Character Building

In English Language Teaching

Editor :
Fathor Rasyid

Character Building

in English Language Teaching

Editor
Fathor Rasyid

Character Building in English Language Teaching

Editors:

Fathor Rasyid, M. Pd.

Design Cover:

Robait Usman

First printed 2013

ISBN: 978-602-17072-9-6

Printed in:

Naila Pustaka

Jl. Kemutug 32 Ring Road Selatan

Banguntapan – Bantul Yogyakarta 55191

Hp: 081 555 788 548

email: naila.pustaka@gmail.com

Table of Contents

Foreword

This international proceeding is a compilation of papers written by the speakers of both speakers in the plenary session and parallel sessions. This international seminar is annually held by STAIN (State College for Islamic Studies) Kediri, and this year event is organized by *Tadris Bahasa Inggris* (English education). Furthermore, the topic of the seminar—Character Building in English Language Teaching—was intentionally selected for we—English teachers—would also like to contribute to the character building of the nation, since in the last few years Indonesia has encountered moral decadence particularly among youngsters.

It is true that relating character building to the English language teaching is not that easy. For that reason the three speakers in the plenary session were deliberately selected on the basis of their expertise. Caroline Bently, for instance, the director of Indonesia Australia Language Foundation (IALF) Bali has lots of experiences in teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia. She once organized English Language Training for Islamic Schools (ELTIS) and coached its masters' trainers. In addition, Prof. Suwarsih Madya, from Yogyakarta State University (used to be IKIP Yogyakarta) specializes on the teaching English as a foreign language. She is also one important key persons in TEFLIN (Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia). Finally, A. Effendi Kadarisman, from State University of Malang (used to be IKIP Malang) is a "Professor" who spent ages in USA. He has actively become a speaker in both national and international conference and his papers have been published in reputable journal, such as *Linguistik Indonesia, TEFLIN Journal, Reflections in Southeast Asean Seas: Essays in Honor of Professor James T. Collins.*

In addition, the speakers in the parallel sessions were carefully chosen by a team of reviewers, again, on the basis of their expertise. They are from all over Indonesia, and some of them living in Australia. They are from a variety of disciplines within the English language teaching. They are practitioners in the grassroots. Their experiences provide a breakthrough in inserting character building in English language teaching. Therefore, by the end of the seminars or through this international proceeding, we become aware and know how the integration between character building and English language teaching is like.

The participants of the international seminar are of three sorts. The first is invited participants. They senior high school English teaching in *kerasidenan* Kediri (Kediri, Blitar, Tulungagung, and Nganjuk). The second is non-invited participants. They are high school English teachers and English lecturers all over Indonesia. The last is decision makers, such as *Kadiknas*, school principals and so forth.

Eventually, I expect this international seminar proceeding is beneficial and therefore we do contribute to the character building of the nation through our profession as English teachers/ lecturers. Moreover, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to any party, particularly to the organizing committee for the success of the seminar.

Kediri, October 5, 2013

Fathor Rasyid
Editor

CHARACTER BUILDING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: AN INTRIGUING CROSS-CULTURAL ISSUE

A. Effendi Kadarisman
State University of Malang

Abstract: This paper argues that "character building in ELT" is an intriguing cross-cultural issue. In Western culture, ELT is a purely academic enterprise, with no moral responsibility of carrying along character education. On the other hand, in Indonesia, which is now plagued by moral problems, character education has become the central issue; it goes deep into the formal educational system, including the 2013 English Curriculum. And yet, despite its inclusion in ELT, character education will probably remain implicit in the actual practice of teaching and learning English in the classroom; for the goal of learning English is to help learners master this language for worldly instrumental purposes. In contrast, Arabic instruction in pesantren—given as off-side notes for comparison—is geared toward religious purposes; and so character education takes a central role and becomes fully explicit. Finally, the success of ELT in Indonesia owes not to the inclusion of character education but to observing the sound principles of foreign language teaching.

Key words: character building, the 2013 Curriculum, ELT in Indonesia, Arabic instruction in pesantren, implicit and explicit character education.

Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) as an academic field is an intellectual enterprise that deals with how to teach English effectively so that learners can master the language and use it as a means of international

communication. In nearly seven decades of the history of TEFL—if we take Fries (1945) as its first proponent, this academic enterprise has been a serious and endless effort to find the best possible way of teaching English to speakers of other languages, and hence also the term "TESOL". This effort has been the main reason why there have been many different methods of teaching English.

In the second and third chapters of his book *Teaching by Principles*, Brown (2001) presents a "methodical" history of foreign language (FL) teaching. Among the well-known methods are the grammar translation method, the direct method, the audiolingual method, the cognitive code learning, suggestopedia, the silent way, total physical response, the natural approach, and communicative language teaching (pp. iii-iv). These methods, as the names indicate, are based on different basic assumptions, linguistically and/or psychologically. They have different ways of manipulating the three language components (vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation) and helping learners acquire the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). However, they are similar to one another in two important ways. First, each method is trying to do its best to succeed in teaching a foreign or second language. Secondly, each method keeps the business of foreign language teaching within limits of the intellectual domain, and never goes across into covering the moral domain. As such, TEFL keeps pure academic orientation and has no obligation to carry moral burden such as character education.

In fact, in *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*, Kelly (1969) reveals similar things. Across the centuries (see Figure 27 on p. 394), beginning with the classical era, moving to the middle ages (12^{th} – 15^{th} centuries), then to the renaissance,

next to the "17th-18th-19th" centuries, and finally to the modern era (late 19th – early 20th centuries), theories of FL teaching have been preoccupied with three aspects: teaching materials, methods of transmission, and teaching media (pp. 2-3). The teaching materials and their arrangement are determined by the procedure of selection and grading. The methods of transmission fall into two categories: presentation and repetition; that is, the presentation of the three language components and the repetition of the four language skills. The teaching media include the teacher, the book, and—in the modern era—the machines. The three aspects (i.e., materials, methods, and media) relate ultimately to the provenance of *ideas*, particularly, with reference to modern sciences, *linguistics* and *psychology* (emphasis added). In short, even when it is stretched back historically so as to include the classical era of teaching Latin and Greek, the concern with morality or character building does not show up in the FL teaching enterprise in the Western world.

In this context, the selection of "Character Building in English Language Teaching" as a theme for an international seminar is somewhat puzzling to me. In Western scholarship, more specifically in the field of TEFL or TESOL, the inclusion of "character building" in a seminar, conference, or workshop would be odd or unusual. But in Indonesian context, "character building" has been so frequently picked up as part of a theme for national or international seminars and conferences. So it seems that there is some conflict between Indonesian and Western values concerning the position of "character building" in academic affairs.

Therefore, instead of discussing how to help build learners' character through English language teaching, I would prefer to focus on the "theme" itself, and raise it as

an "intriguing" cross-cultural issue. Notice that the adjective *intriguing* means 'interesting for being odd or unusual' (*Electronic Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, 2007). This paper starts with identifying some moral problems in Indonesia which eventually lead to the need for character building in the formal system of national education. Then it looks at character building in ELT from Indonesian and Western perspectives. Next, it compares between implicit character building in English instruction and explicit character education in Arabic instruction in the *pesantren* (Islamic boarding school) culture. And finally, it concludes the discussion by predicting a future direction of ELT in Indonesia.

