



**Teaching English in the KTSP Curriculum and 2013 Curriculum
Simultaneously: A Case Study of “A Senior High School in Semarang”,
Central Java, Indonesia**

Author: Girindra Putri Ardana Reswari

Queen's University, Belfast

British Council ELT Master's Dissertation Awards 2018: Commendation

ABSTRACT

The implementation of dual curricula simultaneously (KTSP Curricula and 2013 Curricula) has been happening in Indonesia since 2013. Some previous research has already analysed this issue in terms of the contents of the English curriculum and the students or teacher as the stakeholder in general. Meanwhile, there is no single research related to teachers' voices in teaching English in dual curricula when previous research supported the idea that the teacher is the important entity in determining education success.

This research is aimed at understanding the experience of English teachers who teach two different curricula in a senior high school in Indonesia. The study will provide relevant information about teachers' voices, challenges, and perspectives on both curricula which can add to current debate on developing future curricula.

A case study is being used in this research; the school selected is Senior High School 9 Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. Four English teachers and one vice-principal of curricula are being interviewed to give their opinions. Data from interview is then triangulated with document study, which in this research is taken from a syllabus comparison of the KTSP Curriculum and the 2013 Curriculum from each grade of senior high school.

Some of the findings confirm previous research. Teachers tend to feel that dual curricula in teaching is not efficient, especially when we go back to the fact that English in Indonesia is still categorised as English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Teachers also feel that this dual curricula implementation will prevent them from focusing on both curricula equally. At the same time, English teaching in Indonesia is important since classroom teaching is the only source of learning English accessible to members of all societies. Furthermore, English learning is also employed to determine students' success in the national examination as a requirement to go to the next level of education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I want to express my greatest gratitude to Allah SWT for the blessing. My second greatest gratitude is dedicated to the Indonesian government, especially the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education or LPDP (*Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan*) for giving me a chance to get the scholarship to pursue my master's at Queen's University Belfast. I also would like to send my infinite gratitude to Dr Aisling O'Boyle and Dr Caroline Linse as my supervisors, for their patience, guidance, feedback, and support in helping me to finish this dissertation.

Special thanks go to all lecturers and friends of TESOL QUB 2016/2017 for their support, knowledge, and inspiring experiences. I would like, also, to thank all the teachers

of SMAN 9 Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia, who participated in this study, giving their time and sharing their perspectives during the interview process.

My personal thanks go to my never-ending support system in Indonesia. My parents, Wadiyo and Malarsih, my brother and sister, Girindra Saraswati, Girindra Putra, and all my best friends in Indonesia for their prayers and motivation during my study.

Finally, I would like to thank the Indonesian Students Association (PPI Belfast) and my housemates in 103 University Avenue for being my new family in Belfast. Thank you for all help and togetherness – I can always feel the happiness and have wonderful memories of the lovely city of Belfast, Northern Ireland.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

Indonesian curricula have changed several times during the past fifty years and always follow world-wide ELT methodologies: (a) 1945's grammar translation-based curriculum, (b) 1958's audio-lingual-based curriculum, (c) 1975's revised audio-lingual-based curriculum, (d) 1984's structure-based communicative curriculum, (e) 1994's meaning-based communicative curriculum, (f) 2004's competency-based curriculum. According to Yuwono (2005, p4), 'ELT in Indonesia seems to be always problematic. Meanwhile, those who continually revise the curriculum do not seem to consider factors

such as suitable qualifications for teachers and numbers of students, nor does this phenomenon provide strategies and alternatives’.

Nowadays, there are two curricula implemented simultaneously in Indonesia. These are the 2006 curriculum – named in Bahasa Indonesia *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)* and the 2013 curriculum. KTSP is a set of an operational curriculum elements which is compiled and implemented by each educational unit to provide wide authority and scope to schools to undertake and develop organisational variations in education in accordance with the circumstances, potential, and needs of the region, as well as the condition of students. Meanwhile, the 2013 curriculum is applying a scientific approach as its basic learning approach and has three aspects of assessment. They are knowledge aspects, skills aspects, attitudes and behaviour aspects.

