
Part One :

Language Planning and Character Building

The Politics of ELT: Threats to Teachers' Identity and National Character Building

Taufiq Effendi

University of New South Wales, Australia

Abstract: ELT has progressively turned into a tremendously far-reaching political vehicle for various parties. This threatens the identity of English teachers and the efforts for national character building. For the West, ELT could contribute to the exploit of establishing, expanding and maintaining their "Glory". For widespread missionary organisations, it is modified as attracting sweet that carries "Gospel" agenda. For other groups, it is discovered to be a highly powerful arm to amass "Gold". These "3G" orientations spotlight the fact that ELT is fragile to concealed agendas and ironically this makes English teaching is potentially a politically loaded profession. Out of the three drives, however, Phillipson (1992) argues that the first is likely to be the most devastating attack to the rest of the globe. Anglocentricity has overshadowed the world of view of individuals especially in the neo-colonialised countries. Consequently, teachers, the key everyday actors for national character building, are subject to such colonial shadow and become bias transformers (Varghese et. al., 2005: 22; Pennycook and Marin, 2010: 349). Seeing this global poli-linguistic occupation, national awareness to counter Anglocentricity in order to foster teacher identity and national character building free from colonial shadow is urgent.

I. Introduction

For a few decades, there have been discussions on how English language teaching is considered biased as it can be largely influenced by political forces. This is indicated by the fact that the teaching of English program has progressively turned into a tremendously far-reaching rewarding industry of any interested parties, most clearly the overruling English-speaking countries. The Director-General of the British Council revealed in the 1987/88 *Annual Report* (page 8): as

sited by Phillipson (1992: 48-49) "Britain's real black gold is not North Sea oil but the English language. ... The challenge facing us is to exploit it to the full." Phillipson subsequently disclosed that Britain's action to expand this exploitation was shortly tagged on by the US through an initial major project with Macmillan Publishing Company to take an active part in the global scenario. These two actions officially signify the departure point of the politics in English language and teaching.

Triggered by the lucrative potential the language teaching could generate, the coalition, as what Karmani (2005) discloses, has turned an English teaching pedagogy into a maneuver that dictates other countries and creates a money-spinning machine that adds to the giant earnings from their main abuse conducts. One upshot of their blow has resulted in the tremendous number of countries that have started using the language in their education system and eventually ascending it to reach a privilege status as their official language (Pennycook and Marin, 2010: 339). This global massive occurrence has unmistakably brought about huge benefits to the dominating English-speaking alliance. This aftermath leads us to come to a conclusion that English language teaching is likely to be the vehicle for political agenda and therefore English teachers whether consciously or not could become its agents. To understand this concept, I would like to illustrate how scholars have framed this issue into three major angles: Glory, Gospel and Gold. Subsequently, I would like to draw how this is connected to teacher identity and national character building, another issue in the field.

II. Western "Glory"

In today's post-colonial era, English language teaching is argued to denote the domination of Western power. It is

seen to have been used as a tool that contributes to the exploit of establishing, expanding and maintaining the Glory of the West. The teaching of English language acts as a main bridge for targeted nations to enter the world of imperialist ideologies through the medium of the language (Phillipson, 1992). Once English is taught, the targeted world citizens learn and use it, the West then can utilize it to further impose their ideas, penetrate and gradually shift the local heritage and realities. Phillipson (1992: 52-53) argues that language is a medium by which the main "centre" communicates and controls their "periphery" agents and also the medium by which they broadcast their version of the world (Phillipson, 1992: 52-53). Such occupation could take up both directions: top-down and bottom-up constructions. The penetration can penetrate the elites and the elites shape individuals in the society. As a result, each individual, having shared this occupying imagination, reinforce the construction to sustain the elites.

This is where the critical role of the teaching of the language comes in. Karmani (2005) puts forward his findings; English teaching in Islamic states was seen to have contributed to the strengthening of the Western domination in the regions. This is further said as one way to fight against "terrorism", the emerging term the West has invented. As a result, the people learn less Islam but more English. This evidence has put all the individuals and their local heritage at an obvious risk. a massive and revolutionary shift has then started to take place. This could result in manifold detrimental impact to the whole design of the nation.

III. "Gospel" Orientation

Apart from the goal of a power, English language teaching is found to be a potential vehicle that carries "Gospel"

orientation. The purpose of such movement varies from merely spreading its messages to aiming at proselytizing people of other cultures and religions and especially the believers of Islam. Such an orientation is known to be Teaching English as a Missionary Language (TEML). One example of this movement is carried out by some missionary organizations that work with the United States (Pennycook and Marine, 2010). One reason of how this is happening is because these organizations carry more or less the same intention. In this manner, their missions co-exist and therefore demonstrate strong interdependency.

Said (1977: XII-XIII) discloses that the elites in the White House are notoriously ambitious in designing the world of their version. In particular, they are aiming at redesigning Muslim countries. One way of achieving this goal is to welcome and support the action nicely covered by the teaching of English language to spread Christianity (Pennycook and Marin, 2010). Said (1977: 100) reveals that Britain had even acted on this mission much earlier since a few centuries ago. At this stage, one might wonder how TEML could gain some success in foreign countries. Tennant (2002) in Pennycook and Marin (2005: 341) narrated "build a church, and no one will come. Start an English school, and you'll get anyone". He further elaborates that English teaching mask is extremely powerful and therefore is a key foundation of the church planting effort across the globe (p. 340). Having said that, it was concluded that English language teaching is potentially political to deliver Gospel messages.

