) was adopted as the

main approach to reach the learning competences. There were three competences which were addressed to pursue: discourse competence, understanding various short functional texts, and the linguistic competence.

The first is discourse ability. This is students' competence to understand and produce oral and written texts in relation to four language competences (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The second is students' competence to comprehend and produce various short functional and monolog texts, and essay texts such as procedure, descriptive, recount, narrative, report, news item, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, spoof, explanation, discussion, review, and public speaking. The third is linguistic competence. This other competences are relating to mastering the grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and written rules, social cultural competence (language expression based on the community context), strategic competence (problem solving in communication occurred), and discourse maker competence (Depdiknas RI, 2006 in Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011).

The competency-based curriculum has received a more special place in the current Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) or School-Based Curriculum (Emilia, 2011). Regarding English language teaching, the Government Regulation No. 19 Year 2005 stipulates that language education should develop language competence with special emphasis on reading and writing according to the literacy level set for every level of education (Yulia, 2013). The new paradigm of the KTSP was aimed to achieving education objectives based on local characteristics and school circumstance. The 2006 curriculum 2006, it popularly called (Satriani, Intan, Emilia & Gunawan, 2012) was developed to create better atmosphere of learning activities for the learners.

Learning should be interactive, interesting, challenging. Learning should raise high motivation, give enough opportunity to the learner to participate in the learning activity, and encourage the learner to be creative, independent and initiative. In KTSP, the teacher does not have to describe objectives and materials in detail for a teaching learning process in the classroom. Hence, the teacher is given freedom to use an approach that is relevant to the KTSP, for example the Contextual Teaching Language (Satriani, Intan, Emilia & Gunawan, 2012). At the same time, the 2006 curriculum suggests that a learner must be active to analyze and make inquiry on what he learns and create a new product from what he learned.

Due to some critics, in 2013 the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture introduced a new curriculum for public schools from elementary through high school. Having less thoroughly evaluation of the curriculum, e.g. the strengths and weaknesses for certain stages and components (Sundayana, 2015), this new curriculum is attempted to the response of the TIMSS and PISA about the learning evaluation. Under the new curriculum, English is a mandatory subject in both junior and senior high school (Larson, 2014) to provide and build the critical learning among the students through the scientific approach. Even this current EFL teaching curriculum adopts the scientific approach, English is widely taught through GBA. Whatever, the teachers in their key roles must be able to motivate students to learn English in an interesting ways (Yulia, 2013:14).

2.3. Teaching and Learning in the Classroom Context

Teaching is guiding and facilitating students to learn (Brown, 1994). Two consequences appear: (1) guiding and facilitating, and (2) to learn. In this context, one who is responsible to guide and to facilitate is the teacher; one who has another liability is the student. Thus, learning is on when the two sides go long together. Moreover, as learning is as something that happens to an individual-an internal and subjective action, it primarily deals with the process of inquiry and discovery.

Therefore, classroom interaction within classroom members, e.g. of students to students, students to teachers are the central (Barbara & Hunter, 2004; Mikaela, 2008; Tarnopolsky & Goodman, 2013). For some particular context, for example, the teachers and students are important factors. The teachers are demanded to create and provide learning opportunities which are empowering, e.g. stimulating (Stone, 1995a; Lemieux, 2001), challenging (Littlewood, 2008; Razmjoo & Ardekani, 2011). When the learning atmosphere are open for learning opportunities than students are engaging (Masouleh & Jooneghani, 2012).

Empowering instructional practices provides students enjoyable learning. Enjoyable learning is the most wanted by all language learners and teachers. Learning and teaching process are determined by three elements: (1) the level of learning participation and the kind of tasks involved by the learners, (2) the role of the teachers in learning process, and (3) the learning atmosphere. The more intensive participation of the students, the higher quality of learning it is (Joko Nurkamto, 2009).

Active participation in learning is successfully established when some requirements are available: (1) students has direct opportunities in learning, (2) multitasks exercise cognitively, personal-socially, psychomotorically, and (3) actively and critically involve in observing and studying multisources of learning (Joni, 1993 as cited in Nurkamto, 2009) in term of classroom interactive exchange.

There are two reasons for creating and performing interactive exchange in the classroom: (1) by the assumption that the teachers are professional to make such judgment and decision under the complexities of situation of the classroom and school, and (2) under the assumption that teacher thought, judgment, and decision guides classroom behaviours (Stern & Shavilson, 1981; Clark & Perterson, 1986).