I. From Moral Problems to Character Building in Indonesian Education

Let me start this section by presenting a personal account of "character building" making part of a seminar or conference theme in Indonesia. When in March of this year (2013) I was asked by the Committee of the ELT International Seminar at STAIN Kediri to present a topic under the theme "Character Building in English Language Teaching (ELT)", my reaction was: well, this is Indonesia ... This reminds me of the other two previous conferences. In December 2012, I was asked to give a presentation at Fakultas Ilmu Budaya (FIB) Universitas Brawijaya (UB) under the theme "*Sumbangan Kajian Bahasa dan Sastra terhadap Pembangunan Karakter Bangsa*" (Contributions of Linguistic and Literary Studies to National Character Building). This is similar to the theme for the 2nd KIMLI (Kongres Internasional Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia) at Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI) in October 2011: "*Bahasa dan Pembangunan Karakter Bangsa*" (Language and National Character Building). All of these themes are typically Indonesian.

What did I do then? For KIMLI 2 at UPI, I wrote a paper that was purely linguistic, "Mapping out Mentalism in Linguistics and other Related Disciplines" (Kadarisman 2012), totally ignoring the theme. This is a paper about mentalistic ideas first outlined by Chomsky (1965); then they gained strong influence on the field of linguistics, and subsequently on many other areas of specialization. As for the conference at FIB UB, being one of the four guest speakers, I had to adjust my topic to the theme, presenting "*Bukan Sekedar Berbahasa dan Berbangsa yang Baik dan Benar*" (Beyond the Correct Language, beyond the Good Nation). This is a topic criticizing our present conditions as a nation that has failed in many walks of life. But this is not important for the present ELT International Seminar at STAIN Kediri. The important thing is that during the presentation I pointed out that in England, America, or Australia, a conference on linguistics or ELT taking up the following themes would be unimaginable:

- How Linguistics and Literature Boost up British National Character
- Generative Grammar and American Creative Minds
- Systemic Functional Linguistics: Toward the Making of Ideal Australian Citizens
- Shaping Western Morality through Foreign Language Teaching
- *Second Language Acquisition: Learning Tolerance from other Nations

In Western scholarship, such themes would be considered "very unusual" [1], for mixing up academic disciplines with

1 In linguistics, asterisk (*) is used to mark an ill-formed linguistic unit (e.g., *bnik, *books good, and *She early left). In this paper, the hypothetical examples are marked with an asterisk (*) to show that they are academically and culturally strange, and therefore rejected.

moral issues. A linguistics or ELT conference and character building are two different, almost unrelated enterprises. If you do linguistics, just focus on your business. If you do ELT, just focus on your own field. Forget all about other irrelevant matters.

But this is Indonesia: a country of big slogans. At KIMLI 2 at UPI, I ignored the theme. At the seminar at FIB UB, I was somewhat sarcastic in treating the theme. But at STAIN Kediri right now, I would like to take up the theme in a critical and scholarly manner. As noted earlier, the theme "Character Building in ELT" is typically Indonesian. It obviously reflects a national ambition to clean up all problems in a country that has been declining in morality and self-integrity. To mention the most obvious: the corrupt government, the ineffective bureaucracy, the deteriorating natural environment, the massive deforestation through illegal logging, the weak law enforcement—these are among threatening problems that loom large on the face of the nation. Accordingly, the national response is an outcry: what we badly need right now is "character building".

And who or what department is held most responsible for doing national character building? This seems to be the national concern. It is reported that the president, the vice president, and all the ministers have eventually come to an agreement that character building is primarily the responsibility of the Department of Education and Culture.[2] How does this department do that? It launches the 2013 Curriculum. It is a new curriculum for education at the elementary and secondary levels, both lower and upper secondary.

2 This information was given by Slamet Setiawan, Ph.D., the resource person at the "Workshop on the 2013 High School English Curriculum" at the English Department, State University of Malang, on August 23, 2013.

According to *Buku Saku Pendidikan Karakter Sekolah Menengah Pertama* (A Pocket Book of Character Education for the Junior High School) as part of the new curriculum, **character building** as an essential part of the goal of national education as stated in the earlier Government Regulation No. 20 Year 2003 **has failed**, as noted (paraphrased into English) in the following:

> The present fact indicates that the nation has been drastically declining in character as shown by massive juvenile delinquency, decreasing civility, absence of self- discipline, increasing drug abuse, violence among students and civilians, corrupt behavior, and the weakening sense of nationalism. Accordingly, to overcome these mounting national problems, character education becomes an urgent measure and a strategic choice (pp. 3-4).

Therefore, character building needs better reformulation. In the *Buku Saku Pendidikan Karakter* it is made clear that character education is of paramount importance since it aims to inculcate on the part of the learners deep-seated moral values that make them live in harmony with the Almighty God, with themselves, with their fellow humans, with the natural environment, and with their nation and country (pp. 9-10). Moreover, character education is chiefly the responsibility of three school subjects: religious education, civics, and the Indonesian language. In addition, to make it more intensive and accomplish better results, character education is also to be integrated into all other subjects (p. 5), including English.

In *Materi Pelatihan Guru: Implementasi Kurikulum 2013* (Materials for Teacher Training: Implementing the 2013 Curriculum), it is explicitly stated that each school subject is meant to help develop the learners in three personal "dimensions": attitude, knowledge, and skill (pp. 120-

139). Each of these dimensions, as summarized in Table 1, is elaborated into "core competencies" (KIs); and each core competence is further specified into "basic competencies" (KDs). The attitude is broken down into KIs 1 and 2; the knowledge is incorporated into KI 2; and the skill is incorporated into KI 4. Further, KI 1 is specified into KD 1, KI 2 into KDs 2.1–2.3, KI 3 into KDs 3.1–3.11, and KI 4 into KDs 4.1–4.13.

Table 1. A Summary of *Tiga Dimensi* Elaborated into *Kompetensi Inti* and further Specified into *Kompetensi Dasar*

Tiga Dimensi (Three Dimensions)	*Kompetensi Inti or KI* (Core Competencies)	*Kompetensi Dasar or KD* (Basic Competencies)
Sikap (Attitude)	KI 1	KD 1
	KI 2	KDs 2.1 – 2.3
Pengetahuan (Knowledge)	KI 3	KDs 3.1 – 3.11
Keterampilan (Skill)	KI 4	KDs 4.1 – 4.13

I will not discuss all the core and basic competencies. The last two dimensions, *knowledge* and *skill*, are commonplace and hence familiar to ELT scholars in Indonesia and in the international community. That is, whoever wants to be proficient in English needs to master the working knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation, and then puts this knowledge into the social or communicative function of English by mastering the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

But how the first dimension (i.e., *attitude*) is elaborated and further specified is of special interest. A direct quote of the original version in Indonesian is necessary here (see Table 2.a) to show the "unique features" of the 2013 English Curriculum. An English translation of the contents of Table 2.a is given in Table 2.b.