IV. "Gold" Temptation

Finally, as briefly mentioned in the former introduction, English teaching is also discovered to be a highly powerful

arm to amass "Gold". It has been widely attractive and driven diverse actors to move participating in the global spread of the language. The actors come from native and non-native countries. For the sake of material fortune, these players would do every possible strategy to promote this industry. It is documented that English teaching is now "a highly lucrative international commodity with an annual turnover of over \$9.6 billion (Language Travel Magazine, 2004 in Karmani, 2005: 365). Such an alluring promise in addition to other appeals has driven the West to take wide-ranging actions and disseminate their language weapons (Phillipson, 1992).

Adding to this, a sample of research done in Japan might be worth looking at to see how Gold hunters play their role in order to gain as much earnings as they could in the English language teaching industry. It was Bailey (2006) who reports that most Japanese business-owned-English language schools in the country utilized a strategy that might not be common in other countries, to get as many female customers as possible. They tried to create imagination that makes female Japanese have sexual desire towards white male teachers. These female Japanese targeted customers are made to wonder the opportunity to escalate their social status, gain better career and live a special life by having a relationship with white male teachers. The exploitation of native speaker male teachers these language schools hire whispers a hidden message that English teaching can be used as an economic device to grab abundance of wealth no matter what steps that they employ. Driven by profit orientation, this actor has either consciously or unconsciously been supporting and maintaining the Western dominance.

V. Threats to teachers' identity and national character building

Having said that, the presence of English teachers is argued to play a central role in this "poli-linguistic" realm. The politics of ELT triggered by Glory, Gospel and Gold agenda can hardly operate without their participation. They are inseparable element in the unity of the world of English language teaching. As they are involved, their identity is likely to have been constructed according to what political drive they are part of. Clearly, they are the active agents of change and creation dictated by a power they belong to. To illustrate the earlier discussion, teachers are central to be used as the projectors that display orientalist beautiful sceneries to attract and hypnotise their targeted viewers, a nice way to safeguard colonial power. Teachers are also vital to be used as games that can make their targets pleased, entertained and addicted to have more without their noticing the hidden message that underlies the creation and exposure of the games, a beautifully concealed way to spread Christian beliefs. In addition, teachers are potential to be utilized as the sweet that attracts a huge population of ants, a quite common way to make money from ELT industry. This damaging upshot could clearly generate threats to teachers' identity and in the long run to our national character building.

Taking these three different possible roles of English teachers as the agents of power, religion and wealth, as what Varghese et. al. (2005: 22) also argues, it is difficult to say that English teachers are unbiased transformers. In a stronger tone, Pennycook and Marin (2010: 349) even exacerbate this understanding by suggesting, "From a critical perspective, teaching is never ideologically neutral." All these views, then, lead to a frame that English language teaching is a politically

loaded profession and therefore English teachers, whether native or non-native, would find it difficult to avoid not becoming its agents either consciously or not. In other words, their identity is to a great extent constructed by their particular political construction in their particular context.

In regards to the identity of English teachers, anglocentricity can manifest in various aspects. One indicator could be reflected on the perception of the non-native and native-speakerness dichotomy. The perception of superiority of native speaker teacher over non-native can operate in the subjectivity of the teachers, students and everyone. Pavlenko (2003) well illustrates how non-native English speaker students felt inferior towards their native English speaker classmates. Before knowing they can consider themselves as legitimate multi-lingual speakers, these students felt unconfident in their English competence despite the fact that they had become English teachers and at that moment they were pursuing a post-graduate program in TESOL in the United States. Similar picture of how identity of English teachers appears and who they should be in most realities was expressed by the school students whom a non-native English teacher was assigned to teach. These individuals expressed disagreement of having a non-native English teacher. This collective experience reflects that the colonial shadow was playing a considerable role in the minds of these individuals. This might conclude that even if an image-text approach were employed, the pre-existing of the colonial image of a perfect world has taken its position in each individual's subjectivity.

Another indicator could be seen by the attitude of non-native teachers towards published textbooks. The perception of the superiority of native speakers has somehow led to teachers' vulnerability against books published by the Western publishers. Many considered, if not all, regarded these

textbooks as all-encompassing teaching resources (Richards, 1998) they could hardly argue about. This has caused significant reliance on textbooks that could result in a gradual deskilling of teachers' potential. Consequently, textbook has become the main "engine" for Western domination and therefore it is not a surprise *"that the world market is flooded with textbooks not grounded in (the) local sociocultural milieu"* (Kumaravadivelu in Meddings and Thornbury, 2009: 11). *"Ironically, many have been found to carry hidden curriculum that impose western values and cultures (Pennycook, 2002).*

The two indicators are simply a tiny proportion of representatives of how anglocentricity can threaten the identity and beliefs of teachers and other actors involved in the whole system of English education. Pennycook (2002: 22) argues, "Much of what we do as language teachers, teacher educators, parents, applied linguists and so on may be directed by popular discourses that are derived from the spirit of neo-imperialism". This seems to imply that the effect of the anglocentricity is considerable and devastating to nations of other cultures.