2.4. Language Teaching Development toward the Global Competitiveness

In Indonesia, the shortage of professional teachers is crucial to conduct the effective learning activity (Aziz, 2008). In general, language teachers are trained to construct and set their pedagogical competences in terms of language proficiency and pedagogical knowledge (J. C. Richards, 2014). Language teachers are possibly seen from their pedagogical and knowledge competence. These two main domains are as the representation of their personal/group shared values.

The main teaching principles include teaching strategies (Richards & Rodgers, 1999; Richards, 2014). The language teaching competence and performance cover the domains of:

language proficiency, content language, content knowledge, teaching skills, contextual knowledge, language teacher identity, and learner-focused teaching.

In instructional environment, it is important shape language learning environment which dropping teaching and learning in to the area of learning to speak. Ironically, students are rarely given space to practice their English listening in the classroom (Musthafa, 2001), take for example, in term of teaching Speaking in Indonesia, it is still challenged in terms of learning tasks, activities, materials, and practices (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006). Arkin (2010) conducted his research on the area of teaching speaking, and the findings show that the skill-based language teaching is effective improving EFL lecturers in the university and thus, creativity, speaking competence, and confidence are the keys to success in English environment.

In the global context of competition of pedagogy, e.g. in England and Turkey had compared the novice teachers in the two countries. The results suggest that the two countries served their novice teachers as professional teachers in order to compete in an increasingly dynamic globalized economy (Busher, Lawson, Wilkins, & Acun, 2011). The study also revealed the reform of teaching from transferring knowledge, where the students are receptive, to the process of empowerment, that is the process of learning among the individuals in the classroom (Busher et al., 2011: 390). The significant finding related to empowerment was the difference of ways in expressing ideas among the students. Turkish students tend to be shy and doubtful in giving ideas or argument whereas the English students tend to be spontaneous despite of being true or false their ideas (p. 395).

The fast competition in the global world demands a high quality education. Thus the improving teachers' quality is a must (Sanaky, 2005). Teacher empowerment is a part of the education reform. It is impossible to make a change in our education without involving teachers as the implementators (Sarason, 1992 as cited in (Klecker & Loadman, 1998). School reform asked the teachers to be actively active decision-makers to (1) improve their quality, and hence student learning, (2) implement the new practices, (3) provide motivation and recognition, (4) create more democratic school environment, and (5) increase the sense of professionalism, indeed (Baecher, 2012:317).

Thus, the new learning of the 21st century seeks to engage learners in more powerful conceptualizing and meta-cognizing processes, engaging the learners as co-constructor of concepts-as the definer, theory maker, critic and analyst, an autonomous and able to make independent decisions (Cope & Kalantzis, 2007; Oder, 2014). In engaging students to learn in the classroom, Cremin, Thomas, & Vincett (2005) often evaluated and suggested three model of classroom management: room management, zoning, and reflective team-works (Cremin, Thomas, & Vincett, 2005). Being highly motivated and critical thinkers, independent learners, self-directed learners, and autonomous learners are the main learning objectives that is going to reach in the framework of the 2013 curriculum (Kemendikbud_RI, 2013).

