Language Policy in Practice: Reframing the English Language Curriculum in the Indonesian Secondary Education Sector

Handoyo Puji Widodo

Abstract English language curriculum development in a culturally and linguistically diverse setting is always a site of struggle. Particularly in Indonesia, there has been a dramatic change in English language curricula in the secondary education sector during the past decade. This change has much been driven by the ideological and political agenda instead of pedagogical benefits of interested stakeholders (e.g., students, teachers, and parents). This is evidenced by the fact that the current curriculum, The 2013 ELT Curriculum, does not detail key elements, such as curriculum materials, pedagogy, and assessment from relevant theories of language, language learning, and language teaching. Though there is much literature on English language curricula in Indonesia, it does not specifically highlight key principles of reframing English language curricula in the Indonesian secondary education sector from a critical situated perspective (Tollefson, Language Policy, *14*, 183–189, 2015). To fill this gap, the present chapter attempts to provide directions for reframing the current curriculum and to give fresh insight into the design of English language curricula, which takes into account agencies of teachers and students as well as socio-cultural environments. These directions are also applicable to other ELT contexts in Asia or the context where the status of English is a foreign language or an additional language.

Keywords Critical situated perspective • English language curricula • Indonesian secondary education • Language policy in practice

1 Introduction

Ideologically and politically speaking, language policies leave an imprint on the design and implementation of language curricula at classroom and school levels. In many cases, these policies dictate what, why, and how teachers teach and students learn language. The status of whether this language is considered as either a foreign language (language as a school subject) or an additional language (language as a

H.P. Widodo (✉)
Politeknik Negeri Jember, Jember, Indonesia
e-mail: handoyopw@yahoo.com

R. Kirkpatrick (ed.), *English Language Education Policy in Asia*,
Language Policy 11, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_6

means of communication) is strongly determined by the socio-political agenda. Through policy and curriculum documents, educational standards and competencies are always determined without comprehensive knowledge on language and language pedagogy, better understanding of planning goals, collaboration between policy makers and curriculum makers, and rigorous negotiation between local needs and globalization demands (Widodo, 2015). These factors will result in ideologically and politically imposed language policies. These policies are hardly to be enacted on classroom and school levels. Very often, there is a hot debate over the enactment of the policies among school administrators and teachers who are always seen as implementers of policy and curriculum materials. This debate occurs due to conflicting needs and interests between policy makers, school administrators, teachers, students, and interested stakeholders.

With this in mind, language curriculum design is never apolitical but ideologically laden in which there are conflicting needs and interests that underlie language curriculum design. In this chapter, language curriculum design refers to change, reform, development, or innovation depending on how the design is contextually perceived. For us as teachers, teacher trainers, and teacher educators, language curriculum design is a starting point for sound and well-crafted language policy and curriculum materials, pedagogy, and assessment. A language curriculum can be defined as a plan (perceived curriculum), a process (enacted or experienced curriculum), and a product (valued or validated curriculum). These different orientations of language curricula show the multidimensionality of a language curriculum at the levels of planning, implementation, and evaluation.

The issue of language curriculum design is always debatable, and English language curriculum design in Indonesia is no exception. Since the Independence of Indonesia in 1945, Indonesia's ELT curricula particularly in the secondary education sector (junior and senior high schools) have undergone substantial changes. Particularly during the past 11 years, there have been three periods of curriculum change: 2004 Curriculum (competency-based curriculum), 2006 Curriculum (school-based curriculum), and 2013 Curriculum (scientific inquiry) respectively. These changes have exerted influence on how pedagogical practice and assessment in Indonesia's English language pedagogy are shaped. For this reason, the present chapter addresses key principles of reframing the current curriculum, the 2013 ELT Curriculum. Before discussing these principles, it begins by reviewing the linguistic landscape in Indonesia to depict a social environment where the English language curriculum is positioned and enacted. The chapter also provides an overview of English language curricula during the past 11 years. The contributions of the chapter are providing directions for reframing the current curriculum and giving fresh insight into English language curriculum development, which takes into account agencies of teachers and students as well as socio-cultural environments.

2 Contemporary Theory on Language Policy: Critical Situated Approaches

Language policies shape how language curricula are designed. They embrace "the explicit, written, overt, de jure, official and 'top-down' decision-making about language, but also the implicit, unwritten, covert, de facto, grass-roots and unofficial ideas and assumptions" about language in a particular context of situation and culture (Schiffman, 2006, p. 11). In the context of language curriculum making or development, language policy determines "what language is to be used and learned in school" and "what choices in grammar, vocabulary, genre, and style are appropriate in particular contexts [of situation and culture]" (Farr & Song, 2011, p. 654) This language policy certainly varies in terms of formality and orientation. At a grassroots level, language teachers are responsible for interpreting and enacting language policies, which affect their teaching practices. They also have responsibility for remaking this national language policy into school or classroom policy, which fits well with a local context of teaching practice. This language policy remaking plays an important role in appropriating language policies in the form of national curriculum guidelines (Pease-Alvarez & Alisun Thompson, 2014). Particularly in the context of enforced standardization and standardized testing reflected in rigid one-size fits all curricular mandates, the deployment of critical situated approaches to language policy remaking (Tollefson, 2015) helps language teachers question what works best for themselves and for their students. In this respect, teachers play a role as engaged policy makers "who are directly involved in the enactment of educational policy at the local level, which, in the case of teachers, encompasses the classroom experiences of their students" (Pease-Alvarez & Alisun Thompson, 2014, p. 168). Thus, by looking at English language curricula through the lenses of criticality and situatedness, language teachers are fully aware that such documents are the realities of language policy in practice, and they do not take the documents for granted, but they remake those curricula, which are relevant to their educational practices situated within local and global social, political, and economic conditions.

3 The Linguistic Landscape in Indonesia

Indonesia, an archipelagic country with over 17,000 islands stretching along the equator between Southeast Asia and Australia, is known as a multilingual and multicultural country (Paauw, 2009; Widodo & Fardhani, 2011). Geographically located between two main oceans and two continents, Indonesia is famous for a home to more than 300 ethnic groups who inhabit only 6,000 of 17,000 islands and have their own unique cultures and customs. "The estimated 103.5 million Javanese are the largest ethnic group in Indonesia," inhabiting the eastern and central parts of Java (Minahan, 2012, p. 109). Partly because of government-initiated transmigration

programs, there are also sizable Javanese populations throughout the archipelago. Javanese people speak Javanese, an Austronesian language, the language of daily life. Indonesian or Bahasa Indonesia, the official language of Indonesia, is spoken as a second language by the Javanese. The majority of the Javanese are Muslims, and a small number of the Javanese follow Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, and "*Kejawen*, a traditional animistic religion mixed with Muslim practices and strong Hindu and Buddhist influences" (Minahan, p. 109, italics, my emphasis). Other ethnic majorities in Indonesia include the Acehnese, the Ambonese, the Balinese, the Banjars, the Bataks, the Buginese, the Dayaks, the Madurese, the Minahasas, the Minangkabaus, the Papuans, the Sasaks, the Sumbanese, the Sundanese, the Tenggerese, and the Torajas. These groups have different ways of life. The Chinese also become a growing ethnic group that extends the richness of the Indonesian culture.