Personally, the first time I read the Indonesian version of how *sikap* (attitude) is developed into KI and KD, I was shocked! Character education in the form of religious belief has been carried along too far into the curriculum. The moral issue has been made so pervasive that it unwittingly interferes with the English curriculum. Look at KI 1 (*to appreciate and devote oneself to his/her religious belief*) and its specification into KD 1 (*to give thanks to God for the opportunity of learning English as a means of international communication, and the thanksgiving is realized through learning motivation*). How can the teacher know and measure that the motivation of learning English is the realization of the learners' thanksgiving to God? Does it mean that high learning motivation is a result of high intensity of thanksgiving, and low learning motivation is a result of low intensity of thanksgiving?

The quality of thanksgiving, in my opinion, is much like the quality of literary appreciation. It is not something dictated and determined from the outside, but something growing from the inside. Reading the same poem, for instance, A can be deeply moved and hence highly appreciate the literary work, whereas B may just think and feel that it is a piece of 'unusual' writing. Similarly, having obtained the same opportunity or luck, X may consider it more as a blessing from God than a result of his hard efforts; and so he is deeply grateful to Him. Meanwhile, Y may think that it is simply a logical consequence of his hard work, and there is not much divine interference with it; and so God is simply a Supreme Being out there, watching. Briefly, unlike *knowledge* and *skill* making up English proficiency which are easy to measure, the quality of *thanksgiving* (if any) while learning English is something deeply personal and very difficult to measure.

Table 2.a. *Sikap* Elaborated into *Kompetensi Inti* and further Specified into *Kompetensi Dasar*

	Kompetensi Inti (KI)	Kompetensi Dasar (KD)
Sikap	1. Menghargai dan menghayati ajaran agama yang dianutnya	1. Mensyukuri kesempatan dapat mempelajari bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar komunikasi internasional yang diwujudkan dalam semangat belajar.
	2. Menghargai dan menghayati perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (toleransi, gotong royong), santun, percaya diri, dalam berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam dalam jangkauan pergaulan dan keberadaannya.	2.1. Menunjukkan perilaku santun dan peduli dalam melaksanakan komunikasi interpersonal dengan guru dan teman.
		2.2. Menunjukkan perilaku jujur, disiplin, percaya diri, dan bertanggung jawab dalam melaksanakan komunikasi transaksional dengan guru dan teman.
		2.3. Menunjukkan perilaku tanggung jawab, peduli, kerjasama, dan cinta damai, dalam melaksanakan komunikasi fungsional.

Table 2.b. *Attitude* Elaborated into *Core Competencies* and further Specified into *Basic Competencies*

	Core Competencies (KI)	Basic Competencies (KD)
Attitude	1. To appreciate and devote oneself to his/her religious belief	1. To give thanks to God for the opportunity of learning English as a means of international communication, and the thanksgiving is realized through learning motivation
	2. To appreciate and to be committed to honesty, self-discipline, responsibility, social awareness (tolerance, social responsibility), politeness, and self-confidence in doing interaction with the social and natural environments within his/her reach.	2.1. To show polite behavior and social courtesy in doing interpersonal communication with his/her teachers and classmates.
		2.2. To show honesty, self-discipline, self-confidence, and responsibility in doing transactional communication with his/her teachers and classmates.
		2.3. To show responsible behavior, care, cooperation, and love of peace in doing functional communication.

I could not imagine how experts in TEFL in the international sphere would react to KI 1 and KD 1. They would probably shake their heads and wonder: what has been going on in ELT in Indonesia?

Now, let's move ahead and compare between KD 2.1 on the one hand and KDs 2.2 and 2.3 on the other. KD 2.1 (*to show polite behavior and social courtesy in doing interpersonal communication with his/her teachers and classmates*) probably sounds natural to us Indonesians as well as to native speakers of English. According to Pragmatics or the study of language in interpersonal context, it is natural that, when engaged in verbal communication, interlocutors should be aware of the necessity of politeness and courtesy (see Brown and Levinson 1987). By contrast, KD 2.2 (*to show honesty, self-discipline, self-confidence, and responsibility in doing transactional communication with his/her teachers and classmates*) and KD 2.3 (*to show responsible behavior, care, cooperation, and love of peace in doing functional communication*) would sound "strange", not only to English speakers but also to us Indonesians in general. In doing transactional and functional communication, is it really necessary to bring along so much "morality" into our communicative act?

It should be noted that all "core competencies" (KIs) and their specifications into "basic competencies" (KDs)—see Table 1—are not only stated in the 2013 Curriculum for the lower secondary school but also repeated explicitly in the 2013 *Buku Guru* (Teachers' Manual, pp. 2-4), clearly with the purpose of reminding the English teachers of the importance of "character building" through "religious education" as a proposed solution to the "moral problems" that plague the nation. Moreover, in the textbook (i.e., *Bahasa Inggris When English Rings the Bell*) for the first-year students, the lessons,

while meant to develop knowledge and skill[3], are also geared indirectly into building personal attitudes showing love and care for oneself, social environments, and natural surroundings. These show up in Chapters 1-8 of the book: (1) How are You? (2) It's my Birthday, (3) I Love People around Me, (4) I Love Things around Me, (5) I Love my Town, (6) She's so Nice, (7) What do They Look Like?, and (8) Attention Please! Will the implied moral doctrine in English lessons—together with the lessons in all other school subjects—succeed in building the learners' character? Only time will tell. We will wait and see whether the learners will become young people of good character upon graduation.

Character education or character building is definitely necessary for all kinds and at all levels of education. In Indonesian context, it should be part of the national curriculum, including the English curriculum. But, while carrying some burden of character education, our English curriculum should look good and sound intelligent to the international community; it should not look bizarre and sound strange to them. Frankly speaking, I do not know what to say if an outsider asks about the practical significance of KD 1, KD 2.2, and KD 2.3 for EFL teaching and learning.

II. A Cross-cultural Look at Character Building in ELT

This section compares between Indonesian and Western attitudes toward the inclusion of character building

3 The textbooks for the lower secondary school are designed as activity-based instructional materials, whereas those for the upper secondary school are designed as genre-based instructional materials (Dr. Sri Rachmajanti, personal communication, in early September 2013). When aspects of character education are implicitly included in these instructional materials, as noted above, this is because the textbook writers have been very creative—adjusting the materials with the ultimate instructional goals stated in the 2013 English Curriculum.

in the ELT enterprise. As for the Indonesian attitude, it is very clear from the previous discussion that in this country, where the government and the people are getting desperate owing to the overwhelming moral problems, character education must now be included explicitly in the education system. So, character education goes deep not only into the 2013 English Curriculum, but also into the curricula for all other subjects at the lower and upper secondary schools. As has been discussed in the previous section, *pembentukan sikap* or "attitude building" in the 2013 Curriculum is meant to make the learners deeply religious, truly human, morally well-built, personally self-disciplined, intellectually outstanding, socially attentive, environmentally sensitive, nationally patriotic, and globally presentable. Thus the goal of Indonesian education is to produce "super humans". The well-known expression in Indonesian, popular during the New Order regime, is *pembentukan manusia Indonesia seutuhnya*, or "the making of perfect Indonesian citizens".