References

- Aziz, A. (2008). Curriculum Development in Indonesian Education.
- Baecher, L. (2012). Pathways to teacher leadership among English-as-a-second-language teachers: professional development by and for emerging teacher leaders. *Professional Development in Education*, 38(2), 317–330. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2012.657877>
- Busher, H., Lawson, T., Wilkins, C., & Acun, I. (2011). Pedagogy, empowerment and discipline: comparative perspectives of novice teachers in England and Turkey reflecting on “the other.” *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(3), 387–400. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2011.552905>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2007). New Media, New Learning. *The International Journal of Learning*, 14(1).
- Cremin, H., Thomas, G., & Vincett, K. (2005). Working with teaching assistants: three models evaluated. *Research Papers in Education*, 20(4), 413–432. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02671520500335881>
- Dharma, A. (2008). Indonesian Basic Education Curriculum Current Content and Reforms. In *Roundtable Discussion in Retrac Governing Board Meeting at Institut Aminuddin Baki, Genting Highland, Malaysia, 27 August 2008* (pp. 1–8). Genting Highland, Malaysia: Institute Aminudin Baki.
- Hamida, L. (2008). Penerapan Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris di SLTP di Surabaya (Implementasi dan Kendala yang Dihadapi). *J. Penelit. Din. Sos.*, 7(3), 146–153.
- Kemendikbud_RI. Permendikbud RI Nomor 81A tahun 2013 tentang Implementasi Kurikulum (2013). Jakarta.
- Klecker, B. J., & Loadman, W. E. (1998). Defining and measuring the dimensions of teacher empowerment in restructuring public schools. *Education*. 118.3 (Spring 1998): p358. *From Gale Light Arts, Economy, Education, Humanities & Social Science.*, 118(3), 358.
- Larson, K. R. (2014). Critical Pedagogy(ies) for ELT in Indonesia. *Teaching Education*, 25(1), 122–138.
- Lemieux, C. (2001). Learning contract in the classroom: tools for empowerment and accountability. *Social Work Education*, 20(2), 263–276. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02615470120044347>
- Lengkanawati, N. S. (2005). EFL Teachers’ Competence in the Context of English Curriculum 2004 : Implications for EFL Teacher Education. *TEFLIN Journal*, XVI(1), 79–92.
- Lie, A. (2007). Education Policy and EFL Curriculum in Indonesia: between the Commitment to Competence and the Quest for Higher Test Scores. *TEFLIN*, 18(1), 1–14.
- Littlewood, W. (2008). Process-oriented pedagogy: facilitation, empowerment, or control? *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 246–254. <http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn054>
- Mappiasse, S. S., & Sihes, J. A. (2014). Evaluation of English as a Foreign Language and Its Curriculum in Indonesia : A Review. *English Language Teaching*, 7(10), 113–122.

- <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n10p113>
- Masouleh, N. S., & Jooneghani, R. B. (2012). Autonomous learning: A teacher-less learning! *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 835–842. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.570>
- Mattarima, K., & Hamdan, A. R. (2011). The Teaching Constraints of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia : The Context of School Based Curriculum. *Sosiomunika*, 4(2), 287–300. Retrieved from http://www.sosiohumanika-jpssk.com/sh_files/File/Karim.pdf
- Musthafa, B. (2001). Communicative Language Teaching in Indonesia: Issues of Theoretical Assumptions and Challenges in Classroom Practice. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 2(2), 296–308.
- Nurkamto, J. (n.d.). Problem Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris di Indonesia. Surakarta.
- Nurkamto, J. (2009). Peningkatan Profesionalisme Guru melalui “Reflective Teaching.” In *Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar UNS* (pp. 1–10). Surakarta: Universitas Negeri Surakarta.
- Oder, T. (2014). English language teachers’ perceptions of professional teaching. *Teacher Development*, 18(4), 482–494. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2014.953253>
- Razmjoo, S. A., & Ardekani, S. G. (2011). A Model of Speaking Strategies for EFL Learners. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 3(3), 116–142.
- Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today* (1st editio). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2014). Teaching Speaking Theories and Methodologies.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1999). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and analysis* (Fifteenth). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanaky, H. A. (2005). Sertifikasi dan Profesionalisme Guru di Era Reformasi Pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 2 Mei.
- Satriani, Intan, Emilia, E., & Gunawan, M. H. (2012). Contextual Teaching and Learning Approach to Teaching Writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 10–22.
- Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to Consider : Developing Adult EFL Students ’ Speaking Abilities. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 204–211). Cambridge: CUP. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190.028>
- Stone, S. J. (1995). Empowering teachers, empowering children. *Childhood Education*, 71(5), 294.
- Sundayana, W. (2015). Readiness and Competence of Senior High School English Teachers to Implement Curriculum 2013. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 29–36. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17509%2Fijal.v5i1.828>
- Tutyandari, C. (2005). Breaking the Silence of the Students in an English Language Class. In *The 53rd TEFLIN International Conference* (pp. 1–2). Yogyakarta.
- Wachidah, S. (2013). Bringing the 2013 Curriculum to Light. In *The First Educational Linguistics Conference* (Vol. 1, p. 524). Yogyakarta: UNY Press.
- Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2006). The Teaching of EFL Speaking in the Indonesian Context: the State of teh Art. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, 34(2), 269–292.

Yulia, Y. (2013). Teaching Challenges in Indonesia: Motivating Students and Teachers' Classroom Language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1).