Although one ethnic group may be dominant in one area, we can practically find people with diverse cultural backgrounds in most areas of Indonesia. It is evident that Indonesia is a home to hundreds of languages and cultures (Widodo & Fardhani, 2011). Many of ethnic groups have their own languages or dialects. It has been reported that Indonesia has more than 700 local languages with different dialects at distinct linguistic levels: phonetic, phonological, lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic and cultural (Ethnologue, http://www.ethnologue.com/statistics/country; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). For instance, in East Java, people speak local languages such as Javanese and Madurese with different dialects. Most of the Indonesians are bilingual or multilingual in daily social encounters. They code switch from one local language to another or from Bahasa Indonesia to a local language. Widodo and Fardhani (2011) point out that languages used in Indonesia can be classified based on (a) number of speakers, (b) socio-economic and institutional status and prestige, and (c) socio-institutional and political power as well as privilege. These categories include (1) a national lingua franca (NLF), *Bahasa Indonesia*; (2) majority indigenous languages, such as Javanese, Madurese, Sundanese, Batak, *Bahasa Melayu*, Banjarese, Buginese, and Papuan; and (3) minority indigenous languages like Lamandau, Iban, Alor, Alas, and Mapia. It is important to note that a national lingua franca is defined as "a 'contact language' between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture …" (Firth, 1996, p. 240). Majority indigenous languages are seen as the languages of which the number of speakers exceeds 1 million, and minority indigenous languages are viewed as those spoken by less than 200,000 people.

Although the Dutch ruled Indonesia for more than 350 years, Bahasa Indonesia, originally from Malay, was successfully institutionalized as a national lingua franca when the *Sumpah Pemuda* (the Oath of Youth) was declared on 28 October 1928 (Errington, 1986). The *Sumpah Pemuda*, 'unity in diversity,' has become a driver of strengthening patriotism, nationalism, and interethnic solidarity; shaping a unified national identity; and legitimatizing Bahasa Indonesia as a national language or a language of wider communication between Indonesians who ethno-linguistically differ (Goebel, 2010). These ideological motives attempt to maintain Indonesia's cultural and ethnic diversity. This ideology is also formally spelled out in the

Chapter 36 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (Alwi, 2000; Drakeley, 2005; Nababan, 1991; Widodo & Fardhani, 2011). In other words, the choice of Bahasa Indonesia as a national lingua franca among culturally and linguistically diverse groups has been made on a supra-ethnic basis where all ethnic groups accepted the decision to build a new national identity (Kridalaksana, Verhaar, & Moeliono, 1982). It is no wonder that "Bahasa Indonesia has peacefully been implemented and accepted as the official language of administration, business, education, employment, mass media, and other social services" (Goebel, as cited in Widodo & Fardhani, 2011, p. 132) because the language does not belong to any of Indonesia's diverse ethnic groups (Paulston, 2003).

The fact that Indonesia is multicultural and multilingual affords numerous opportunities and poses challenges for Indonesians. This context opens up doors for them to learn different languages and cultures, and pose them a challenge to maintain their linguistic and cultural identity while learning another language, including other local languages and foreign languages. Although a specific culture may represent a specific area in Indonesia (Hamied, 2012), there are always possibilities for everyone to live with people from different cultural backgrounds.

4 Language Policy in Practice: English Language Curricula Enacted in the Secondary Education Sector in Indonesia

The Independence of Indonesia was proclaimed on 17 August 1945 after the surrender of the Japanese at the end of World War II. It is worth noting that the Japanese occupation of Indonesia took place between 1942 and 1945 (Lamb & Coleman, 2008). Soon after this, English was chosen as a compulsory foreign language or a school subject to learn and was widely taught in secondary schools and universities. At that time, a newly-established government led by the First President and the Vice President, Soekarno and Mohammad Hatta, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia (RI) also called 'the Indonesia's Old Order,' made a politically and ideologically laden decision that Dutch nor Japanese was not chosen as a school subject since both were the languages of colonists. The decision was also based on the fact that English was more widely acceptable as a tool for international communication (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Mistar, 2005), so English was seen as an instrumental language.

English has become a language for international communication that Indonesian people need to learn and acquire as stipulated in the Act of the 2003 National Education System. The status of English as a school subject has been well established, and "English has gained its present authority and prestige in Indonesian society; it has become essential 'cultural capital for an information-driven global world" (Gee et al., as cited in Lamb & Coleman, 2008, p. 192). English has been part of the curriculum and is formally taught in secondary schools up to university though English was institutionalized as an optional school subject in primary

schools from 1994 to 2012. Among other school subjects, English is included in the high-stakes or national examination called *Ujian Nasional* in the secondary education sector as well as in a university/college entrance examination. This indicates that English is a required language that Indonesians need to learn to pass these high-stakes examinations. Therefore, there have been many attempts to assist Indonesian students to become competent in English. To this end, there have been changes in language policies and curricula since 2004. At the national level, the Government of RI plays a pivotal role in these changes. To understand these changes, it is important to briefly review them.

4.1 The 2004 ELT Curriculum

In 2004, Indonesia underwent decentralization in education. Along with this new policy, the 2004 ELT Curriculum called Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi (KBK) in Bahasa Indonesia or competency-based curriculum (CBC) was implemented nationwide. The legal basis of the new CBC was the 2003 Act of National Education System No. 20. Specifically, the new ELT curriculum adopted Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, and Thurrell's competence model and Halliday's systemic functional grammar (SFG) framework (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2003a, 2003b). As spelled out in the 2004 ELT Curriculum, the goals of English learning were to:

(a) develop communicative competence, which emphasizes macro skills such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing and five competencies, including linguistic, discourse, actional, sociocultural, and strategic;
(b) build and raise self-awareness of acquiring English as a foreign language and a means of learning and communication;
(c) build and develop a solid understanding of a close relationship between language and culture and raise intercultural understanding.

Drawing on these goals, elements of English learning include language skills, communicative competence, the position of English as a foreign language, English as a means for communication, and intercultural awareness. To this end, English textbooks were designed around text types (e.g., recounts, narratives, information reports, exposition, discussions, reviews). The 2004 ELT Curriculum also recognized the application of Halliday's three metafunctions to the teaching of four skills, such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Anchored in this, the goals of the 2004 ELT Curriculum also included as follows:

(a) Listening: understand ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings in different genres and text types;
(b) Speaking: express spoken ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings in different genres and text types;
(c) Reading: grasp ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings in different genres and text types; and
(d) Writing: express written ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings in different genres and text types (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2003a, 2003b).

Activities in English textbooks were organized based on (1) themes and tasks, (2) text types and text forms, and (3) macro language skills. In these textbooks, micro language skills such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation were not explicitly presented, but depended on how teachers presented such micro skills in the classroom. Conceptually, the curriculum emphasized performance-based instruction in which students were expected to perform integrated language skills and competencies in different communicative situations. Practically speaking, most of the English teachers were reluctant to create their own classroom materials and explore the approaches adopted in the curriculum. Teachers relied on commercially-published textbooks, and they seemed to become implementers of the textbooks. This suggests that English teachers juxtaposed the textbooks with the curriculum and thought that the textbooks were a product of the curriculum to which they had to adhere. In addition, activities in English textbooks comprised test items, emphasizing comprehension and memorization. These were typical of most of the English textbooks. This implies that the nature of English language instruction was cognitively demanding.