VI. Reflection of Anglocentricity in Indonesian context

A reflection of this colonial shadow in Indonesian context could be seen from the outcry against the removal of English subject in primary school. Social networks and media were flooded by negative reactions from not only the grassroots but also from scholars and even English teachers. Many tried to convince the government that English mastery is an obvious mediator as well as moderator for the future success of not only individuals but also the country. It was also argued that failing to master the language is an obvious indicator of the failure of the national achievements (Putri,

2012). Another perspective was also raised to demonstrate that the policy to remove the subject was inappropriate. English subject had to stay because it was argued to be a must-have ability and communicative methodology had to be the key to achieving this goal (Martin, 2012). This opinion added the two indicators discussed earlier: superiority of native-speakerness and reliance on textbooks. It reflects what Box (2003) calls as "CLT attitude" which is a widely held belief that CLT is a stand-alone technology that would work in any particular classrooms of any other traditions. These two attitudes represent how Anglocentricity seems to have a strong root in Indonesian society.

Anglocentricity can cause people to fail to recognise that success is a multi-dimensional concept and therefore has manifold contributing factors. It is hard to defend that English mastery would be an obvious key to one's success and therefore has to sacrifice other factors for the sake of giving it as early as primary schoolhood. Even if the goal is for "science and technology advancement, teaching English in primary school is not the answer" (Alwasilah, 2012). Likewise, a success of a generation nation-wide cannot be caused by a single mediator. Many people in the world achieve success without having to master the language. Again, success is a manifold concept that is interpreted different from one person to another. One question remains: what would a person, claimed to be very successful in his/her life, say when asked "what is the key of your success?" Would the person say "it's English"?

To a larger extent, however, this colonial shadow is found to have continuous long term impact and could generate continuous expansion. John Perkins (2004) in his controversial book "Confessions of an economic hit man" reveals the fact that the West was operating a seemingly humanist but

apparently devastating neo-colonialist maneuver that would hit other countries to obey their wishes. One example reports that it is found not only penetrating the profession, but is said to have expanded to a much larger scale in societies. Karmani (2005: 636) reports that the power of colonialist ideology is not staying in schooling hemisphere only but is infiltrating into "almost every major public and private institution in the region; the military, healthcare sector, oil industry, aviation industry, telecommunications sector and so forth were all as a matter of routine required to learn English as part of the region's drive towards industrialization." Such operation would somehow influence every individual included in the circle. The bigger the circle, more individuals are shadowed. This could imply that almost everyone is to a certain degree contaminated by imperialist version. Consequently, the Anglocentricity is to a certain degree taking part in everyone's personal world view.

VII. Construction of Anglocentricity

English language teaching, in its most outer layer, is said to have been controlled by a neo-colonialism structure. This is done systematically through a top-down approach. It goes from the elites, stake holders, powerful mass media and books, other influential people, then goes to society and each individual including teachers and students. The colonialist version of what English language can do and what English language teaching is all about is poured from the top to the bottom very comprehensively until it penetrates the imagination of the society. Each individual in the society interacts, exchanges information, and influences each other. Then, every individual in the society would go overshadowed by the dominant view.

This natural social interaction process strengthens the penetration of the political construction and this makes it even more comprehensive and strongly rooted in the minds of the society. This phase is probably more appropriately called as the social construction phase. In this sense, social construction in neo-colonialism era is apparently taking place after the colonialist political construction. This social construction phase then makes the colonialist image go to everyone's imagination and becomes attached in their unconscious state of mind that is used as the basis in expressing personal subjective view. As a result, every individual in the society, including English teachers, students, elites, stakeholders and so on, unconsciously represent the colonialist political construction point of view when disclosing their seemingly personal narratives/subjective opinion. This is an unavoidable consequence until they get brain-washed with completely contrasting views that wake them up from their hibernation and then use these views to attack the former ones.

In this framework, it could be seen that teacher's identity could be a political construction. An image of what an English teacher should be has first been constructed by the colonialist. Through their systematic structure, every member in the society has received this politically-constructed image of a teacher's identity. Unintentionally, they spread this image and also pass it on to the next generations through a natural social interaction process by a wide range of means of knowledge transfer. This then allows certain uniformity of imagined teacher's identity in all possible settings. Every member in the society has more or less similar ideas, though not identical, of what an English teacher is like.

Then, when they enter the world of English language teaching whether as teachers, supervisors, administrators,

students and any other possible roles, will have had this politically-constructed version of what an English teacher should be. The teachers will have more or less similar ideas. The students will have more or less similar ideas and so do the other members of this community. Teaching begins. The students learn. Classroom activities start. Interaction takes place. Still, all this process operates under the colonial shadow that has been politically constructed by the colonialist before the teaching and learning start. Teachers express their views and transfer their knowledge and skills that somehow represent the colonial image to a certain degree. Students learn and receive the transferred knowledge and synergise the colonialist image they have received before starting the lesson. Both teachers and students express their personal subjectivity but still carry some of the colonialist image. This will not change until the more powerful party in this classroom community gets brain-washed with completely contrasting views to the deeply rooted colonial image and then use the new views to deconstruct the older ones.

With such considerable influence of the colonial shadow, it would be uneasy to foster national character building. Many individuals in the society have been directed to see the world from the perspective of the hegemony. The values of this occupation have been intensively disseminated through media, books, education, research and even popular culture to uniform the globe. This colonial shadow threatens the values, cultures, traditions, religions and other cultural heritage of a nation. To tackle this dominance, there needs to be a prevalent awareness of such colonial shadow operation. The context, realities and particularities of our own country need to receive the main priority.