This could be a chart with the two curricula listed in two columns
KTSP Curriculum and the 2013 Curriculum

Regarding English as a subject, the implementation of both curricula is presenting a new challenge for English teachers in Indonesia, as several differences have emerged between the implementation of KTSP and the 2013 curriculum as the newest curriculum. Putra (2014) summarised the changes in standard content made by the Ministry of Education in the 2013 Curriculum. The changes are: (1) removal of English as a subject from elementary school, (2) reduction of teaching hours at senior high school, (3) reduction of contents of teaching materials (types of text and speech activities), (5) limitation of topics of discussion, (6) explicit addition of grammar points, (7) integration of all language skills, and (8) reduction of teachers’ duties in material and curriculum development.

According to Nugraheni (2015), implementing a different curriculum is clearly violating the principle of equity in terms of education. The differences in the use of the curriculum as the basic teaching approach will give different inputs, so every citizen loses the right to obtain the same education input. Further, she also explained that the impact of dual curricula will also be to make teachers and schools busy preparing new administrative

and teaching materials and tools for the new curriculum. Meanwhile, the new curriculum to be implemented is not regarded as mature and ready yet.

Indonesians are still English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, and they do not have a lot of opportunity to practise English. Research conducted by Manara in 2007 indicated that students do not have the chance to practise their English since their environments still use Bahasa Indonesia and local languages in every aspect of daily life, including signage, reading materials, official forms, and speaking. The role of English at school is therefore of fundamental importance since it is the only means by which the Indonesian government can guarantee that their citizens are learning English. English has also become important since it is now a National Examination subject and an assessment subject as a prerequisite to enter higher education.

Even though many researchers criticise the implementation of double curricula, there has not been any research that focuses on teachers' voices and opinions regarding this issue. Meanwhile, when searching the internet for the views of English teachers about teaching double curricula, we find that most of them are contradictory on the implementation of double curricula. As reported through some local news sources in Indonesia, for instance in a *Sumbang Antara News* article by Mukhlisun (2015), Sulistyono as the Chief of the Indonesian Teachers Association asks the Ministry of Education to stop the dual curricula policy since it can foster discrimination among the schools. Therefore, in this research I will focus on English teachers' opinions regarding the implementation of double curricula in Indonesia. The aim of this research is to understand what is their feeling about it and what they want related to the English curriculum in Indonesia. This is important since according to P. Patankar and S. Jadhav (2013), the teacher has the crucial role as the mediator between students and curriculum, and the curriculum is important in determining students' success in learning.

1.2 Research Objectives and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to understand the experience of English teachers who teach two different curricula in a senior high school in Indonesia. The study will provide relevant information about teachers' voices, challenges, and perspectives on both curricula which can add to current debate on developing future curricula.

In accordance with the objectives of the study, there are four research questions:

1. What are the views/perceptions/experiences of English Language teachers who are delivering/teaching both the 2013 curriculum and the KTSP curriculum in a senior high school in Indonesia simultaneously?
2. What challenges do the English language teachers face in teaching English using the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum simultaneously?
3. What are teachers' strategies to deal with those challenges?
4. Which curriculum do the English language teachers think is better in relation to teaching English in Indonesia?

1.3 Rationale of the study

Curriculum as a basic element of the learning process has an important role in determining the success of the teaching process. According to Njeng'ere (2014), curriculum has a role in identifying and organising the learning process into goals, objectives, aims and learning outcomes to be achieved. Curriculum will set a parameter of students' success in relation to knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Patankar and Jadav (2013) explained that curriculum plays an important role in the education field. Curriculum will inform interaction in all aspects of education, including among teachers and students, students with instructional content, materials, resources, and processes of evaluating educational objectives. In the end, the success of students will be determined by assessment criteria and learning indicators that have been set in the curriculum.

However, success of the curriculum cannot be separated from teachers' role in its facilitation. Print (1993) stated that teachers facilitate the curriculum and should be able to implement it and make it suitable for the learning environment (including school characteristics, local needs, cultural background). Based on Handler (2010), on the practical side, the teacher has the responsibility to be able to engage in curricular decisions such as understanding the content of the curriculum, planning activities, and assessment based on the curriculum focus, as well as matching content with several standards on the curriculum syllabus. Since the teacher has an important role in relation to the curriculum, it is important to analyse teachers' voices and perspectives on the implementation of a curriculum.