The successful implementation of the 2004 ELT Curriculum was hampered by an extensive list of factors such as poor classroom management, a lack of pedagogic foundations and contextual knowledge, no extensive engagement in English use, atheoretical classroom materials analysis and use, test-driven language instruction, poor understanding of competency and systematic functional frameworks, rigid pedagogic values and traditions, and government-controlled language assessment. These do not allow for exploratory and innovative language teaching practices and commonly occur in some Asian countries where English is seen as a school subject (Littlewood, 2007; Priyanto, 2009; Richards, 2010). Given these problems, to help students acquire English as a means of communication in an international arena, the Government of RI through the Ministry of National Education (now The Ministry of Education and Culture) incorporated the concept of school-based curriculum (SBC) into the 2006 ELT Curriculum. For this reason, the name of the 2004 ELT curriculum was changed to "*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*" (*KTSP*) in Bahasa Indonesia or SBC.

4.2 The 2006 ELT Curriculum

The 2006 ELT Curriculum or SBC was introduced to meet different socio-institutional, economic, cultural, and educational backgrounds and recognized the fact that each school in a different district needed to cater to its student and institutional needs as well as made use of its local resources. The revised version of the curriculum also aimed to meet globalization challenges that Indonesia has to face as information communication and technology (ICT) advances steadily. Along with this move, the 2006 ELT Curriculum adopted the framework of school-based curriculum (SBC) or *KTSP*. In this curriculum, the Government of RI gave each school freedom to design its curriculum, implement, and evaluate it at the school level

using local resources, broader socio-cultural dimensions, and learners' needs (*Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan*, 2006). This type of curriculum did not prescribe curriculum materials, but set core competency guidelines that English teachers needed to develop. The core of the 2006 ELT Curriculum had been driven by the fact that context, meaning, and communicative competence needed to be integrated since these are inextricably intertwined.

The 2006 ELT Curriculum were designed and developed by English teachers who worked within teams. These teachers could share their curriculum with other teachers from different schools in the same district through an English Teacher Development Group (ETDG) forum (*Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran* or *MGMP* in Bahasa Indonesia). Through this forum, English teachers could provide feedback on each others' curriculum materials such as syllabi, lesson plans, and lesson units. Board of education at the district level facilitated and supervised these forums. The board assigned teacher supervisors, experienced teachers, to provide mentoring and supervision to school teachers.

The 2006 ELT Curriculum was also based on national education standards set out by *Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan* or *BSNP* (Council for National Education Standard or CNES). These standards include content standard, process, competency standards for school leavers, teachers and staff, facilities, management, financing, and evaluation (*Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan*, 2006). The package of the 2006 ELT Curriculum designed by individual schools included the goals of ELT, a yearly school calendar, lesson plans, and syllabi. Fundamentally, teachers designed and developed their own 2006 ELT curriculum based on the following principles:

(a) students' and stakeholders' needs and interests;
(b) integrity;
(c) sensitivity to the development of science, technology, and arts;
(d) relevance to real-life needs;
(e) comprehensiveness and sustainability;
(f) life-long learning;
(g) a balance between national needs and local needs.

Generally speaking, the implementation of the 2006 ELT Curriculum was based on the 2004 ELT Curriculum informed by competency-based, communicative competence, and systemic functional frameworks. The difference between the two curricula is that the Government did not prescribe a detailed nationally-mandated curriculum, so each school was responsible for designing, implementing, and evaluating its own curriculum with the supervision of district board of education. In spite of this, the Ministry of National Education still exerted much control on a national assessment system, which did not reflect the core of the 2006 ELT Curriculum. In most EFL classes, English teachers skewed their English language instruction to the national examination in which competency standards were set up by policy makers.

4.3 Policy on International Standard Schools (ISSs)

In addition to the implementation of *KTSP* or SBC, in mid 2006, the Indonesian Government enacted policy on the international standard schools (ISSs) or English medium instruction (EMI) to improve education quality and cater to students with outstanding academic capabilities. The policy of EMI has recently been pervasive in Asia (see a chapter by Mihyon Jeon in this volume; Hu, Li, & Lei, 2014). This policy has ideologically been driven by the discourses of internationalization, globalization, and modernization. In the context of Indonesia, the implementation of this policy was geared to strengthen the nation's international competitiveness and to produce workforce ready to work for transnational firms. The policy on ISSs attempted to meet international competitiveness and global demands as part of economic globalization. It was geared for primary and secondary education to train and educate globally competitive students (Zacharias, 2013). The enactment of the ISSs was seen as a strategy for gaining wider access to cutting-edge knowledge and strengthening national competitive edge in knowledge and science (Hu, 2007a, 2007b). The internationalization program through both the national and institutional policy documents was also a major driver of planning and enacting the ISSs. This case is similar to that of other Asian countries such as China (Hu et al., 2014).

The definition of the ISSs is the one that meets all the national standards and which takes into account educational standards of one of 34 members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and other world's most developed countries that have much more improved education systems in the international arena. The purpose of the policy was to enable school leavers and university graduates to compete globally with others from other countries. It is important to bear in mind that the ISSs differs from common international schools established in some big Indonesian cities (e.g., Jakarta, Surabaya, Denpasar) to accommodate the needs of expatriates who would like to send their children to schools with international standards (curriculum, teachers, and facilities) and a school environment similar to that of their home countries. The typicality of the ISSs includes EMI, the use of information and communication technology (ICT), and the administration of international testing (e.g., TOEFL and Cambridge's International General Certificate of Secondary Education). On an institutional level, the ISSs adopted standards of accreditation, curriculum (e.g., language policy and planning, pedagogy, and assessment), and school management set up by OECD-affiliated countries. International standard schools (ISSs) were also encouraged to build collaboration with sister schools in one of the OECD member countries.

Five years (2006–2011) have witnessed the fact that the implementation of ISS policy was problematic in some aspects. First, teachers were lack of English abilities, and students were no exception. For this reason, most of the classrooms were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia. Even though teachers claimed that they adopted a bilingual or EMI approach to their instruction, they were not well-equipped with sufficient English language ability. Moreover, although most of the textbooks were written in two languages: Bahasa Indonesia and English, but the students read

Bahasa Indonesia texts. This indicates that the students were not ready for EMI. Teachers received no sound training in EMI. They were also lack of resources written in English, and they translated Bahasa Indonesian written textbooks into English, but the translated versions were poorly written. These demonstrate that both teachers and students were not well-prepared for EMI. Both the teachers and the students preferred using Bahasa Indonesian as a medium of instruction because it was much easier to teach and to understand a lesson. These problems were also reported by Hu, Li, and Lei (2014) in the context of China.