In fact, in the Government Regulation No. 20 Year 2003 (mentioned earlier), many qualities of perfect Indonesian citizens were already stated explicitly: *pendidikan nasional bertujuan untuk mengembangkan potensi peserta didik agar menjadi manusia yang beriman dan bertakwa kepada Tuhan Yang Maha Esa, berakhlak mulia, sehat, berilmu, cakap, kreatif, mandiri, dan menjadi warga negara yang demokratis serta bertanggung jawab* (the national education aims at developing the learners to become citizens who are truly faithful and devoted to the One Almighty God, noble in character, physically healthy, academically knowledgeable, professional, creative, independent, politically committed to democracy, and socially responsible).

From both the 2003 Regulation and the 2013 Curriculum, we learn that the Indonesian government—via

the Department of Education and Culture—has been so busy struggling with **verbal formulation and re-formulation of character building** through national education. This should remind us Indonesian citizens of *P4* (1986) or *Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila* (Guidelines for Understanding and Practicing *Pancasila*), a moral doctrine which was very popular during the Soeharto regime. This doctrine failed not because of lack of eloquence in verbal formulation, but because of our deteriorating political culture. In my opinion, what we badly need right now is not eloquent, high-sounding verbal doctrines, but exemplary deeds in the national, regional, and local leadership and bureaucracy. The present-day "Jokowi phenomenon"[4], which has been so appealing to the general public, the press, and the competing presidential candidates, is strong evidence that people love a hard-working leader, a well-executing social problem-solver of great integrity and high commitment.

Let's stay away from politics and go back to the ELT business, to find out what Western scholars think about the inclusion of character education in ELT. When I was puzzled by the inclusion of "character building" into themes for several national seminars (which I thought to be "typically Indonesian"), I was curious about the themes for the annual TEFLIN International Conference (which I thought would be free from local-culture interference). Surprisingly, even this international ELT conference once got tempted by character

4 For those unfamiliar with the current Indonesian political culture, the "Jokowi phenomenon" needs explaining. Jokowi or Joko Widodo is presently the governor of DKI Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia. Since his election less than a year ago, he has been working very hard for the welfare of the poor people, for making Jakarta a comfortable place for all its inhabitants, for making the natural environments dweller-friendly, and for making the traffic less congested. Now, results of his hard efforts have started showing up, making him—according to many reliable surveys—the most likely elected candidate for the Indonesian president in 2014.

education. Accordingly, in the third week of August 2103, I wrote an email to 7 (seven) Western scholars inquiring their opinions about character education in ELT. Their names and expertise are given in Table 3; and my email reads as follows.

> Dear ...
>
> I need your professional help in giving judgments on the following annual Themes for the TEFLIN (Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia.) International Conference.
>
> 1. Malang, 8-10 December 2009
>
> "Responding to Global Challenges through Quality English Language Teaching"
> 2. Bandung, 1-3 November 2010
> "Revitalizing Professionalism in ELT as a Response to the Globalized World"
> 3. Semarang, 3-5 November 2011
> "Language Teaching and Character Building"
> 4. Surabaya, 6-8 November 2012
> "English Language Learning and Teaching in the Digitization Era"
> 5. Jakarta, 27-29 Agustus 2013
> "Achieving International Standards in Teacher Education"
>
> In my opinion, the themes for the Conference in 2009, 2010, 2012, and 2013 sound normal/natural—as seen from the perspective of English/Western culture. But the theme in 2011, "Language Teaching and Character Building", to me sounds typically Indonesian. Or, perhaps, other Asian countries would have a similar theme?

I need you comments on this matter; and thank you very much for your great help.

With best wishes,

Effendi

Before we proceed further, it is necessary to note some backgrounds of the seven scholars. They are professors or associate professors in Linguistics, English, ESL, and SLA, including L2 Pragmatics. All of them teach at American universities, except Hunter; he teaches at the University of British Columbia in Canada. Three of them (i.e., Conners, DuFon, and Hunter) know Indonesian culture very well; but only Hunter gave a reply to my email.[5] The opinions given by the seven scholars about "Language Teaching and Character Building" as a theme for the TEFLIN International Conference in Semarang in November 2011 are summarized in the last column in Table 3. More about their opinions are given below.

Table 3. Western Scholars and their Opinions Summarized

No	Name	Expertise	University	Opinions Summarized
1	Conners, Thomas	Associate Professor in Linguistics	University of Maryland	-
2	DuFon, Margaret	Associate Professor in English	California State University – Chico	-

5 For the sake of economy while keeping all due respect, I refer to these seven scholars by their last names only, without mentioning their academic title: "Professor" or "Dr".

3	Schmidt, Richard	Professor in ESL	University of Hawaii	odd to English-speaking ears
4	O'Grady, William	Professor in Linguistics	University of Hawaii	unusual in Western scholarship
5	Hunter, Thomas	Associate Professor in Linguistics	University of British Columbia	typically Indonesian
6	Kasper, Gabriele	Professor in L2 Pragmatics	University of Hawaii	implicit in Western education
7	Crookes, Graham	Professor in ESL	University of Hawaii	possible with some modification

Schmidt and O'Grady are of the same opinion. In his own words, Schmidt writes,

> "I agree with your intuitions about the conference theme titles and that the theme for 2011 **sounds odd to English-speaking ears**" (emphasis added).

Similarly, O'Grady says,

> "Yes, Effendi, you are right. The theme for the 2011 conference **would strike most 'westerners' as unusual**" (emphasis added).

Hunter, who is quite familiar with Indonesian culture, states,

> I agree that the theme "Language Teaching and Character Building" **has perhaps a "too Indonesian" feel to it**. When I read that phrase what comes immediately to mind is the old history of *Pendidikan Pancasila*. ...
>
> Whether or not to give a positive judgement on that

> point depends partly on who the audience for your report is, and whether the TEFLIN material is aimed at reaching an **international audience**. If it is I would suggest recommending that **terms like "character building" be avoided**, since that term brings up thoughts of Foucald's critique of the "discipline and punish" aspect of Western (and colonial) society. It would be better to find a term that somehow invoked "healthy diversity" and "shared goals and aspirations" among international partners (emphasis added).

Thus Schmidt, O'Grady, and Hunter agree that the inclusion of "character building" in a theme for an international ELT conference sounds "odd", "unusual", and "typically Indonesian". Hunter further suggests that it should be avoided, and a more suitable term should be put in its place, which invokes culturally shared goals and aspirations among an international audience.

On the other hand, Kasper shows some tolerance to the theme, saying,

> The idea of "character building" is not alien to "Western" thinking, or rather what I now of it. ..... But I don't think I usually talk about [it and **it is] surely nowhere written down in my syllabuses** ... (emphasis added).