Another rationale of this research is related to the importance of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Indonesia. In Indonesia, English is one of the subjects in junior and senior high schools that is measured in the national final examination. Saukah and Cahyono (2015) noted that it is also officially stated by Ministry of Education Decree No. 34/2007 officially states that ultimately the score in the English National Examination is the deciding factor in whether students can graduate from schools to be accepted into higher levels of education. In the Indonesian context, the Ministry of Education uses the results as a criterion-referenced decision, as outlined by Braun, Kanjee, Bettinger, & Kremer (2006), most national assessments are criterion-referenced. Therefore, Fiktorius (2013) believed, examinees with scores above the standard are considered to have demonstrated an anticipated level of ability and hence pass the examination, or vice versa.

Besides the importance of ELT in Indonesia in relation to the national examination, interaction in the learning process is the ultimate opportunity for learners to practise a non-native language. Research conducted by Manara in 2007 showed that in Indonesia, where English is regarded as a foreign language, students do not have the chance to practise their English, since their environments still use Bahasa Indonesia and local languages in every aspect of daily life, including signs, reading materials, documents, and speaking. That is why the roles of the teacher and curriculum in ELT in school are the only sources of

guaranteed success in English learning in Indonesia. Brown (1991) stated that classroom interaction would give non-native learners a chance to practise their English, improving their structural automaticity and thereby enabling them to have better fluency in English. According to Hall and Verpaetse (2000), much language learning occurs in the classroom. Classroom interaction enables the learner to achieve a practical application of academic knowledge gained in the class.

Since the curriculum will determine material and classroom interaction, according to Clipperton in Takahashi, Austin, and Marimoto (1998), in order to achieve success in teaching a foreign language, classroom interaction in that language should be purposeful, interactive, and creative. To create this learning environment, language teachers should be able to tailor instructions and guide interaction for a variety of learners. Another theory of success in learning language was delivered by Allwright (1981), who believed that teachers, students, and materials are three elements, none of which can stand independently.

1.4 Outline of the study

This dissertation is arranged in six chapters. The first chapter is an introduction, which describes the background information of the topic. Detailed information on the research, such as research objectives and research questions, the rationale of the study, and an outline of the study are also given in the first chapter. These details are given to help readers to understand the structure and function of this research and the reasons why this research should be conducted.

Existing theories in the domains of English curriculum and English Language Teaching in Indonesia that support the present study are explained in Chapter 2. Named as the Literature Review chapter, it explains the English curriculum in Indonesia, the KTSP curriculum in ELT in Indonesia, the 2013 curriculum in ELT in Indonesia, as well as

teachers' perspectives on the curricula changes in Indonesia and the importance of ELT in Indonesia.

The methodology of this research is explained in the third chapter. In general, the methodology chapter presents details on how this research is designed and why particular methods have been selected. Selecting research methodology is addressed first, to provide background knowledge of why several methods were chosen. This is followed by an explanation of the case study, the interview and interview design, document analysis and participants.

The fourth chapter presents the findings of the research. These consist of results of the interviews and document analysis. Results of interview comprise teachers' opinion on the double curricula implementation in teaching English. Meanwhile, document analysis consists of the comparison of syllabuses of KTSP Curriculum and 2013 Curriculum. Findings of the research are presented as the basis for discussion in the next chapter.

Chapter five includes the discussions. This chapter is essential, since it analyses the findings, as well as comparing and contrasting the current study with the previous study. It consists of a triangulation of interview results and document analysis. It is also supported by critical analysis of the literature review of previous studies. This discussion chapter will answer each research question.

The study is concluded with a summary of the core chapters. Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research will be elaborated to help to further possible developments in the research on this topic. All documents that support the study are attached at the end in the form of appendices.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, several literature reviews and previous studies are analysed. It begins with general concepts around curriculum and the English curriculum. This is followed by

specific contexts for this research. These are: the English curriculum in Indonesia, the KTSP curriculum in ELT in Indonesia, the 2013 curriculum in ELT in Indonesia, and teachers' perspectives on curricula changes in Indonesia. In order to deepen understanding, the importance of ELT in Indonesia is explained.