VIII. Conclusion

At this stage, this paper has tried to address how ELT has been a subject for political interests. Looking at the three forces, it could be argued that the Glory mission has taken the largest portion of the world's population. This is because the West aims at a global scale and English teachers, wherever they are, no matter what their first language is, are subject to this "colonial shadow" (Varghese et. Al., 2005: 22). Phillipson (1992) in his comprehensive review of Linguistic imperialism in a devoted chapter mentions that teachers are the "inter-state actors". They are used as the bridge that connects the colonialist to their colonised societies. They are regarded very important to spread the language as well as Western values and ideologies. Therefore, since the day the West realized how profitable English language teaching could be, they have been disseminating their teachers to all their targeted foreign countries in order to thrust the West's version of what English language teaching is about and how it is conducted. Similar mission has also been conducted to foreign English teachers inside or outside the English-speaking West countries (Karmani, 2005; Phillipson, 1992).

Most importantly, as part of the neo-colonialism structure, the West has devoted a massification of the necessary back-ups: theories, methodology, textbooks and education. Such serious attempts were likely to generate a wide-reaching perception of what an ideal version could be and the answer is guided to the West's type of construction. Despite individual reality and choice to frame an identity, the majority is delicate to be influenced by international framing. As a result, Anglocentricity in the imagined identity of most English teachers tends to operate in determining their identity. In other words, they, both native and non-native English

speakers, would, whether consciously or not, to certain extent, find it uneasy not to operate within this colonial shadow of English language teaching.

Finally, although it is not possible to get away from political nature of English language teaching but teachers could choose what political drive to attach. They need to get exposed with contrasting ideas to deconstruct what they used to believe in. Through this pursuit of truth, they can either strengthen their old beliefs or surprisingly weakens them. Each of them is the agent of what they believe in, of what they have been exposed with, of what they have been reflecting about, and of what they have been brain washed with. In English teaching, they would find it not possible to conduct the so-called a neutral teaching because each individual, not exclusive to teachers, always puts hopes on other people. Even if they do not want other people to do something, at least they will always hope that other people will not do any harm to them. Clearly, every teacher is a political agent. Every teacher is a brain washer and those who are less powerful will get brain washed. Again, though teachers cannot be neutral but they can try to gradually break out from the neo-colonialist Anglocentricity.

References

- Alwasilah, A. C. 2012, 11 17. *Opinion*. Retrieved 09 05, 2013, from The Jakarta Post: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/11/17/it-s-time-revitalize-indonesian-teaching.html>
- Anderson, B. R. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bailey, K. 2006. Marketing the *eikaiwa* wonderland: Ideology,

- akogare*, and gender alterity in English conversation school advertising in Japan. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 24: 105-130.
- Bax, S. 2003. The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal* 57(3), 278-287.
- Holliday, A. 2006. Key concepts in ELT: Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal* 60 (4), 385-387.
- Karmani, S. 2005. Petro-linguistics: The emerging nexus between oil, English, and Islam. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 4(2): 87-102.
- Martin, N. 2012, 10 19. *Opinion*. Retrieved 09 05, 2013, from The Jakarta Post: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/10/19/eliminating-english-primary-school-and-its-discontents.html>
- Meddings, L. and Thornbury, S. 2009. *Teaching Unplugged: Dogme in English Language Teaching*. Peaslake UK: Delta. (Extract).
- Moran, P. R. 1996. 'I'm not typical': Stories of becoming a Spanish teacher. In D. Freeman and J. C. Richards (Eds.) *Teacher learning in language teaching*, pp.125-153. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pavlenko, A. 2003. "I never knew I was a bilingual": Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 251-268.
- Pennycook, A. 2002. *English and the discourses of colonialism*. New York: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. and Coutand-Marin, S. 2010. Teaching English as a Missionary Language. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 24(3), 337-353.

- Perkins, J. 2004. *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. Linguistic imperialism: Theoretical foundations. In R. Phillipson *Linguistic Imperialism*, pp.38-77. Oxford: OUP.
- Putri, A. 2012, 10 21. *Opinion*. Retrieved 09 05, 2013, from The Jakarta Post: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/10/21/teaching-indonesia-s-children.html>
- Richards, J. C. 1998. Textbooks: Help or hindrance in teaching? In J. C. Richards (Ed.) *Beyond training*, pp.125-152. Cambridge: CUP.
- Said, E. 1977. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. 2005. Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4(1), 21-44.

IMPLEMENTING THE 2013 CURRICULUM: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Burhanudin Syaifulloh

STAIN Kediri

Abstract: The government of Indonesia has changed its curriculum for ten times since its independence. The newly introduced curriculum is called the 2013 curriculum. This curriculum uses scientific and integrative thematic approach intended to improve the student's competency in their knowledge, skill and attitude. Besides, being faithful, productive, creative, innovative and affective are also the main goal of implementing this curriculum. At least there are five factors behind its implementation; internal and external challenge, thought model improvement, reinforcement of curriculum management and materials. It is not the same with the previous curriculum, which gives autonomy to schools to design and develop their curriculum based on their situations and needs, the later is designed by the central government in one package including books, curriculum and syllabus. This has raised pros and contrast throughout Indonesia beside its development is relative short. However, the implementation of this curriculum would always cause some effects whether positive or negative.