From a critical perspective, anchored in the ISSs, Indonesia is seen as a consumer or importer of international standards set by the OECD member countries (Sakhiyya, 2011). In this respect, it has to enact those standards to national schools without weighing if such standards suit institutional contexts and needs at school and classroom levels. In other words, the ISSs adopted OECD member country-set curriculum, facilities, teachers' quality, management, and accreditation without any adaptation or modification. Through an economic capital lens, international standard schools (ISSs) applied higher school tuition and fees. This was compounded by the fact that they received financial support or grants higher than regular schools. This educational hegemony created injustice between ISSs and regular schools in that the Indonesian Government paid much more attention to the ISSs in terms of financial support and facilities. The ISSs as a product of nationally-initiated policy does not reflect what an EMI framework was supposed to achieve instead of benefiting educational elites such as policy makers, schools, and economically-advantaged students and parents. Students with high socio-economic status got access to the ISSs though the Indonesian Government allocated 20 % of the financial support to students from economically-disadvantaged families. In fact, students with a high socio-economic status got access to better education quality, services, and facilities. In other words, the ISS policy created social, economic, and educational hegemonies or inequalities.

In addition to these problems, based on input from non-government bodies and community leaders, the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia made a judicial review. The outcome of the review was to revoke Chapter 50, Paragraph 3 of the Act of the 2003 National Education System, which legalized the ISSs. In early January 2013, the review attempted to provide all citizens with equal rights to quality education without any socio-economic discrimination or injustice. The final decision was to cease the ISS program. At present, the ISS policy is no longer implemented in the secondary education sector, but EMI flourishes in the higher education sector through world class university (WCU) programs.

4.4 The 2013 ELT Curriculum

In this section, I would like to briefly review the current curriculum, the 2013 ELT Curriculum. To begin with, the current curriculum aims to prepare Indonesians for becoming citizens who are religious, productive, innovative, and passionate as well

as who can contribute to societal, nation's, and world's civilizations. These institutionally envisioned goals of education have much to do with citizenship, nationalism, and national identity. The current curriculum emphasizes learning designed by teachers (the taught curriculum) and learning experience (the experienced curriculum) based on students' sociocultural backgrounds and ability. It also attempts to meet eight national standards, including content, process, competency standards for school leavers, teachers and administrators, facilities, management, financing, and assessment. These standards are geared to improve educational quality and cater to global demands (e.g., human resources with global workplace requirements). Setting these standards pertains to national needs and global demands.

The development of the current curriculum is anchored in the following principles:

1. Student-centered pedagogy is of top priority. Students are afforded an opportunity to choose what to learn to achieve a particular competency.
2. Interactive pedagogy involves interactions between teacher and students, between students and materials, and between students and their social environments.
3. Integrated pedagogy assists students to explore what they need to learn and to see interconnectedness among a variety of materials through direct observations and mediated observations through the Internet, for instance.
4. Exploratory and engaging learning and teaching are framed in scientific inquiry or discovery learning, which follows these steps: Observing, questioning, exploring or experimenting, associating, and communicating.
5. A collaborative principle underpins a learning process.
6. The use of technology enriches learning and teaching process.
7. Students' needs inform pedagogy.
8. Critical and interdisciplinary approaches are adopted to inform the whole pedagogy.

In terms of curriculum materials, these include Indonesian minimum competency standards for school leavers, core competencies, basic competencies, student textbooks and teacher guidebooks, and lesson planning. Firstly, the curriculum puts much more emphasis on national standards, which are translated into minimum competency standards for school leavers. These standards are set based on levels of education such as primary education and secondary education. Like those in the 2004 and 2006 ELT Curricula, there are two competencies in the current curriculum: core competencies and basic competencies as mentioned earlier. Core competencies include four domains: spiritual attitudes, social attitudes, knowledge, and skills. These core competencies are broken down into basic competencies. The following are examples of core and basic competencies in the 2013 ELT Curriculum (Table 1).

These competencies are developed based on disciplinary and content-based approaches. Basic competencies complement each other in each of the lesson units. The former deal with three aspects: affective, cognitive, and psychomotor. These

Table 1 Core and basic competencies

Competencies	Junior high school	Senior high school
Core competencies (Year 1)	Understand knowledge (facts, concepts, and procedures) based on curiosity about science, technology, arts, and culture as well as observed phenomena	Understand knowledge (facts, concepts, and procedures) based on curiosity about science, technology, arts, culture, and humanities; knowledge about humanity, nationalism, citizenship, and civilization; and procedural knowledge about topics of interest to solve problems
Basic competencies	Understand texts about greetings, thanking, and apologies to build a social relationship with others at home and in school	Understand spoken and written texts to respond to questions, compliments, and care
	Understand purposes, rhetorical elements, and linguistic features of simple spoken and written texts about self-introduction	Understand purposes, rhetorical elements, and linguistic features of self-introductory texts
	Understand purposes, rhetorical elements, and linguistic features of simple spoken and written texts to name days, months, years, and time	Understand purposes, rhetorical elements, and linguistic features of greeting texts

competencies should reflect balanced attainments in relation to hard skills and soft skills. The latter are derived from core competencies.

Pedagogical speaking, the current curriculum prescribes a five-stage learning cycle using a scientific approach. The learning cycle includes (1) observing, (2) questioning, (3) exploring/experimenting, (4) associating, and (5) communicating. At the stage of observing, teachers ask students to observe things, places, natural/social phenomena, or social activities/events/realities. Observing can also take the form of field trips, video shows, and other digital presentation of what to be observed. In the phase of questioning, the teachers pose questions to ensure what the students have observed. This questioning can take the form of pair/group discussions. At the exploring stage, the students are asked to notice or create/construct texts that are relevant to what the students observed. Also, they can search for sources of information and linguistic resources to get assigned tasks done. In the phase of associating, the students are told to make a connection between linguistic features, rhetorical resources, different things, phenomena, or social activities/events observed. At the stage of communicating, the students are asked to demonstrate or perform relevant tasks individually or jointly. The students are also encouraged to share or publish what the students have performed or done either individually or jointly.

Through a critical lens, the nature of the current curriculum is highly prescriptive in that it dictates what and how to teach and learn English within the remit of pre-

determined competencies. Both core and basic competencies are set based on the ideological and political agenda. These competencies do not reflect communicative language competence and the totality of competencies that students have to develop to become competent users of English. English teachers have to tailor their pedagogic practice and assessment to these competencies without any adaptation or modification. In addition, the current curriculum is accompanied by prescribed syllabi and textbooks in order to lighten teacher workloads. This effort seems to underestimate teacher capability of designing sound syllabi and textbooks. Pedagogically speaking, the way teachers teach follows a prescribed five-step learning cycle. In relation to assessment, though the current curriculum emphasizes both process- and product-based assessment, it still prioritizes cognitively demanding assessment in which student capability is assessed through formal assessment. What is missing in the current curriculum is that the curriculum puts emphasis on idealized guidelines, which do not recognize crucial elements of what the curriculum means to English teachers, school administrators, teacher educators, and interested stakeholders (e.g., students, parents). More crucially, the current curriculum does not detail curriculum materials, pedagogy, and assessment, informed by relevant theories of language, language learning, and language teaching. Instead, it delineates ideologically and institutionally envisioned goals and competencies as well as rigid and idealized language pedagogy and assessment.

5 Key Principles of Reframing the 2013 ELT Curriculum

This section fleshes out six key principles of reframing the current curriculum in order to serve both inferred and expressed needs of students, teachers, and interested stakeholders. These principles provide directions for adapting the official curriculum to a particular pedagogical context. More crucially, these principles attempt to position teachers as curriculum developers and makers.