Kasper states that "character building" is there as part of Western education; but she further notes that it is conventionally implicit, never made explicit in her syllabuses. The final response is given by Crookes, who shows greater tolerance, stating,

> If #3 (i.e., the Semarang 2011 theme) is highly meaningful in terms of Indonesian culture and a theme

> that is presently of concern to Indonesian language educators, that could be a good reason for having it. One slightly more domestic theme out of five seems reasonable. We do worry about the overly-western aspects of TESOL. Why shouldn't an Indonesian ELT conference have **an Indonesian theme** once in a while? (emphasis added).
>
> But there's more to say: "character building" *used* to be a crucial component and rationale of western (Anglo, US & UK) education systems *and* if memory serves, it has recently resurfaced in the education literature ...
>
> So, I think that to play it safe, you might consider **modifying #3** to open it out a bit. Something like (though this sounds clumsy) "**Language teaching in the contexts of character building, liberal education, and citizenship in the 21st century**" (emphasis added)

From the responses given by five Western scholars, it is clear that only Crookes thinks that a "typically Indonesian theme" should once in a while be allowed; and yet, some modification is necessary to make it more amenable to the international participants.

When it comes down to a "controversial cultural issue", Western scholars may have different opinions. As discussed above, their opinions concerning the inclusion of character building in an ELT conference theme range from sounding "odd to English-speaking ears" to the possible occasional inclusion—with some modification of the theme. Briefly, their responses fall into three different categories: (a) it sounds odd and thus should be rejected; (b) it is always there in ELT but only implicitly carried out; and (c) it should be allowed as a national variation.

However, it should be noted that "character building" implies "different meanings" as it is seen from Indonesian and Western perspectives. In Indonesia, as made clear in its verbal formulation in the 2003 Government Regulation as well as in its reformulation in the 2013 Curriculum, emphasis is given on the prominence of **religious belief, humanistic values, and personal integrity**. On the other hand, in the Western perspective, **personal integrity** takes the greatest prominence, making humanistic values implicit and pushing out religious belief, owing to the fact that Western education belongs to the so-called *secular* domain. Note that the term "secular" here is used as a neutral term, putting it in contrast with the "religious" domain (see Kadarisman 2008).

This is what Crookes says about "character building",

> Character education could be considered part of general "liberal education", in which language teaching plays an important role when we learn languages not for mere instrumental purposes (to get a job, to order a meal in a foreign restaurant) but when we are learning to be **part of humanity** as a whole, to develop critical intercultural communication, and so on (emphasis added).

Along this line of "secular" reasoning, Kasper gives more elaboration,

> All education is **morally oriented** of course (emphasis added). Rational and critical thinking, questioning authority, being or becoming an active democratic citizen, caring for the environment and a more equal distribution of resources, creativity, responsibility, empathy, cooperativeness and collegiality are certainly

educational goals even at university level, but they are more "seen but unnoticed" in a hidden curriculum.

Notice that both Crookes and Kasper refer to character education as inculcating "individual and social qualities" on the part of EFL learners, without mentioning their religious beliefs whatsoever. Although Kasper states that "all education is morally oriented", she further specifies that "moral orientation" in the Western sense has nothing to do with religion; but rather it means personal integrity, individual capability, social awareness and responsibility, and environmental care.

III. Implicit and Explicit Character Education in FL Teaching

Moving further, I would like to compare between "implicit" and "explicit" ways of carrying out character education in FL teaching. In the Western world as well as in the earlier English curricula in Indonesia, character education is (and was) done implicitly. It is carried out through exemplary deeds and ideal models at school and in the classroom. At school, students "learn" by indirectly absorbing the clear vision and mission of the school, good and visionary leadership by the headmaster, efficient and effective administration of educational needs, and keeping the school environment clean and green. In the EFL classroom, students "learn moral values" from the teacher's self-discipline, professionalism in carrying out educational and instructional tasks, promptness in beginning and ending the lesson, responsibility of correcting and giving back students' assignments, and graceful and friendly ways in treating the students. Moreover, they also "learn intellectual values" from

the teacher's high competence in English and professionalism in teaching: near-native fluency in speech, eloquence in writing as demonstrated in class while explaining the lesson, lively ways of presenting vocabulary, systematic and clear ways of explaining grammatical structures, and well-executed and tactful ways of correcting learners' errors. In sum, the **implicit character education** takes place when students keep on learning from the school that presents itself as an educational model and from their EFL teachers who present themselves as professional models with respect to moral and intellectual values.

In fact, in the 2013 English Curriculum, while character education is made explicit and religious as well as humanistic attitudes are formally incorporated into the *Buku Guru* (Teachers' Manual), English instruction in the classroom—I predict—will very probably proceed as it did before. The "moral values" are indeed put explicitly throughout the Teachers' Manual (see Table 4), as illustrated by parts of the "guidelines" for Chapter I: "How Are You?"

Table 4. Incorporating Moral Values into the *Buku Guru* (Teachers' Manual)

Page	Indonesian Version	English Translation
	Fungsi sosial dari ...	The social function of ...
29	(sapaan dan pamitan): Menjaga hubungan interpersonal dengan guru dan teman	(greeting and parting): Keeping [good] interpersonal relation with the teacher and classmates

30	(perkenalan): Memperkenalkan diri untuk menjalin hubungan interpersonal dengan guru dan teman	(self-introduction): Introducing oneself to promote interpersonal relation with the teacher and classmates
30	(bernyanyi): Menghibur, mengungkapkan perasaaan, menghayati pesan moral	(singing): Entertaining, expressing feelings, and appreciating moral values
30	Topik (dalam nyanyian): Hal-hal yang memberikan keteladanan tentang perilaku yang menginspirasi	Topic (in the song): Topics which show exemplary deeds and give inspiration

The guidelines picked out as illustrative examples in Table 4 clearly indicate the decisive governmental act of "moralizing English instruction". However, the relevant question is: will such moralistic goals of teaching English in Indonesia get accomplished in the instruction? Are there ways to measure the learners' acquired moral values after they have learned greetings, parting, self-introduction, and sung a song? Or alternatively, is the assessment to be done more on the proficiency aspects of learning English? They are, as noted on pp. 29-30, *ucapan, tekanan kata, intonasi, ejaan, tanda baca, dan tulisan tangan dan cetak yang jelas dan rapi* (pronunciation, word stress, intonation, spelling, punctuation, and clear and neat handwriting and printed words). I believe it is much easier to measure the learners' progress in acquiring these "tangible" aspects of English proficiency than to evaluate their progress

in acquiring the "intangible" moral values. Indeed, the success of English instruction is determined by the learners' success of learning these tangible proficiency aspects. Therefore, in spite of the moralistic nature of the new curriculum, EFL teachers will probably keep devoting themselves to teaching English (language components and skills) as they did before. Moreover, as argued earlier, students will acquire moral values not through listening to "eloquent sermons" but through imitating "exemplary deeds". In education as well as in social life, action speaks louder than words.

The implicit character education in ELT is socioculturally an integral part of Western literacy or, broadly speaking, Western education. This is in sharp contrast with the teaching of Arabic in the *pesantren* (Islamic boarding school) culture. In this respect, Kasper's *Google* reference[6] is of particular interest, as quoted somewhat redundantly below.