Key words: curriculum implementation, the 2006 curriculum, the 2013 curriculum

I. Introduction

Curriculum has a significant role in education. This is because through curriculum educators can translate their ideas, concepts, and theories into practice. Print (1993) defines curriculum as all the planned learning opportunities offered to learners by the educational institution and the experiences learners encounter when the curriculum is implemented. As a consequence, a curriculum should be well-designed and having a clear vision of what it is trying to achieve.

In order to acquire a good curriculum, an institution or a government often re-designs an existing curriculum or even designs a new curriculum. For example, in the Indonesian context, the school curriculum has been changed for many times since its independence and the newly introduced curriculum is the 2013 curriculum. These changes likely occurred due to the fact that there have been alterations in various aspects of life in Indonesia, such as in social, cultural, economic, and political system. In this case, a curriculum as planned learning should be developed dynamically based on the changes and needs of a society. As a consequence, a new curriculum is often considered to be better than the previous one.

The current Indonesian curriculum is named as the 2013 curriculum and it was officially launched on 15 July 2013. One of the main reasons for implementing this curriculum is because the ministry wants to restore character education and improve students' creative thinking. In addition, it is commonly believed that the quality of the Indonesian education is still unsatisfactory. This is supported by the result of the survey conducted by the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) in 2009 which shows that Indonesian education is ranked 66th out of 74 participating countries in reading, mathematics and science. Therefore, implementing this new curriculum is expected to improve the quality of education in Indonesia.

In this paper, I will first review the history of the Indonesian curriculum, then I will discuss the comparison between school based curriculum and the 2013 curriculum and finally the strengths and weaknesses from the 2013 curriculum are elaborated.

II. Discussion

The history of the curricula used in Indonesian schools and its relation to the government's policies.

The Indonesian government has undergone several changes in curriculum since its independence in 1945. The changes of the curriculum are classified into three main periods of time: old era regime (1945-1965), new era regime (1965-1998), and reformation era (1998-present).

There were three changes in Indonesian curriculum during the old era regime. The first curriculum was well known in Dutch as *the 1947 leer planned* or *the 1947 planned learning*. However, this had just been implemented nationally in 1950. The development of this curriculum was influenced by political conditions in which Indonesia had just got its independence. Besides, its educational system was previously based on the Dutch educational system. Therefore, the aims of this curriculum were intended to accommodate national interests, for example, building nationalism in students' minds. The next curriculum was named *the 1952 detailed planned learning*. This elaborated every subject being studied in more detail and placed emphasis on a subject for a teacher. Finally, in the end of this era, the government developed a new curriculum called *the 1964 curriculum* focusing on students' ethics, intelligent, emotion, skill and physical. This curriculum ended after a new regime ruled the country.

In new era regime, the government had changed its curriculum for four times. The first change occurred in 1968 when a new government under Soeharto's leadership ruled Indonesia. This government brought a new ideology called "pancasila (five principles)" to which the contents of the

curriculum should be based on the principles of this ideology. This was named as *the 1968 curriculum*. The emergence of this curriculum was influenced by political interests, that is, to replace the old regime's curriculum products. However, this curriculum tended to focus only on the theory without considering the factual problems occurred in the society. Therefore, many people criticized on this curriculum.

In 1975, another curriculum emerged which was well known as *the 1975 curriculum*. The emergence of this curriculum was influenced by the booming of the concept of management which was called as management by objective. In this case, the government wanted to make the curriculum more effective and efficient, therefore, its methods, materials and learning goals were designed into general instructional goals and specific instructional goals. Unfortunately, many teachers criticized this curriculum because they had to write the detailed goals of the subject in every meeting which were considered wasting their time.

The third curriculum was *the 1984 curriculum*. The focus of this curriculum was on process skill approach and this was well known as student active learning (SAL) to which the students were positioned as the subject of learning. However, many schools had difficulty to interpret the concepts of SAL. Therefore, the government changed the curriculum and replaced it with a new curriculum called as *the 1994 curriculum*. This tried to combine the concepts of previous curricula between the goals and the process of learning. Yet, the students had to learn more subjects at school.

In the reformation Era, four changes of curriculum had been done by the government. The first curriculum was called *the supplementary 1999 curriculum* as a revised edition of

the 1994 curriculum in which the contents of this curriculum was not much different from it. Then, *the 2004 national curriculum or competence based curriculum* was proposed. The aims of this curriculum was developing and providing skills and knowledge that will enable the individual to survive in a changing, challenging, unpredictable, and complicated world. This curriculum was considered better compared with the previous one, since its materials were less, so that it could provide more time to students to develop their competences. In addition, implementing student centered approaches in teaching and learning process was encouraged in this curriculum. Teachers are supposed to have enough knowledge and skills to facilitate students in learning and developing their competences and to be familiar with the use of technology in the classroom.

Unfortunately, the implementation of this curriculum was considered to have failed because of some reasons, such as that many Indonesian teachers still have low quality, many schools have limited facilities, many teachers do not have enough understanding in implementing the curriculum, and the national examination does not measure students' competences. These reasons have caused the emergence of a new curriculum in 2006 called *the school based curriculum or the 2006 curriculum*. The basic concepts of this curriculum are similar to the 2004 curriculum, but the 2006 curriculum gives wider autonomy for each school to develop their own curriculum by taking into account the potentials of schools and the surrounding region. This curriculum has been implemented for around six years now. However, the government decided to introduce new curriculum, which is called the 2013 curriculum. Unlike the 2006 curriculum, the

newly introduced curriculum of 2013 comes in a package with its syllabus. This could be good news for some teachers because their burden would be less, but maybe not for some others.