5.1 Revisiting Roles of Teachers from a Curriculum Development Perspective

Classroom life is socially complicated in that students learn better in a particular classroom context, but they underachieve in another classroom setting. For this reason, language teachers play different pivotal roles. Practically speaking, though policy makers and officially appointed curriculum developers attempt to standardize a curriculum as a plan or intention, teachers approach the curriculum differently. In the curriculum development literature, there are three approaches to how teachers enact a curriculum at a classroom level. These approaches include fidelity—curriculum transmission, adaptation—curriculum development, and enactment—curriculum

making (Snyder, Bolin, & Zumwalt, 1992). With these approaches in mind, language teachers play different important roles.

In the first curriculum model, a curriculum transmission or top-down framework, teachers are required to follow prescribed curriculum materials, such as syllabi, lesson plans, and textbooks. The curriculum controls what and how to teach and what and how to learn. In this respect, teachers play a role as curriculum transmitters who always implement their pedagogical agenda based on standards of achievements. Learning goals and objectives, outcomes, content, process, and assessment are predetermined by policy makers and officially appointed curriculum developers without assessing students' needs as the actual actors of the curriculum in addition to teachers. Moreover, teachers consider textbooks as a classroom curriculum and follow lessons prescribed in the textbooks. Students work on these textbooks page by page. The official curriculum frames objectives, content, pedagogy, and assessment in which the totality of students' language ability is assessed or judged through a series of tests. In other words, teachers are spoon-fed by the whole package of the curriculum.

In the second curriculum model, curriculum adaptation or development, teachers tailor curriculum materials (e.g., competency standards, syllabi, textbooks) to their local teaching practices. They make significant adjustments so that they can explore what best works and what does not work best. In this sense, the role of teachers is to transform curriculum as-a-plan or product of language policy into the pedagogical enterprise (the experienced or enacted curriculum). In addition, teachers are entrusted to unpack and enact the hidden curriculum, unplanned curriculum materials. In addition, they may include important concepts, principles, skills, values, and knowledge, which are not articulated in the mandated curriculum (the null curriculum). Anchored in the adaptation framework, teachers attempt to connect curriculum materials with what students would like to learn. This process is called the experienced curriculum (Doyle, 1992). Thus, the adaptation approach gives teachers autonomy to frame curriculum materials according to their local contexts.

The third curriculum model, curriculum enactment, sees curriculum as a process "jointly created and jointly and individually experienced by students and teacher" (Snyder et al., 1992, p. 428). In this regard, curriculum is not viewed as a product, but as a process of (re)construction of the enacted experiences (the ongoing process of teaching and learning) both students and teachers encounter. With this in mind, teachers play a role as creators of curriculum knowledge. They are agents of change in thinking and practice in which they engage students in this process. In addition, the teachers use, adapt, and supplement curriculum materials based on students' needs, interests and personal development so that the teachers can assist the students to explore what is relevant to themselves and community, rather than achieve prespecified objectives that hardly cater to their needs and ability (Shawer, 2010).

In the current curriculum, teachers should be able to play roles as curriculum developers and curriculum makers. They should be entrusted to critically problematize, challenge, and revise the mandated or official curriculum, which may not be relevant to their pedagogical context. They can re-formulate standardized competencies

to develop students' ability and go beyond what policy makers and curriculum developers on a top management level intend students to learn or achieve. The teachers deserve the right to supplement what is missing in the intended curriculum and to include knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are important for students' learning development. From the perspectives of curriculum adaptation and enactment, teachers are no longer receivers or consumers of the curriculum, but constructors of the official curriculum. Curriculum development, evaluation, experimentation, expansion, adaptation, and supplementation among others are tasks in which teachers engage. With these roles in mind, teachers always endeavor to develop their own curriculum and adapt the official curriculum to the needs of students and their own needs as professional learners as well as negotiate any curriculum materials with the students as members of the classroom community. They should view a process of negotiation or dialogic talks between teachers and students as well as needs as a springboard for innovating and exploring best curriculum materials such as syllabi, lesson plans, pedagogical materials, and test papers. Teachers as curriculum remakers and curriculum makers always see the official curriculum as resources for developing their own classroom curriculum. It is evident that teachers also play different roles, among others: classroom-level policy makers, needs analysts or assessors, syllabus designers, lesson planners, materials designers or developers, explorers or creators of pedagogical methods and practices, classroom managers or designers, reflective practitioners, and program evaluators. Definitely, there are many other roles that language teachers play when working with their students, depending on tasks or activities the students perform. To make possible the agenda of innovating the 2013 ELT curriculum, English teachers need to understand and play roles as curriculum developers and curriculum makers. Thus, it is critical for teachers to see these roles as a need for engaging in vibrant and continuing language curriculum development and making.

5.2 Negotiating Policy and Curriculum Materials: Teacher-Driven Language Curriculum Development

A curriculum as a product of language policy and planning embraces three elements: policy and curriculum materials, pedagogy, and assessment. These elements construct the totality of language curriculum. As Graves (2008) emphasizes, the fabric of a language curriculum design process embraces planning, enacting, and evaluating. The outcome of the design "is going to be experienced by teachers and students in the classroom" (Macalister & Nation, 2011, p. 1). This implies that both teachers and students have agency and rights to engage in this process. From a critical situated perspective, language curricula are always attached to social environments. These social environments include a myriad of contextual factors: social, cultural, political, historical, educational, economic, geographical, and institutional. This suggests that language curriculum design is complex, dynamic, and fluid by its

very nature. Due to the complexity and fluidity of this enterprise, a curriculum is always at the center of hot debates in the educational landscape.

It is a common phenomenon that policy makers formulate or develop curriculum policy and endorse curriculum materials. This curriculum policy comes out of ideologically based positions of political actors (e.g., Dorn, 2008; Schoenfeld & Pearson, 2008). This suggests that curriculum reform or change is driven by ideological or political interests instead of educational interests. From language policy and planning perspectives, the whole package of curriculum is called curriculum materials, "the products of a curriculum, developed for several curriculum levels (national, e.g. standards; school, e.g. the school curriculum plan; or classroom, e.g. lessons, modules activities)" (Voogt et al., 2011, p. 1236). It is no wonder that "[t]here has been a growing tendency to align curriculum standards with accountability requirements. In the specificity of these standards and requirements, curriculum policies increasingly prescribe not only *what* is taught but also *how* it is taught" (Bascia, Carr-Harris, Fine-Meyer, & Zurzolo, 2014, p. 231).

From the viewpoint of teacher-driven language curriculum development, teachers should be entrusted to become drivers of changes in both language policy and practice within and beyond the remit of their classrooms and schools. It is understood that "teacher-driven curriculum innovations may take many years to achieve widespread dissemination, legitimacy and formalization in policy" (Bascia et al., 2014, p. 229). To facilitate this, policy makers should recognize teacher agency, the "capacity of teachers to act within the context of problematic situations"—to engage in autonomous action "within the contingencies of the environment within which such action occurs" (Priestley, Edwards, & Priestley, 2012, p. 196). This implies that teachers are not implementers or transmitters of policy and curriculum materials, but they are engaged actors who are capable of critically seeing possible constraints or inadequacy of formal policy and curriculum materials by developing or modifying curriculum content at classroom and school levels. A myriad of empirical research on curriculum making reports (Bascia et al., 2014) that teachers are portrayed as active agents in their own classrooms and at the school level, but as playing only a marginal role at the policy level in that their voices remain unheard.