> The idea of "character building" is not alien to "Western" thinking, or rather what I now of it. But it seems strangely obsolete to me, so I googled it. I found that character building is a key goal in Islamic education. If the sources can be trusted, it seems that it is not a specifically Indonesian concern but shared in the Islamic world.

In Indonesian context, *pesantren* may be considered one best manifestation of Islamic education, with the goal of preserving Prophet Muhammad's messengership: *li utammima makaarima al-akhlaaq*[7], or "to bring the noble character into perfection". Therefore, learning Arabic in *pesantren* has a clear instrumental purpose: it is a prerequisite for understanding Islam, especially

6 The citation here is a direct quote from Kasper's reply to my email, discussed earlier.

7 This quote is part of the well-known saying of the Prophet, "Innamaa bu'itstu liutammima makaarima al-akhlaaq," meaning "I have been sent down as a prophet chiefly to bring the noble character into perfection" (see "Al-Adab al-Mufrad" no. 73, by Al-Imaam al-Bukhaariy).

the Qur'an (the holy book for the moslems) and the Hadeeth (the prophetic traditions, or what Prophet Muhammad said and did during his lifetime).

From my own personal experience of becoming a *santri* (Islamic student) at Pondok Modern Darussalam in Ponorogo during the 1970s, better known as "Gontor" (the name of the village where the *pesantren* is located), "character building" was and still is very explicit in its educational system. The four mottoes of this *pesantren* are: *akhlaaqun kariemah, ajsaamun shahiehah, 'uluumun waasi'ah,* and *afkaarun hurrah* (noble character, healthy physique, broad knowledge, and freedom of mind). Note that "noble character", following the ultimate goal of Islamic education, is placed first and hence given the highest prominence among the four mottoes.

Since it takes the lead in all educational activities, character building plays the most important role. It shows up in the Curriculum, which is included within *Panduan Manajemen KMI Pondok Modern Darussalam Gontor* (2006: 20-21), or Management Guidelines for KMI, Modern Islamic Boarding School, Darussalam Gontor. KMI or *Kulliyyat al-Mu'allimien al-Islamiyyah* (Islamic Teacher Education) is a six-year schooling, combining the lower and upper levels of secondary education. At KMI, the *pesantren* subjects are grouped into three categories: (a) Islamic subjects, (b) Arabic subjects, and (c) general-knowledge subjects.

I will discuss Arabic subjects later, and mention Islamic subjects and general-knowledge subjects first to set up a background. The Islamic subjects include: (1) *al-Qur'an* (the Qur'an), (2) *tajwid* (phonetics and phonology of the Qur'an), (3) *tafsir* (interpretation of the Qur'an), (4) *tarjamah* (translation of Qur'anic verses), (5) *hadits* (prophetic traditions), (6) *mustalah hadits* (analytic judgments on prophetic traditions),

(7) *fiqih* (Islamic jurisprudence), (8) *ushul fiqih* (logic of Islamic jurisprudence), (9) *faraid* (sharing inheritance), (10) *tauhid* (Islamic theology), (11) *ad-dien al-Islamie* (Islamic civilization), (12) *muqaranat al-adyan* (comparative religions), and (13) *tarikh Islam* (history of Islam).

The subjects of general-knowledge (translated into English) include: (1) Indonesian, (2) English, (3) mathematics, (4) physics, (5) chemistry, (6) biology, (7) geography, (8) history, (9) book keeping, (10) civics, (11) sociology, (12) psychology, (13) education and instruction, and (14) logic.

It should be noted that at Gontor all textbooks for the Islamic subjects, except for the first-year students, are written in Arabic. Accordingly, learning Arabic is geared into two directions: first, as an absolutely necessary instrument for understanding Islamic textbooks, and secondly, as an indirect instrument for absorbing Islamic values. So, as noted earlier, Arabic subjects make up a second category; they are placed after Islamic subjects and before subjects of general-knowledge. In other words, Gontor is a *pesantren* that takes up Islamic values at the highest level, Arabic as a religious instrument at the second level, and general-knowledge that broadens students' intellectual horizon at the third level.

Now it should be obvious that in the *pesantren* culture the teaching of Arabic is inseparable part of religious education. Accordingly, **character education is incorporated into and made explicit within Arabic instruction**. As shown in Table 5, Arabic instruction at Gontor includes 11 subjects.

The subjects that belong to Arabic proper are *nahwu* (sentence structure), *sharaf* (word structure), *tamrin al-lughah* (language exercises), *muthala'ah* (reading comprehension), and *insya'* (composition). *Muthala'ah* (reading comprehension)

needs special comments here. In English reading books[8], only few passages belong to narratives, usually with a "surprise ending", whereas most passages belong to many other different text types: recount, descriptive, report, procedure, exposition, discussion, explanation, and news item. This is because since 2004 English instruction at the secondary school level has been using the genre-based approach (Emilia 2011). By contrast, many passages in Arabic reading books are imbued with explicit character education.

Table 5. Arabic Subjects at *Pesantren* Gontor

No	Subjects	English Translation
1	imla'	dictation
2	tamrin al-lughah	(Arabic) language exercises
3	insya'	composition
4	muthala'ah	reading comprehension
5	nahwu	sentence structure
6	sharaf	word structure
7	balaghah	poetics
8	tarikh adab al-lughah	history of Arabic literature
9	mahfuzhat	cultural and literary maxims
10	al-mu'jam	(Arabic) dictionary
11	khath	calligraphy

At Gontor, the four-volume reading books *al-Qiraa'at al-Rasyiedah* (Smart Reading) have been in use since the 1960s: volume 1 for the 2nd year, volume 2 for the 3rd year, volume 3 for the 4th year, and volume 4 for the 5th year. To illustrate,

8 See, for example, Interactive English Learning for SMA/MA Students (Grade X, 2006), Interactive English Learning for SMA/MA Students (Grade XI, 2007), and Developing English Competencies for Senior High School (SMA/MA) – Grade XII of Natural and Social Science Programmes, 2008.

al-Qiraa'at al-Rasyiedah volume 1 contains 60 reading texts; they fall into four categories: (a) 10 narrative texts, (b) 38 descriptive-expository texts, (c) 4 dialogues, and (d) 8 couplets of Arabic poetry. Out of these 60 reading passages, about 30 texts are selected as reading materials for the 2nd year students. Interestingly, all the 10 narratives are included in the instructional materials; for psychologically, stories and new vocabularies in them are easier to remember, and educationally, they are explicit examples leading to character building.