The 2006 curriculum and the 2013 curriculum: An overview

The changes of paradigm from centralized to decentralized education in Indonesia have forced changes in various aspects of education, including curriculum. In decentralized curriculum, teachers' involvement in developing curriculum is significant because this would enhance their level of professionalism and result in more relevant and workable curriculum innovations. In line with this concept, a new curriculum has been implemented in Indonesian schools in 2006 that is the school based curriculum. This emerged since the 2004 curriculum or competence based curriculum (centrally based curriculum) has failed to take into account the diverse needs of students and teachers in a particular school. However, the school based curriculum doesn't stand for a long time with the emergence of the 2013 curriculum. The following paragraphs elaborates both curriculum (the 2006 curriculum and the 2013 curriculum).

The 2006 curriculum (The school based curriculum)

The school based curriculum means that all curricular decisions are made at the school level. However, this does not mean that schools have responsibility for creating all their own curriculum materials. Rather, it means that schools have more autonomy in deciding how to use materials provided in national textbooks and in creating curriculum materials, such as planning, designing, producing, implementing, and evaluating educational experiences through selecting and

adapting curriculum materials in relation to their particular situations and needs (Gopinathan & Deng, 2006).

In the Indonesian context, the school based curriculum has some characteristics, such as its vision and mission are developed based on the situations and needs of local educational institutions, its teaching and learning activities use student centered approaches, develop creativity, and create an enjoyable classroom atmosphere, its curriculum management uses school based management, and its evaluation applies classroom based evaluation (Pusat Kurikulum, Balitbang Depdiknas, 2008).

In terms of the aims and objectives of the school based curriculum in Indonesian context, it is understood that the general aim of the curriculum is giving wider autonomy for each school to develop their own curriculum by taking into account the potentials of schools and the surrounding region. In this case, the mutual cooperation between schools and teachers in developing a certain curriculum, for example English curriculum, is very important so that the aims and objectives of the subject could be achieved. Furthermore, deciding the aims and objectives is often considered as the starting points before designing a curriculum. Aims are defined as general statement of the overall, long term purpose of the course (Graves, 1996), while, objectives may refer to activities, skills, language type or a combination of them all (Harmer, 1991). In addition, Nunan (1988) stated that objectives should be congruent with the aims and relevant to how the teachers conceptualize the content of the course. In this case, objectives are more specific ways to achieve aims.

There are several aims in relation to the implementation of the school based curriculum in English subject, for example for senior high school, namely:

1. Developing communicative competence in the form of spoken and written to reach the informational level. In this level, the students are able to access knowledge through the use of the language.
2. Having consciousness in the importance of English so that the students can improve the quality of the nation in global society.
3. Developing students' understanding about the inter-relationship between language and culture.

In relation to the above aims, the scope of English subject for senior high school, is:

1. The ability to understand and/or produce oral and written texts by integrating four language skills, that is, listening, speaking, reading and writing to achieve the informational level.
2. The ability to understand and create various short texts and essays in the form of procedure, descriptive, recount, narrative, report, news item, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, spoof, explanation, discussion, review, and public speaking.
3. The ability to acquire linguistic, socio-cultural, strategic, and discourse competences. (Pusat Kurikulum, Balitbang Depdiknas, 2008). In this case, the specific guideline is provided by the Departments of National Education, which is integrated in the national curriculum to implement the above aims and the scopes.

In terms of the underlying theory of this curriculum (English curriculum), the theory of communicative competence and literacy level are used. Hedge (2000) summarizes the key components of communicative competence as identified and

elaborated by a number of researchers (for example, Canale & Swain, 1980; Faerch, Haastrup & Phillipson, 1984; Bachman, 1990; all cited in Hedge). She listed five components of communicative competence: linguistic competence, pragmatic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence, and fluency.

Linguistic competence refers to the ability to use the language correctly, how well a person has learned features and rules of the language. In addition, *pragmatic competence* refers to the ability to use language appropriately in specific social situations. Next, *discourse competence* refers to the ability to use the new language in spoken and written discourse. Then, *strategic competence* refers to strategies for effective communication when the learner's vocabulary proves inadequate for the job, and his or her command of useful learning strategies. The last is *fluency*, which deals with the ability to achieve cohesion among the words uttered, to process the language appropriately and to respond at the speed required in 'real time' reasonably.

Another theory used in developing this English curriculum is the theory of literacy level. In this case, students in a certain level of school are expected to achieve a particular English proficiency level. The curriculum was based on the theory proposed by Gordon Wells in 1987. According to Wells (1987), there are four levels of literacy in learning a language: performative, functional, informational, and epistemic level. *The performative level* involves decoding simple written messages and encoding ideas into four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). *The functional level* involves coping with the needs of everyday life that involve written language. *The informational level* involves the use of literacy

skills in the communication and acquisition of knowledge. *The epistemic level* involves acting upon and transforming knowledge and experience that are, in general, unavailable to those who have never learned to read and write.

In line with its strengths and weaknesses of this curriculum, I think that implementing a particular curriculum would bring some advantages and disadvantages depending on the situations and conditions when the curriculum is implemented.