2.1 Curriculum

To analyse the implementation of the curriculum, it is best to start by understanding the term 'curriculum' itself. Based on some studies, there are several definitions of curriculum. One comes from Goodson (1994, p11) who stated that curriculum is about conception, construction, negotiation, and renegotiation in a variety of arenas and levels. Another definition, from Kelly (1999, p83), is that curriculum is always translated as something negative related to the syllabus that sometimes limits teachers' planning, since it tells teachers what they should do or lists subjects that should be taught.

Even if there are many different opinions on the definition of curriculum, some researchers agree that the term curriculum is always classified into distinct points. Su (2012) outlined five definitions of curriculum. These are:

1. Curricula as a set of objectives = goals or objectives
2. Curricula as courses of study or content = content + goals
3. Curricula as plans = content + goals+ teaching methods
4. Curricula as documents = content + goals + methods + assessment
5. Curricula as experiences = content + goals + methods + assessment + extracurricular activities and learning environment + hidden curriculum + cultures

Moore (2015), in referring to and updating Stenhouse (1975), also believes that curriculum is classified into four different definitions as follows:

- a. Curriculum as product

Curriculum as product is related to the use of curriculum as a standard of teaching practices.

b. Curriculum as process

Curriculum as process is about what actually happens in the classroom. It is more about the development and change of curriculum after it is used in at class.

c. Curriculum as praxis

Curriculum as praxis is focusing on teachers in adapting the curriculum. Sometimes, they have different views and perspectives in understanding and applying the curriculum.

d. Curriculum as context

Curriculum as context is about the curriculum's relationship to the outside world.

Based on some definitions above, it is concluded that curriculum is a concept created and often utilized by government as a guideline for the teaching process. Curriculum also can be used as a standard on which to base teaching materials, activities, books and assessments.

2.1.1 English Curriculum

Jawarskova and Porte (2007) divided the history of ELT curricula into six categories: the early period, the 1960s, the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s and the new millennium. Conventional methods – for instance, the grammar translation method – was used to learn non-native language. Those approaches were focusing more on reading and writing, with little consideration of speaking and listening. According to Richards (2013), throughout the twentieth century approaches to teaching English moved from production of accurate language use towards more active activity that focuses on interactive and communicative classroom processes.

Even if nowadays every country implements different English curricula, most countries are using communicative approach as a basis for the English curriculum. One

example is South Korea. Based on a study in Korea conducted by Dailey (2010), the national Ministry of Education tried to improve the quality of English in Korea by shifting the curriculum from traditional grammar instruction to a communicative English curriculum. The reason behind this change of curriculum was because South Korea recognised the influence of English as a key in developing their international markets and strengthening their economy after they faced economic crisis.

Prasad (2013) contended that nowadays, even if no syllabus model has been universally accepted, language syllabus is most frequently about a communicative approach. This covers communicative competences such as: language skills, content, grammar, vocabulary, and functions. To support the communicative approach in the English curriculum, classroom activities such as group work, task work, and information-gap activities are being used. Regarding Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Savignon (2002) stated that applying CLT does not mean that grammatical or formal accuracy should be removed from the learning list. Many discussions related to the focus on meaning makes people think that forms are not important. However, latest researches support the view that it creates a better result in communicative ability if form-focused exercises and meaning-focused experience work together. However, this should be matched to learners' ages and levels.

However, UNESCO's draft scheme (2004) pointed out that students have different needs, abilities, interests, backgrounds, and ways of learning. These are all based on different backgrounds of language, cultures, customs, and experiences depending on where they are born and live (continent, country, city, region, family). That is why the English curriculum can differ, based on what learners need.