As noted earlier, the narrative texts are imbued with character education, with the "moral of the story" sometimes explicitly stated at the end, as shown in *al-Qiraa'at al-Rasyiedah* volume 1. In "*Al-Shobiyyu wa al-Fiel*" or the Boy and the Elephant, a story of a boy and an elephant teasing and mocking each other, the narrative ends with the following line "*wa 'alima anna-l-ladzie yaf'alu al-syarra yalqaa al-syarra*" (So the boy knew that whoever does harm to others will get harm in return, p. 18). In "*Al-Asadu wa al-Fa'ru*" or the Lion and the Mouse, a story of a kind-hearted lion and a helpful mouse, the moral of the story—often cited orally by students at Gontor outside the classroom—is "*Laa tahtaqir man duunaka fa likulli syai'in maziyyatun*" (Never insult anyone lower in status than you are, for everyone excels in a particular way, p. 24.) And in "*Al-Syarru bi al-Syarri*" or Wrongdoing for Wrongdoers, a story of a boy beating an innocent dog and getting beaten by an educating adult, is concluded by a verse from the Qur'an (42: 40) "*fajazaa'u sayyi'atin sayyi'atun mitsluhaa*" (Let evil be rewarded with like evil [Dawood 1990: 486], p. 72). In short, the moral of every story in the reading book for the second-year students relates directly to moral values in Islam; and so does the moral of each story in the other three reading books for the higher classes.

Going back to Table 5, *imla'* (dictation) and *khath*

(calligraphy) need special notes. They tell us that "right spelling" is of great importance, and so is "beautiful writing" — especially as related to Qur'anic verses. This goes along with *tajwid* (phonetics and phonology of the Qur'an), mentioned earlier under the Islamic subjects. These three subjects make students aware that they should give due reverence to the Qur'an: read it with the accurate and precise pronunciation, write it with the right spelling, and make the verses look beautiful and appealing by writing them in calligraphy.

As the students are moving toward the advanced level, they should learn *balaghah* (poetics), which helps them understand and hence appreciate Arabic literature in general and the Qur'an in particular. The moslems believe that their holy book conveys divine messages using the most eloquent form and thus the best literature of Arabic, as the Qur'an (2: 23-24) itself claims that no poet or man of letters can ever compete against it in terms of literary beauty. Similarly, from *tarikh adab al-lughah* (history of Arabic literature) advanced students learn more about Arabic literature in a historical perspective, which again puts the Qur'an at the center holding the highest reverence.

Finally, *mahfuzhat* (cultural and literary maxims) and *al-mu'jam* (Arabic dictionary) will round off their knowledge of Arabic, its literature, and its culture. *Mahfuzhaat*, which literally means "literary expressions to be memorized", is a compilation of proverbs, well-known sayings, and great poems of the past. By learning *mahfuzhat*, the students are introduced to literary expressions from the very beginning, so that they are expected to become sensitive to poetic beauty. In terms of content, they are expected to absorb all the moral values, since *mahfuzhaat* (which they must memorize and will be given to them as an oral exam) contains various religious and moral wisdoms passed down from generation to generation in the Islamic world. Great pieces of *mahfuzhat* go hand in hand

with knowledge about culture-specific and language-specific expressions the students learn from *al-mu'jam*. This subject, literally meaning "dictionary", not only enables students how to use monolingual Arabic dictionaries to enrich their vocabulary and reading skills, but also introduces them to varieties of expressions and idioms in Arabic as related to cultural values and moral wisdoms.

And what is the result of Arabic instruction at Gontor? Throughout the decades, since the 1950s until 2010s, it has been a remarkable success. The sixth-year students (equal to the third-year students in upper high schools) at this *pesantren* are generally fluent users of Arabic. They understand lectures in Arabic well; they are able to speak and teach elementary and intermediate materials to their juniors; they can read standard Arabic textbooks (on religious, language, and literary subjects) fluently; and they can write compositions well. Moreover, as required, every student is able to write a religious sermon in Arabic and, acting as a *khatib* and *imam*[9], read it out to the *jama'ah* (congregation) during the Friday prayer. In other words, their mastery of listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills is truly outstanding—compared with the results of Arabic instruction in (public or private) Islamic high schools in Indonesia in general. Graduates from Gontor, mostly having excellent Arabic proficiency, are ready to pursue a bachelor degree in Islamic studies or in Arabic language and literature at a university in an Arabic-speaking country.

The reasons for this great success of learning Arabic are obvious. First, Arabic is formally taught in the classroom and then used as a real means of communication within the *pesantren* 24 hours a day. Secondly, all Islamic textbooks are written in Arabic; and so this language has been used in a

9 One in charge of leading the Friday prayer acts as the khatib (sermon-giver) and imam (prayer leader) at the same time. At Gontor, this is a religious-academic requirement for graduation.

well-planned, six-year immersion program. Third and finally, within the *pesantren*, using Arabic, together with English, for daily communication is made obligatory. Those who break this rule will be given an educational language-punishment; and thus all students try to do their best to keep using Arabic anyplace and anytime. In short, it is this **rigorous training through the years** that makes Arabic instruction at Gontor a remarkable success—despite the fact that the instructional materials and the teaching method have remained relatively the same in the last five decades.

While Gontor formally claims using the *direct method*, in reality the *communicative approach* has unwittingly been at work there all the time (see Brown 2001). Many principles of communicative language teaching (CLT) are in operation there: "meaning is paramount; language learning is learning to communicate; contextualization is the basic premise; effective communication is sought; language is often created by the learners through trial and error; intrinsic motivation springs from an interest in what is being communicated by the language; and communicative competence is the desired goal" (p. 45). More importantly, while these principles are at work, many senior instructors are graduates from universities in Arabic-speaking countries. They are in charge of keeping the 'Arabic-speaking community' at Gontor moving on and going in the right direction.

At this point, the striking difference between English instruction in secondary schools (and at universities) and Arabic instruction in *pesantren* should be very clear. English instruction aims at helping Indonesian EFL learners master English as a means of international communication, so that eventually they can get engaged in fluent conversation with foreigners, read English textbooks and documents easily as they pursue their career or higher degrees in education, and write well in English as required by their jobs or their research

projects in the academia. And so, character education is definitely implicit in English instruction.

On the other hand, by learning Arabic in *pesantren*, the students are expected to be able to use it as a necessary instrument for understanding the Qur'an, the Hadeeth, Islamic theology, jurisprudence, history, culture, and civilization. Learning Arabic for them is thus a necessary requirement for becoming truly devoted and intellectually knowledgeable moslems. Religious and moral values are therefore carried all the way through in the process of learning Arabic. As a result, it is not surprising that character education, as made clear in the practice of education at Gontor, becomes explicit and central in Arabic instruction in the *pesantren* culture.

IV. ELT in Indonesia: Future Direction

In this paper, "character building in ELT" has been raised as an intriguing cross-cultural issue. At a glance, this relates to seminar and conference themes which are typically Indonesian. But, as we pursue the issue further, character education is meant to be a systematic response to serious moral problems afflicting the whole country. So, the government has recently launched the 2013 Curriculum, which is heavily moralistic in its design. In this curriculum, character education is made explicit for every school subject, including English. Strangely enough, when "attitude" is translated as direct manifestation of learners' religious belief and moral value, and then put verbally within the new English Curriculum as "basic competencies", they sound odd and bizarre, which could be shocking to the international community.