Some of the strengths of the school based curriculum are that the curriculum could encourage schools' autonomy to run education. In this case, the curriculum is developed based on the needs, situations and conditions of the schools. This is different from the previous curriculum where there was no difference in curriculum among areas in Indonesia even though they have different geographical conditions, facilities and human resources. In addition, the schools could provide and develop a particular subject needed by the students and design its curriculum. Finally, the use of this curriculum could reduce the students' burden in the subjects learnt.

Although the implementation of this curriculum gives several advantages, some weaknesses could also be found, such as the lack of human resources, school facilities and the existence of national examination. In terms of human resources, it is believed that many Indonesian teachers have low quality, creativity and qualifications, which could cause difficulty in interpreting standard competency and basic competencies in this curriculum. Regarding the school facilities, many schools in Indonesia have poor facilities particularly schools in remote areas. Finally, the contradiction between this curriculum and the national examination show that this curriculum has not

been prepared thoroughly. The school based curriculum is very school-oriented, and it is different with the centralistic national examination. This curriculum only contains two columns, namely, the columns of competency standard and basic competency. The consequences are that the teaching subjects developed by schools might be very varied. Yet, students may still be tested on the uniform standard of the national examination.

The 2013 curriculum

The 2013 curriculum was officially launched in July 2013. Based on the regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture (no.70/2013), it is stated that there are five factors why this curriculum is designed. The first is internal challenge, which relates the condition of education in Indonesia and the eight national standard of education, namely content, process, passing competency, educator, facilities, management, funding, and evaluation standard. Another internal challenge is related to the growth of productive age in Indonesia. The second is external challenge, which is related to globalization and its issues. The third is improving the thought model, for example, from teacher-centered to student-centered, teacher-student interaction to interactive interaction not only with the student but also with society, environment and other media, passive to active teaching, individual work to pairs or group works, mono-discipline to multi-disciplines and other teaching interactions. The fourth is reinforcement of curriculum management and the last one is reinforcement of materials taught.

In addition, this curriculum also emerged because the more global challenges faced by students in the future,

the current society's perception on the students' burden because they have too many subjects at school, the decline of students' characters, the future competences needed to face the global challenges, and the current phenomena occurred in our society, such as fatal brawls between students from different school, corruption, plagiarism, etc. Furthermore, some significant problems from the previous curriculum (school based curriculum) are still found. For example, the curriculum was not fully competency based, the competency does not frame the holistic domain in attitude, skill and knowledge, the curriculum is not sensitive to the social changes, several competencies are not suit to the needs, the evaluation standard is not appropriate to the competency based evaluation and the curriculum still needs more detailed documents to avoid multi interpretation (Bahan uji publik kurikulum 2013, Kemdikbud, 2012).

The above factors have encouraged the minister of Education and Culture Prof. Muhammad Nuh, DEA to design a new curriculum called the 2013 curriculum. This curriculum would provide less subjects because there are only six subjects taught compared to ten subjects in the former curriculum. Besides, this curriculum also provides more time for teachers to deliver materials, which are appropriate to the global challenge, such as character education, various competences needed, and skillfulness. The minister also stated that this curriculum is intended to improve the student's competency in their knowledge, skill and attitude. Also, this curriculum aims to prepare the Indonesian people to be faithful, productive, creative, innovative and affective in order to contribute to the life of society, nation and global civilization. (Permendikbud, no. 70/2013).

Furthermore, this curriculum uses a scientific approach, which encourages students to observe, question, think and try and an integrated thematic approach, which enables students to capture their knowledge as a holistic system rather than separate entities. In this approach, competences from several subjects are integrated, for example, the content of science and social studies is integrated to the subject of civic education, Bahasa Indonesia and mathematics (Kemdikbud.go.id.).

In terms of the basic framework of this curriculum, the 2013 curriculum is designed based on the philosophical, theoretical, and juridical bases. The philosophical base of this curriculum is to develop all students' potencies to be qualified people as stated in the goal of national education. This curriculum is also developed based on the theory of standard-based education and competency-based curriculum. While the juridical base used is the Indonesian constitution 1945, the law number 20/2003 about the system of national education, the law number 17/2005 about national long-term development plan, and the government regulation no 19/2005 about the national standard of education. (permendikbud no. 70/2013).

The 2006 curriculum and the 2013 curriculum: What's the difference

There are several differences between the 2006 curriculum and the 2013 curriculum. In relation to the subjects taught in elementary level, the 2006 curriculum has 10 subjects, while the 2013 curriculum has only six subjects, namely religion, civic education, Bahasa Indonesia, mathematics, arts and culture and health and sports education. In this case, the teaching of science and social studies is integrated into other subject, for example in the teaching of Bahasa Indonesia. In

In addition, the former curriculum applies a thematic learning method only from the first grade to the third grade, while the 2013 curriculum applies a thematic learning method from the first grade to sixth grade. Furthermore, the latest curriculum has more hours compare to the former with 30 hours compared to 26 hours.

In terms of teaching and learning process, the 2013 curriculum uses student-centered active learning, contextual teaching, and the books used include the materials, teaching process, evaluation and expected competency, while the former curriculum uses teacher-centered learning, book oriented, and only materials included in the books.