2.2 The English Curriculum in Indonesia

Regarding Sahirudin (2013), Nur and Madkur (2014), Putra (2014), and B. Musthafa and Hamied (2014), English is the first foreign language to be taught in Indonesia since 1945, when Indonesia gained independence from Dutch colonialism. Regarding English as an official subject in school, Indonesia has already faced several changes in the English curricula. In 1945, the English subject in Indonesia was using 1945's grammar translation curriculum. It then changed into the audio-lingual method in 1958. Seventeen years after that implementation, the government revised the curriculum and changed it to 1975's revised audio-lingual method curriculum. In 1984, the structure-based communicative curriculum appeared. In 1994, the curriculum again changed, moving into 1994's meaning-based communicative curriculum.

After 10 years' implementation, English Language Teaching in Indonesia was facing curriculum revision again, this time using the 2004 competency-based curriculum. Just two years after the implementation of the 2004 curriculum, a new curriculum was created, the 2006 KTSP curriculum, well known as the School Based Curriculum. However, the KTSP curriculum was also revised by the 2013 curriculum. Two years later, in 2015, the Ministry of Education announced that the 2013 curriculum should be re-evaluated. To deal with that, some schools are back to the KTSP curriculum, and others are still using the 2013 curriculum.

This changing of the curriculum over a short period of time caused some controversy. Sahirudin (2013) argued that the implementation of the new curriculum would always bring new pressure to the educational institution. Government needs to provide new training to teachers about the curriculum. Teachers also need to be able to describe the essence of the new curriculum since it is important for teachers and students to have same understanding of the target language being learned. DeSegovia and Hardison (2009) in Sulfasyah et al (2015) supported Sahirudin by saying that English teachers in Thailand found difficulties while introducing new pedagogical concepts in new English curriculum implementation.

On the other hand, Ring, Nyquist, and Mitchell (2016) argued that curriculum design should be able to follow the need of current and future societies. That is why the process of renewing the curriculum needs to be able to gain the interest of learners. However, it is widely believed that implementing a new curriculum should be balanced with good preparation from the government. Sarosa (2013) stated that socialisation of the new curriculum, teachers training, providing learning materials and books, and evaluating the process are essential government activities when they are implementing a new curriculum. Teachers, who are key to the implementation of a curriculum, also need to have a deep understanding of what should be changed in the practice of the new curriculum, so training the teachers is important in order to guarantee that they will have a chance to learn and develop new knowledge (Fullan 2007).

2.2.1 KTSP in English Language Teaching Indonesia

Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) or, translated into English, the School Based Curriculum (SBC), is the curriculum applied by Indonesia's Ministry of Education in 20016. In this curriculum, schools were given more autonomy to establish their own syllabus, teaching materials, and learning operations. This implementation became problematic at the outset since, according to Lestari, Asih, and Wahyuni, when the Ministry of Education carried out the survey in 2006, they found that some teachers and schools were not ready to create their own material. This has been confirmed by the high number of schools that simply copy and paste the syllabus and teaching materials from the National Education website.

In an ELT context, this curriculum is helping Indonesian students as EFL learners, since the teaching and learning processes will pay more attention to the linguistic, cultural, religious diversity, and other potential differences among individuals (Sanjaya, 2005; Suderadjat, 2004; Kasful Us & Hendra Harmi, 2011; Utomo, 2005; Sulfasyah, 2013). In fact, KTSP is aimed at enhancing students' communicative competence. However, several

previous studies point to the implementation of KTSP in ELT still making teachers 'learning centres' and they highlight a lack of students' activities.

According to Tantra (2015), KTSP is a modification of the 2004 genre-based curriculum. It uses four stages, namely: (1) building students' knowledge, (2) modelling texts, (3) constructing joint texts, and (4) constructing independent texts. That is why teachers will focus more on the reading ability of students rather than students' communicative skills. This is supported by Yulia (2014) who conducted a case study of English teachers in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, related to an evaluation of the KTSP curriculum. Results of the study indicated that teachers tend to emphasise reading skill over other skills. This is because, students ultimately need to take a national examination which focuses on reading skills. Besides too much focus on reading skill, the study conducted by Sulfasyah, Haig, and Pugh in 2016 found that during writing activity in a school in Indonesia, teachers were still using a traditional teaching approach, resulting in limited student participation.