The explicit inclusion of character education into the 2013 English Curriculum, in my opinion, will not significantly change the actual practice of teaching and learning English in the classroom. Since the new textbooks accompanying the curriculum are designed as activity-based and genre-based

materials (see footnote 3), English instruction in Indonesian high schools will probably proceed as it did before. It will not become moralistic, but remain academic in nature.

Moreover, the success of English instruction does not depend on the inclusion of character education, but on observing the sound principles of FL teaching: (a) the instructional objectives reflecting learner needs are well defined; (b) the instructional materials are well selected and well graded; (c) the EFL teachers are professional—academically, educationally, socially, and personally; (d) the teaching methods and instructional media are well chosen and appropriately used; (e) the class size is small so that every learner has good opportunity to practice their English; and (f) the time allotment is adequate so that intensive training may take place. These are "well-known principles" or "iron laws" (Sadtono 2010: 15) determining the success of ELT (see Brown 2011, Harmer 2007, River 1981), not only for lower and upper secondary schools but also for tertiary education, particularly ELT at English Departments in Indonesia. Recall that the success of Arabic instruction at Gontor is mainly determined by faithful observation of the sound principles above.

The 2013 Curriculum claims that it is ready to help prepare "golden generations" that will meet gigantic needs of the nation in the year 2045. With specific reference to ELT in Indonesia, are we optimistic? Notice that, while time allotment for English at the lower secondary school remains 4 instructional hours (4 X 40 minutes = 160 minutes) every week, time allotment for the upper secondary school has been reduced from 4 to 2 instructional hours (2 X 45 minutes = 90 minutes)[10]. In the meantime, the average class size in Indonesian high schools comprises 35-40 students. In other

10 In the 2013 Curriculum, English is officially allotted 2 instructional hours per week, plus the possibility of having 3 additional instructional hours based on students' interest and learning achievement (Materi Pelatihan Guru: Implementasi Kurikulum 2013: 91-2).

words, two important requirements (i.e., adequate time allotment and small class size) are *not* met. So, it would be too much to expect the emergence of "golden generations" who are fluent in using English as active members of the global community. Again, this is a country of big slogans: we are talking big about "golden generations" of 2045; but the sufficient and necessary condition for this national ambition (i.e., mastery of English as a means of international communication) is ignored and neglected.

Finally, we may say that a cigarette ad could ironically be taken as good advice: for the future of ELT in Indonesia, we need to talk less and do more.

Acknowledgements.

The completion of this paper is due in part to the generosity of three helpful individuals. Accordingly, I would like to thank, first, my mentor Drs. M. Akrim Mariyat, Dipl. A. Ed., a senior instructor at KMI and a senior lecturer at Institut Studi Islam Darussalam (ISID) at Pondok Modern Darussalam Gontor, Ponorogo, for providing all necessary information about the practice of Islamic education in general and of learning Arabic in particular at this modern *pesantren*. Secondly, my sincere gratitude goes to Dr. Nurul Murtadho, a colleague and a friend at the Arabic Department, School of Letters, State University of Malang (UM), for providing some Arabic references and helping me translate many Arabic terms and expressions into English. Third and finally, I am very grateful to Dini Kurnia Irmawati, M.Pd., a doctoral candidate at the Study Program of English Language Teaching, School of Graduate Studies (PPs), State University of Malang (UM), for proofreading the earlier draft of this paper and suggesting improvements. Any possible deficiency and negligence, however, are my responsibility alone.

References

Abdu al-Baaqiy, Muhammad Fu'aad. 1987 (1407Anno Hegera). *Al-Mu'jam al-Mufashras li al-Faazhi al-Qur'aan al-Kariem* (A Word-based Dictionary for Searching Qur'anic Verses). Lebanon, Beirut: Daar al-Kutub.

Brown, Douglas H. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (Second Edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buku Guru Bahasa Inggris (Manual for English Teachers), *When English Rings the Bell*, SMP/MTs Kelas VII. 2013. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Buku Saku Pendidikan Karakter Sekolah Menengah Pertama (A Pocket Book of Character Education for the Junior High School). 2012. Jakarta: Direktorat Pembinaan Sekolah Menengah Pertama, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Dawood, N. J. (Translator) 1990. *The Koran, with Parallel Arabic Text*. London: Pinguin Books.

Electronic Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2007

Emilia, Emi. 2011. *Pendekatan* Genre-Based *dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk untuk Guru* (Genre-based Approach to English Language Teaching: A Guide for Teachers). Bandung: Rizqi Press.

Fries, Charles C. 1945. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. *On Communicative Competence*. In Prides, J. B. & Holmes, J.(eds.). Sociolinguistics (pp. 269-85). Harmondsworth: Pinguin.

(Al)-Imaam al-Bukhaariy. In *"Al-Adab al-Mufrad"* (Validated Prophetic Traditions on Islamic Morality) no. 73. Accessed from ejabat.google.com/ejabat.thread?tid.

Kadarisman, A. Effendi. 2008. Hipotesis Sapir-Whorf dan Ungkap-Verbal Keagamaan (The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and Religious Verbal Expressions). *Linguistic Indonesia*, Year 26, Vol. 1: 1-21, February 2008.

Kadarisman, A. Effendi. 2012. Mapping out Mentalism in Present-day Linguistics and other Related Disciplines. *Linguistic Indonesia*, Year 30, Vol. 1: 1-23, February 2013.

Kelly, Louis G. 1969. *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Materi Pelatihan Guru: Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 – SMP Bahasa Inggris (Materials for Teacher Training: Implementing the 2013 Curriculum – English for Lower Secondary School). Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

P4: Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila (Guidelines for Understanding and Practicing *Pancasila*). 1986. Jakarta: Sekjen MPR RI Jakarta

Panduan Manajemen KMI Pondok Modern Darussalam Gontor (Management Guidelines for KMI, Modern Islamic Boarding School, Darussalam Gontor). 2006. Ponorogo: Darussalam Press.

(Al)-Qur'an al-Kariem (in Arabic). 1985. Bandung: Sinar Baru.

Rivers, Wilga M. 1981. *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills* (Second Edition). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Sadtono, Eugeneus. 2010. Beberapa Aspek Pengajaran Bahasa Asing (Aspects of Foreign Language Teaching) in *Antologi Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris* (Anthology of English Language Teaching), pp. 15-32. Malang: Ma Chung Press.

Student Books (in English and Arabic) Selected as Instructional-Material References

Bahasa Inggris, When English Rings the Bell. 2013. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Developing English Competencies for Senior High School (SMA/MA) – Grade XII of Natural and Social Science Programmes. 2008. Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Interactive English Learning for SMA/MA Students (Grade X). 2006. Malang: Dinas Pendidikan Kota Malang.

Interactive English Learning for SMA/MA Students (Grade XI). 2007. Malang: Dinas Pendidikan Kota Malang.

Shabrie, Abdul Fattaah and 'Umar, 'Ali. (no year). *(Al)-Qiraa'ah al-Rasyiedah* (Smart Reading) volumes 1 and 2. Surabaya: Maktabah al-Hidaayah. (The original versions were officially stated by the Ministry of Education of Egypt [in the 1950s] as Textbooks for the Elementary School in this country.)