Shawer (2010) suggests that policy-makers adopt a broad curriculum approach, which provides language teachers a myriad of ways to approach and transform the official curriculum into their own classroom curriculum. In addition, school administrators along with teachers should use a variety of sources to assess, develop, and report what is missing in the official curriculum, and they should be able to identify their contribution to curriculum development. This process-based curriculum design can exert positive influence on curriculum, school, classroom, teacher, and student development. In this instance, a curriculum should be viewed as a process of knowledge (re)construction, which takes place within and beyond both school and classroom as social environments where both teachers and students engage in pedagogic encounters. Thus, negotiating teacher-driven language curriculum development with policy makers may help ensure access, equity, and quality across all educational levels and settings.

5.3 Positioning and Framing English Language Pedagogy

Pedagogy is part of the experienced curriculum. Without this enterprise, curriculum is merely seen as a document or a plan. In other words, pedagogical practices are manifestation of the official curriculum, the hidden curriculum (pedagogical practice without planning), and the null curriculum (what is missing in the official curriculum). The pedagogical landscape is always complex and multidimensional (e.g., power, agency, identity, forms of participation). Due to the complexity of language pedagogy, English teaching and learning cannot be implemented in a linear way. As stipulated in the 2013 ELT Curriculum, teachers and students should experience a five-stage learning process, including observing, questioning, experimenting or exploring, associating, and communicating. This process attempts to dictate ways teachers and students engage in pedagogic encounters. This pedagogic process cannot simply be viewed as an organizational or procedural endeavor, but should be viewed as dynamic, negotiated, and situated practice. As curriculum makers, language teachers should be entrusted to enact their pedagogical practice beyond this dogmatic five-step learning process. In addition, prescribed textbooks as a product of the 2013 ELT Curriculum along with teacher guide books do not give language teachers freedom to assess if these textbooks are relevant and appropriate to their pedagogic contexts. In addition, such textbooks legitimatize the roles of teachers as curriculum transmitters. Language teachers are agents who pass down the intended curriculum without adapting it to their pedagogical situations.

It is high time for language teachers to position and frame their own pedagogical practices based on local or situated contexts (Widodo & Park, 2014). Pedagogical positioning has a lot to do with what conceptual or theoretical stances language teachers adopt to inform their own practices. This positioning also allows them to experiment on theories to better see what works and what does not work in a particular language classroom context. The adoption of a particular theoretical stance should be accompanied with pedagogical framing. This framing aims to skew a particular theoretical stance to a particular pedagogical zone. In Bax's (2003) term, both positioning and framing are also referred to a context approach, which encourages language teachers to tailor their pedagogical practices to meet the needs of students and their social environment/context. This condition is also relevant to what Kumaravadivelu (2001, p. 538) calls postmethod pedagogy, which aims to strike a balance between a teacher-generated theory of practice (e.g., professional knowledge, personal experience, beliefs, values, and views about meaningful pedagogical practices) and contextual conditions (e.g., the local linguistic landscape, sociocultural and political particularities). Taken together, pedagogical positioning and framing can be a springboard for exploring and innovating pedagogical practices in which students engage in making decisions on the choice of such practices. In this respect, students' voices are viewed as sources of input for what to teach and what to learn.

Thus, pre-packed curriculum materials such as a list of competency standards, syllabi, lesson plans, and textbooks among others place language teachers in the

comfort zone. Within this zone, language teachers are merely consumers of policy maker and expert knowledge. The agency of teachers is not well recognized. It does not matter how well-crafted the pre-packed curriculum materials are because language teaching and learning are always complex, dynamic, and unpredictable in that both students and teachers have different beliefs, values, expectations, and cultures in which they nurture outside the classroom. The totality of knowledge (re) construction and negotiation is much shaped by these dimensions. The ultimate goals of this pedagogical trajectory are to help language students build and enhance the ownership of English as well as to view English learning as a short- and long-term investment (Widodo & Park, 2014). Thus, what students have learned from classroom and school should be resources for them to engage in real-life communicative encounters.

5.4 Integrating Assessment and Pedagogy: A Dynamic Approach

Language assessment is a crucial part of the whole curriculum. It should be viewed as the continuum of pedagogic practices. It is important to ponder how and why language assessment should be integrated with language pedagogy. Language assessment should go beyond formative and summative assessment in which the former aims to promote learning informally and frequently conducted in classrooms, and the latter, formally planned and periodically administered, intends to document learners' progress or achievement. This formal assessment is "concerned with measuring the results of learner development and not directly with promoting development" (Poehner & van Compernolle, 2011, pp. 183–184). Language assessment should not be seen as a product of learning, but a process of developing what students have learned. Therefore, there is an urgent need for reframing language assessment as a starting point for taking into account questions of access and fairness in language education. To this end, dynamic assessment as an approach helps language teachers understand their social world as the source of abilities. Assessment is viewed as process and humanistic endeavor in that it does not look at the quantitative results of learner development, but concerned with promoting learner development. This effort is geared to integrate assessment and pedagogy to identify what students are lacking and develop their language repertoire by providing the students with sufficient teacher scaffolding and peer support.

Dynamic assessment is epistemologically rooted in Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and the belief that cognitive capabilities develops through social interactions and physical and symbolic artifacts (see Poehner, 2008, 2009 for more discussion about dynamic assessment in foreign language education). A dynamic approach to language assessment recognizes the single entity of pedagogy and assessment. Thus, the approach "challenges conventional views on teaching and assessment by arguing that these should not be seen as separate activities but should instead be fully integrated" (Poehner, 2009, p. 5).

Stoynoff (2012, pp. 527–528) suggests that anchored in dynamic assessment, classroom-based assessment should

- integrate the teacher fully into the assessment process including planning assessment, evaluating performance, and making decisions based on the results of assessment;
- be conducted by and under the direction of the learners' teacher (as opposed to an external assessor);
- yield multiple samples of learner performance that are collected over time and by means of multiple assessment procedures and activities;
- be applied and adapted to meet the teaching and learning objectives of different classes and students;
- integrate learners into the assessment process and utilize self- and peer-assessment in addition to teacher-assessment of learning;
- foster opportunities for learners to engage in self-initiated enquiry;
- offer learners immediate and constructive feedback; and
- monitor, evaluate, and modify assessment procedures to optimize teaching and learning.

It is important to bear in mind that both pedagogy and assessment are inseparable in that pedagogy is a process of equipping students with required knowledge, attitude, skill, and ability to perform real-life tasks. Assessment is a way to recognize the agency of students and provide useful input for innovating or reframing the existing language pedagogy. Language assessment should be seen as a cognitive, linguistic, psychological, and social enterprise. More crucially, it is used to better understand students' language and non-language development through three formats of assessment: self-assessment (e.g., reflective journals), peer assessment (e.g., observations, projects, simulations), and teacher assessment (e.g., journals, interviews, portfolios). Formal assessments such as formative, summative, diagnostic, and high-stakes (the National Assessment) should not be used to judge student ability as a whole. Therefore, both formal assessment and dynamic assessment should complement each other. This should be a first priority agenda in the enactment of the 2013 ELT Curriculum. Policy makers, teachers, students, and other interested stakeholders should recognize this agenda as a shared vision and motivation for engineering and enacting meaningful language pedagogy.