The more detailed differences between the two curriculums are elaborated below (Perbandingan Kurikulum, Kemdikbud, 2012):

NO	The 2006 Curriculum	The 2013 Curriculum
1.	The passing competences standard is derived from the content standard.	The passing competences standard is based on the society's needs.
2.	The content standard is derived from the passing competences standard of the subject.	The content standard is derived from the passing competences standard.
3.	Separating subjects, which shape attitude, skill and knowledge.	All subjects contributes to shape the attitude, skill and knowledge.
4.	Competences are derived from the subjects.	Subjects are derived from the competences intended to achieve.

5.	Each subject is separated.	All subjects are combined together in the main competence (Each class).
6.	Curriculum development reaches only in the basic competence.	Curriculum development reaches books and teacher guide.
7.	Thematic approach is used from class 1-3. (based on the subject).	Integrative thematic approach is used from class 1-6 (based on the competences).

III. The Strengths and Weaknesses of the 2013 curriculum

The emergence of the 2013 curriculum is expected to bring a new enlightenment in the Indonesian curriculum, which then could improve the quality of education in Indonesia. However, the implementation of this curriculum still remains some controversies. For example, some people argues that this curriculum could reduce the overwhelming burden of teachers and students because the teachers do not need to develop syllabus by themselves and the students will get less subject learnt at school. However, this could stop the teachers' creativity to design syllabus and to use the teaching method which suit to the students' needs. Therefore, implementing new curriculum will always raise some advantages and disadvantages.

Several advantages of the 2013 curriculum are that the passing competences standard (SKL) is determined in the beginning then the subject. This means that before going to the class, students would know their target of learning. In addition, the 2013 curriculum offers the continuously-related competences in all level of grades. It is designed from

elementary school up to senior high school level. Therefore, the students would achieve better competency and understanding in the subject learnt. Furthermore, a more holistic approach is used for the learning process by integrating knowledge, skill and attitude. In this case, the 2013 curriculum gives more attention to the process of learning rather than the result of the learning by using active and joyful learning method. Besides, the current curriculum emphasizes on the analytical approach and student-centered active learning, which demands the students to be more active and independent in finding information, while the teacher's role is a facilitator and motivator.

Although some advantages are revealed, but the implementation of the 2013 curriculum also raises some drawbacks. Providing books, curriculum and syllabus in one package could decrease the teachers' creativity in the teaching and learning process. This is because teachers could not explore their creativity to use syllabus based on their contextual needs. In this case, having the same assumption to all schools, facilities, teachers and students in all parts of Indonesia is clearly untrue. In addition, sudden change of curriculum and relatively short in its development (took less than two years) could confuse teachers (in particular) as the front line of teaching and learning process. This is because they are still in the process of adjusting the school based curriculum and the implementation of new curriculum is not really based on the result of the previous curriculum evaluation. Besides, it is believed that the changing of curriculum implemented in Indonesia could not boost up the quality of our education because curriculum is not the only factor to improve the quality of education. Therefore, the implementation of this curriculum

remains a big question. Furthermore, removing science and social studies from the list of subjects and integrating them into other subjects could really cause another problem for teachers and students particularly the teachers and students coming from remote areas.

IV. Conclusion

There have been many changes in Indonesian curricula since its independence in 1945. The newly introduced curriculum is called the 2013 curriculum. This is aimed at revising the previous curriculum (school based curriculum) which is considered having a lot of weaknesses. This curriculum uses a scientific approach and integrative thematic approach. Besides, the list of subjects learnt is less compared to the previous curriculum. In addition, the teaching and learning process emphasizes on the student-centered active learning and contextual teaching. It is different from the previous curriculum, which emphasizes on the teacher-centered learning and book oriented learning.

The effort of implementing new curriculum does not mean that it is free from controversy. This is because many people are still skeptical of the significance of the new curriculum due to various reasons. However, others believes that this curriculum is better than the previous one because of different reasons and therefore the 2013 curriculum could prepare better generation by having better knowledge, skill and attitude.

References:

- Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan, 2013. *Permendikbud Nomor 70 Tahun 2013*. Retrieved on 20 September 2013 from <http://bsnp-indonesia.org/id/?p=1239>.
- Gopinathan, S. & Deng, Z. 2006. Fostering school-based curriculum development in the context of new educational initiatives in Singapore. *Planning and Changing*, 37 (1-2), 93-110.
- Graves, K. 1996. *Teachers as course developers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harmer, J. 1991. *The practice of English language teaching*. UK: Longman.
- Hedge, T. 2000. The communicative classroom. In T. Hedge, *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. pp. 43-47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2012. *Bahan uji publik kurikulum 2013*. Retrieved on 20 September 2013 from <http://www.pgri.or.id/download/category/132-bahan-uji-publik-kurikulum-2013.html>.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan (2012). *Perbandingan kurikulum 2004, 2006, 2013*.
- Nunan, D. 1988. *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Print, M. 1993. *Curriculum development and design*. (2nd ed.). St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Pusat Kurikulum, Balitbang Depdiknas. 2008. Kurikulum tingkat satuan pelajaran. Retrieved on 20 September 2013 from [file.upi.edu/Direktori/FPBS/JUR._ PEND... pembelajaran/KTSP.pdf](http://file.upi.edu/Direktori/FPBS/JUR._PEND...pembelajaran/KTSP.pdf).

Wells, G. 1987. Apprenticeship in literacy. *Interchange*, 18 (1-2), 109-123.

<http://kemdikbud.go.id/wawancara-mendikbud-kurikulum-2013.html>