However, other research indicated that KTSP creates several improvements in teaching English in Indonesia. S. Madya (2008) points out that a syllabus constructed by the school and not by central government can be matched to students' background and need. A decentralised system of education, especially in learning English, is really important. Kusumaningrum and Triwiyanto (2015) point out that Indonesia is a large country with variations in religious, cultural, social, economic, and geographical factors. Indonesia also has 546 different local languages. Those differences will lead to different needs of competence, content, and learning processes. That is why we cannot uniform the learning approach.

2.2.2 The 2013 Curriculum in English Language Teaching in Indonesia

In 2013, the Indonesian Ministry of Education created the new 2013 curriculum. When this curriculum was implemented, many pros and cons appeared. 2013 is believed to

be a curriculum that can help learners to be more active and critical in learning English as a foreign language. Tantra (2013) said that the 2013 curriculum is designed to follow the needs of the century. The learning paradigm has shifted; students acquire knowledge because they are taught by a teacher to get knowledge by themselves. It is hoped that it will be a good bridge to help Indonesian students in facing the globalisation era (Sarosa 2014) and Chairani (2015). According to Howartt (1984), the actual function of language is as a system for expressing meaning. It is important to use language in interactive and communicative ways. Thus, the 2013 curriculum will create a natural environment for language learners.

Another plus point of the 2013 curriculum is this curriculum is not only focusing on knowledge, but also on affective aspects such as character building. Muhamad and Saparahayuningsih (2016) stated that the 2013 curriculum has character building as the focus since nowadays Indonesia is facing socio-cultural changes. Before, Indonesian culture was widely regarded as courteous, polite, gentle, and caring for others, highly social, and highly cooperative. Nowadays, the nation has shifted into a country with less social sensitivity and more selfishness. This is proved by a high amount of corruption and student brawls that happen everywhere. McDaniel (1998) suggests that teachers should include values and ethics activities in their daily teaching and learning process. Teachers can use reading and writing activities to encourage moral and ethical thought. Another way is by structuring the learning environment as safe environment for learning, sharing, and cooperation, using activities such as discussion, role-playing, and analytical and creative projects as a basis for critical thinking.

Research conducted by Adi (2013) found that English language learning provides many opportunities for integrating the teaching and learning process with values and responsibilities. Teachers can provide students with learning activities that increase student interaction and put students in the centre of learning. In this way, students have more chances to interact with their friends and build good values within themselves – especially as the 2013 Curriculum focuses on English as a tool for communication and critical

thinking, using activities such as role-play, discussion, writing and reading, with social issues as the topic.

As a con, or disadvantage the 2013 curriculum bases learning on a scientific approach. This approach identifies five activities in teaching and learning activity: observing, asking, collecting data, associating and communicating. Suharyadi (2013) found that it difficult to identify an example of teaching English using a scientific approach, since this approach is usually connected to teaching science or mathematics. Besides the scientific approach problem, Putra (2014) summarised changes in standard content made by the Ministry of Education in the 2013 curriculum. The changes are: (1) removal of English as a subject from elementary school, (2) reduction of teaching hours at senior high schools, (3) reduction in the content of teaching materials (types of texts and speech activities), (5) limitation of topics of discussion, (6) explicit addition of grammar points, (7) integration of all language skills, and (8) reduction in teachers' duties in material and curriculum development.

Besides some debates related to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum, it was created to fix numerous incorrect interpretations within the previous curriculum framework, such as the policy of creating lesson plans. In the previous curriculum (KTSP), English teachers tend to focus on reading without giving their attention to other skills. Actually, English language learning should cover the whole language system (linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence), productive and receptive macro-skills (speaking, writing, listening), and productive and receptive micro-skills (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and spelling). In the 2013 curriculum, these four skills are integrated, as the notion of competence encompasses the notion of communicative competence. (Wachidah (2013), cited in Hapsari, (2013), cited in Ahmad (2014)).