5.5 Re-envisioning Sound Language Teacher Training and Education

Teacher training and education institutions play pivotal roles in educating sufficient and highly qualified teachers. Being a language teacher is a complex and demanding profession in that this profession requires not only capabilities of understanding curriculum and putting curriculum materials into practice, but also having solid

understanding of the nature of language and sufficient language ability. Undoubtedly, there are other abilities language teachers have to develop. Therefore, language teacher training and education is an institutional site, which involves a myriad of intertwined factors, such as cognition, visions and missions, philosophical values, socio-political agenda, and other dimensions.

To produce language teachers with the whole package of relevant competence, language teacher training and education institutions should provide a curriculum that touches upon comprehensive theories of language policy and planning as well language curriculum development. They also need to emphasize how such theories are put into practice so that pre-service and in-service teachers better understand how they approach any changing language policy and curriculum development at macro and micro levels. Shawer (2010, p. 182) suggests that "teacher training [and education] institutions introduce pre-service and in-service teachers" to different approaches to understanding language curriculum and possible strategies for raising their awareness of how language teachers are supposed to approach the curriculum. To this end, language teacher educators and administrators should always enhance quality of system, content, and pedagogy of language teacher training and education. They should also involve interested stakeholders in this quality assurance.

Teacher training and education institutions should mold teacher's role into the developmental role rather than the instrumental in order to recognize the agency of teachers. Keiny (1994, p. 159) nicely lists these two conceptions of teacher's role, that is, the instrumental and the developmental as presented below (Table 2).

Teacher's role as the developmental is much relevant to positioning teachers as agents of change. To reframe the 2013 ELT Curriculum, language teachers should take on the developmental role. With this in mind, language teachers always engage in reflective practice, joint knowledge construction, long-life learning, process-oriented personal and professional learning, and theory-driven action enterprise. In line with this, language teacher educators should be aware that teachers should recognize what becoming a teacher means and how they should behave professionally.

Table 2 Two conceptions of teacher role

	Instrumental	Developmental
General orientation	Technical rationality	Reflection in action
Epistemological aspect	Objectivism—knowledge as an external entity	Constructivism—knowledge as a subjective construction
Task ownership	Teacher	Student
Teacher's responsibility	To instruct, transfer knowledge	To promote student's learning processes by providing opportunities for direct interaction with knowledge.
Learning goals	Achievements as products of learning	Learning as a process
Education of teachers	Training or modeling their acquisition of skills and techniques	Integration of theory and action; developing reflective and diagnostic capacities

Therefore, language training and education institutions need to re-envision their language education curriculum so that they can assist both pre-service and in-service language teachers to become competent in language curriculum development and making.

5.6 Sustaining Vibrant Teacher Professional Development

Sustained and vibrant teacher professional development (TPD) is one of the key factors of fruitful language curriculum development and enactment in that teachers are active actors of these enterprises. Opfer and Pedder (2011, p. 376) contend that TPD is deemed as a crucial means of "improving schools, increasing teacher quality, and improving the quality of student learning." TPD is part of professional or teacher learning. Individual teacher learning is affected by institutional or school system orientations. For this reason, schools should provide teachers with support, access, and encouragement to engage in professional learning activities. In short, teacher's individual learning trajectories intermingle with the school's learning system orientation. Both affect the nature and activities of professional or teacher learning in which teachers engage. Specific TPD activities, processes, or programs cannot be divorced from "complex teaching and learning environments in which teachers live" (Opfer & Pedder, 2011, p. 377). Thus, school-level learning system creates socially-produced conditions for teacher learning.

Despite the recognition of TPD, most of the professional development opportunities remain fragmented and poorly aligned with curricula and inadequate to meet teachers' needs for growing professionally in Indonesia. The Indonesian government, districts, and schools have spent a great amount of money on teacher training, workshops, and seminars. None of them impact on rigorous professional or teacher learning. The nature of such professional development activities is just one-shot. To engage teachers in meaningful professional learning or development activities, the teachers understand what such activities mean to them personally and professionally. From a personal perspective, professional development activities help the teachers better understand personal goals and attainments, which lead to their personal growth and development. From a professional viewpoint, such professional development activities impact not only on their professional knowledge and competence, but also on student learning development. The teachers should contribute to their professional communities where they engage in professional knowledge and expertise sharing with their peer teachers.

Thus, professional development activities should support teacher's personal and professional learning, which needs to be sustained and intensive rather than brief and sporadic. Professionally speaking, engaging in teaching as a profession, teacher learning activities should bring about change in pedagogical practice and in turn in student learning. From a casuality perspective, meaningful professional development can enhance teacher instructional practices and in turn result in improved student learning. This concurs with Guskey's argument that professional processes,

actions and activities can "enhance the professional knowledge, skills and attitudes of teachers so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students" (cited in Creemers, Antoniou, & Kyriakides, 2013, p. 3).

From a curriculum development perspective, language teachers should be entrusted to play roles as curriculum developers and makers so that they have a range of opportunities to engage in sustained and vibrant TPD activities. These activities should follow these principles: collaboration, life impact, engagement, empowerment, and sustainability. Collaboration can involve working together with other teachers and teacher educators on joint curriculum materials writing, reflective teaching, action research, peer observation, and other projects, which help them learn from each other. More crucially, this collaboration can build and maintain community of teacher professional learning. The second principle is life impact. Any professional development activities in which teachers engage should impact on their personal and professional growth and on student learning development. In addition, teacher contribution to engagement in professional development activities impact on others. Engagement and empowerment are two other crucial principles of TPD. Teachers should engage in a variety of professional development activities, which can take the form of research, training, seminar and workshop programs, observation, interviewing, journaling, and other relevant activities. Additionally, the teachers are responsible for empowering others through peer modeling and scaffolding. Following a constructivist approach, teachers should help each other and assist less experienced peers to enhance their personal and professional learning. The last principle is sustainability. Teachers should see professional development activities as a need for growing personally and professionally. They need to sustain their passion for continuing such activities. In this way, teachers see themselves as life-long learners. Taken together, collaboration, life impact, engagement and empowerment, and sustainability are key principles that both policy makers and teachers should recognize to plan meaningful and vibrant professional development programs. Thus, factors such as quality, quantity, time, and opportunities should be taken into account so that teachers can reflect on and evaluate quality professional development activities. These activities should be high on the agenda of policy makers, school administrators, and teachers.

6 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have presented the landscape of English language curricula in the Indonesian secondary education context. More importantly, I have pinpointed six key principles of reframing the current ELT curriculum in Indonesia, including (1) revisiting roles of teachers from a curriculum development perspective, (2) negotiating policy and curriculum materials: teacher-driven language curriculum development, (3) positioning and framing English language pedagogy, (4) integrating assessment and pedagogy: a dynamic approach, (5) re-envisioning sound language teacher training and education, and (6) sustaining vibrant teacher professional

development. Assuredly, policy makers and curriculum developers in other Asian countries may make use of these principles to adapt the official curriculum to particular pedagogic contexts. I would like to argue that language teachers should move their pedagogic practices beyond the comfort zone by playing critical roles as curriculum developers and curriculum makers in order to adapt the official curriculum into their own pedagogic practice contexts. Thus, language teachers should see themselves as agents of change in any language policy and curriculum development.

References

Alwi, H. (2000). *Bahasa Indonesia: Pemakaian dan pemakaiannya* [Bahasa Indonesia: Use and its use]. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa/Departeman Pendidikan Nasional.

Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan. (2006). *Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan Jenjang Dasar dan Menengah* [Guidelines for school based curriculum design for primary and middle schooling]. Jakarta: Author.

Bascia, N., Carr-Harris, S., Fine-Meyer, R., & Zurzolo, C. (2014). Teachers, curriculum innovation, and policy formation. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44*, 228–248.

Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal, 57*, 278–286.

Creemers, B., Antoniou, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2013). *Teacher professional development for improving quality of teaching*. New York: Springer.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *English Australia Journal, 18*(1), 22–30.

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional [Ministry of National Education]. (2003a). *Kurikulum 2004 standar kompetensi mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris sekolah menengah pertama dan madrasah tsanawiyah* [The 2004 ELT competency based curriculum for junior high schools]. Jakarta: Author.

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional [Ministry of National Education]. (2003b). *Kurikulum 2004 standar kompetensi mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris sekolah menengah atas dan madrasah aliyah* [The 2004 ELT competency based curriculum for senior high schools]. Jakarta: Author.

Dorn, C. (2008). "Treason in the textbooks": Reinterpreting the Harold Rugg textbook controversy in the context of wartime schooling. *Pedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education, 44*, 457–459.

Doyle, W. (1992). Curriculum and pedagogy. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 486–516). New York: Macmillan.

Drakeley, S. (2005). *The history of Indonesia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Errington, J. J. (1986). Continuity and change in Indonesian language development. *The Journal of Asian Studies, 45*, 329–353.

Farr, M., & Song, J. (2011). Language ideologies and policies: Multilingualism and education. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 5*, 650–665.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 237–259.

Goebel, Z. (2010). *Language, migration, and identity: Neighborhood talk in Indonesia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Graves, K. (2008). The language curriculum: A social contextual perspective. *Language Teaching, 41*, 147–181.

Hamied, F. A. (2012). English in multicultural and multilingual Indonesian education. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 63–78). New York: Springer.

Hu, G. (2007a). The juggernaut of Chinese – English bilingual education. In A. W. Feng (Ed.), *Bilingual education in China: Practices, policies and concepts* (pp. 94–126). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hu, Y. (2007b). China's foreign language policy on primary English education: What's behind it? *Language Policy, 6*(3&4), 359–376.

Hu, G., Li, L., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction at a Chinese university: Rhetoric and reality. *Language Policy, 13*, 21–40.

Keiny, S. (1994). Constructivism and teachers' professional development. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 10*, 157–167.

Kridalaksana, H., Verhaar, J. W. M., & Moeliono, A. M. (1982). *Pelangi bahasa: Kumpulan esai yang dipersembahkan kepada Prof. J.W.M. Verhaar* [Essay collection presented to Prof. J. WM. Verhaar] [H. Kridalaksana & A. M. Moeliono]. Jakarta: Bhratara Karya Aksara.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Towards a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 537–560.

Lamb, M., & Coleman, H. (2008). Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society in Post-Soeharto Indonesia. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11*, 189–205.

Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching, 40*, 243–249.

Macalister, J., & Nation, I. S. P. (2011). *Case studies in language curriculum design: Concepts and approaches in action around the world*. New York: Routledge.

Minahan, J. B. (2012). *Ethnic groups of South Asia and the Pacific: An encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Mistar, J. (2005). Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) in Indonesia. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Teaching English to the world: History, curriculum, and practice* (pp. 71–80). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nababan, P. W. J. (1991). Language in education: The case of Indonesia. *International Review of Education, 37*, 115–131.

Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research, 81*, 376–407.

Paauw, S. (2009). One land, one nation, one language: An analysis of Indonesia's national language policy. In H. Lehnert-LeHouillier & A. B. Fine (Eds.). *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Language Sciences, 5*(1), 2–16.

Paulston, C. B. (2003). Linguistic minorities and language policies. In C. B. Paulston & G. R. Tucker (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings* (pp. 344–407). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Pease-Alvarez, L., & Alisun Thompson, A. (2014). Teachers working together to resist and remake educational policy in contexts of standardization. *Language Policy, 13*, 165–181.

Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development*. New York: Springer.

Poehner, M. (2009). Group dynamic assessment: Mediation for the L2 classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 471–491.

Poehner, M. E., & van Compernolle, R. A. (2011). Frames of interaction in dynamic assessment: Developmental diagnoses of second language learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18*, 183–198.

Priestley, M., Edwards, R., & Priestley, A. (2012). Teacher agency in curriculum making: Agents of change and spaces for manoeuvre. *Curriculum Inquiry, 42*, 191–214.

Priyanto, A. D. (2009). *Maximizing SFL contribution to ELT in Indonesia* (UAD TEFL conference). Yogyakarta, Indonesia: UAD Press.

Richards, J. C. (2010). Competence and performance in language teaching. *RELC Journal, 41*, 101–122.

Sakhiyya, Z. (2011). Interrogating identity: The international standard school in Indonesia. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 19*, 345–365.

Schiffman, H. F. (2006). Language policy and linguistic culture. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 111–125). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Schoenfeld, A., & Pearson, P. (2008). The reading and math wars. In G. Sykes & D. Plank (Eds.), *AERA handbook on educational policy research* (pp. 560–580). New York: Routledge.

Shawer, S. F. (2010). Classroom-level curriculum development: EFL teachers as curriculum-developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 173–184.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education or worldwide diversity and human rights*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zumwalt, K. (1992). Curriculum implementation. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 402–435). New York: Macmillan.

Stoynoff, S. (2012). Looking backward and forward at classroom-based language assessment. *ELT Journal, 66*, 523–532.

Tollefson, J. W. (2015). Language education policy in late modernity: Insights from situated approaches—commentary. *Language Policy, 14*, 183–189.

Voogt, J., et al. (2011). Teacher learning in collaborative curriculum design. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 1235–1244.

Widodo, H. P. (2015). *The development of vocational English materials from a social semiotic perspective: Participatory action research.* Unpublished Ph.D thesis, The University of Adelaide, Australia.

Widodo, H. P., & Fardhani, E. A. (2011). The language rights of indigenous languages: An approach to maintaining Indonesia's linguistic and cultural diversity. In Q. Le & T. Le (Eds.), *Linguistic diversity and cultural identity* (pp. 129–140). New York: Nova Science.

Widodo, H. P., & Park, G. (2014). *Moving TESOL beyond the comfort zone: Exploring criticality in TESOL*. New York: Nova Science.

Zacharias, N. T. (2013). Navigating through the English-medium-of-instruction policy: Voices from the field. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14*(1), 93–108.