2.2.3 Teachers' perspectives of curricula change in English language teaching in Indonesia

In this section, several previous studies related to teachers' opinions in curricula change in Indonesia have been gathered and analysed as a literature review. According to Patankar and Jadhav (2013), the teacher has crucial role as the mediator between students and the curriculum, and curriculum is an important factor in determining students' success in learning. Print (1993) also explained that teachers should be able to implement the curriculum and make it suitable for the learning environment (taking into account school characteristics, local needs and cultural background). Based on the vital role of teachers, their opinions, pro or con, should be considered.

The first research was conducted by Ashadi in 2015. His research is entitled "Indonesian EFL Teachers in the Swing of Curricula". This research is based on the problem of the Indonesian curriculum changing all the time. Sixteen participants were interviewed to collect the data. Results of this research are: (1) teachers feel that they need to be prepared through adequate socialisation and training. (2) Some teachers cannot implement the newest curriculum (2013 curriculum) since it does not integrate with ELT. (3) Teachers believe that they know their students better, so will not follow the syllabus of the curriculum while teaching; they will just do what they believe can better help the students.

The second research is conducted in 2014 by Musthafa and Hamied. The results of their study are similar to those of a previous study conducted by Ashadi. They showed that teachers will use their own personal beliefs in implementing a new curriculum in the class. Teachers also feel that there are not enough guidelines provided by the government every time they create a new curriculum. As a result, teachers tend to not think seriously about curriculum change.

Both sets of researchers show that teachers feel difficulties in facing curriculum changes. Teachers might find it hard to adapt to a new curriculum since they have to learn new things and leave what is familiar and comfortable to their way of teaching. (Greenberg & Baron 2008; Huberman 1989).

The third research studies six teachers' voices in applying new curricula in Indonesia. This research was conducted by Nur and Madkur in 2014. It illustrates that most teachers have positive opinions regarding the implementation of the 2013 curriculum, because the 2013 curriculum focuses not only on students' cognitive aspects, but also on character building. This is in line with Veugelers (2008), who said that values are part of teaching. Values will always be embedded in the curriculum, curriculum materials, and educational practices. The 2013 curriculum also focuses on developing critical thinking and active students. However, teachers face difficulties in adapting to the scoring system, since they have to score both cognitive and affective factors.

2.3 The importance of English Language Teaching in Indonesia

Even if up to now teaching English in Indonesia is still categorised as Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL), English is being used as final examination subject in Indonesia. This is officially stated in the Ministry of Education Decree No. 34/2007. The results of the English examination will ultimately be used to determine students' graduation and students' ability to enter the next level of education. However, the implementation of a national examination will always be a controversy in Indonesia.

Fiktorius (2013) found that the English national examination in Indonesia has reading and listening only in a multiple-choice format, and so does not measure other skills such as writing and speaking. Meanwhile, the Indonesian government tries to encourage

teachers to use a communicative language teaching approach to English in school. Other research in English as a subject for national examination in Indonesia was conducted by Sulistyono (2009), who collected the voices of English teachers. Based on his research, there are some teachers that disagree and others that agree. They believe that the national examination will enhance students' motivation in learning English, which is proven by the large numbers of students joining English courses outside the classroom to learn more English. In line with them, Prameswari (2004) also believes that the national examination is the best way to minimise the quality gap among schools and provinces in Indonesia. The national examination can also provide momentum for the government to evaluate teaching processes in Indonesia. As a requirement for graduating from school, students must also take a school examination. In this examination, English is one of the subjects tested, and is always tested as a requirement to enter university. The Indonesian government organises a test to enter university simultaneously every year. Since English is always a determinant of students' future, the English curriculum should be fixed in order to achieve maximum results.

Since Indonesia is an EFL country, the classroom has an important role in being the only place to practise English. Laufer (2008) explained that in some countries like Singapore, Malaysia and the Philippines, English plays an essential role as the administrative and business language, so the majority of people can speak English fluently. According to Lowenberg (1991), English should be seen as an "additional language" rather than as a "foreign language"; therefore it can be used as medium of instruction in education and the workplace more frequently and give Indonesian society better chances of using English as a communicative tool. However, Huda (2000) and Dardjowidjojo (2003) argued that local language planners often claim that they worry about the negative effects of foreign cultural influences when we use the English language too much.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Selecting the Research Methodology

Selecting the most appropriate research methodology is essential in determining the success of research. One factor that should be counted in selecting appropriate research methods is the research questions. In this research, the research questions require several explanations and deep analysis on the teachers' voices, challenges, and perspectives on both curricula which can add to the current debate on developing future curricula. Based on the research questions, a qualitative method is the right one to use in this research.

A theory based on Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explains that qualitative research focuses on meaning and understanding. Qualitative research is usually used by researchers to obtain information related to how people make an interpretation of their experiences. A key concern of qualitative research is understanding participants' perspectives. The

selection of a qualitative method in this research is also based on Schutt and Check (2012), who stated that qualitative research usually begins with research questions related to what people think, how they act, and why they do particular actions in some educational setting. Qualitative methods have an orientation to social context, and participants usually focus on human subjectivity. They can contradict quantitative methods that always carry the risk that mathematical analysis implies an assumption that participants are ‘passive, essentially determined and controlled’ (Cohen, et al., 2013, p15).

Even if qualitative research is the most suitable method to be used in this research, qualitative methods have several limitations that should be kept in mind during the research. Griffin (2004) stated that having small numbers of participants in qualitative research sometimes makes other researchers, policy makers, and practitioners take the research less seriously. Griffin also explained that without the numerical and statistic data, qualitative research sometimes counted as not serious research, since it is unable to show exact numbers and proportions.

3.2 Case Study

Many researchers related to education use case study as an approach in educational research. Lichtman (2013) explained that case study is an approach that involves the specific and detailed study of a case. Case study also can be limited to one type of situation. Further, it is explained that case study is an appropriate approach when examining a particular programme and its relation to design, analysis, and interpretation. Cohen et al. (2013) explained several types of case study. These are single-case design, embedded single-case design, and multiple-case design, and embedded multiple-case design. The explanation of the four main case study designs based on Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) will be analysed in the following paragraphs.

Single-case design focuses on a critical case, an extreme case, a unique case, a representative or typical case, and a revelatory. According to Kennedy (2005), single-case designs help educational practices to overcome the problem of widely varied students. Single-case design is used to establish experimental control of single participants. Further, Kennedy states that for decades, this type of case study design has been categorised as an effective way to understand behavioural processes.

Second type of case study design which is being used in this research is embedded single-case design. The type of case study which is embedded single-case design is used to analyse more than one unit of analysis. For example, a case study of a whole school, or perhaps also sub-units of classes, teachers, students, and parents. This type of case study is used in such instances, according to Yin (2009), and this design might also use sub-units of the school. English teachers and the vice principal responsible for ensuring implementation of the curricula have been selected as participants in this research.

Other types of case study designs are based on Cohen et al. (2011) and include multiple-case design and embedded multiple-case design. Both of those types compare and use two different case studies or different sub-units of case studies. Quasi experiment is an example of multiple design in case study.

3.3 Interviews

3.3.1 Rationale for interviews

Over all qualitative research methods, it was decided that interviewing is the appropriate method to collect data based on the research question. Strengths and challenges were found in using interview to collect the data. Edwards and Holland (2013) explained that interview is part of fundamental activity in a society. Societies interact and communicate in the same way as interviews happen. Therefore, both of researcher and

societies as participants will not have major difficulties in doing the interview. Williams and Vogt (2011) also explained another strength of the interview that has influenced its increasing use in social research. They argued that participants representing society in an individual and a group capacity can give their own opinion and provide insight into their experiences in various policy areas, including welfare, health, and education.

Besides these strengths, several challenges also might be found in the interview process. Crow and Pope (2008) stated that a qualitative interview might be influenced by the place where it happens, by power relations between the individual and social factors, characteristics of the interviewee, and the complex social relationship and emotions between interviewee and interviewer. That is why an interviewer should make the interview as transparent and comfortable as possible.

3.3.2 Semi-structured interview

Semi-structured interview was used in order to limit challenges. According to Cohen and Crabtree (2008), semi-structured interview has particular benefits. First, questions can be prepared before the interview. Second, it allows participants to express their opinion on their own terms. Third, semi-structured interviews can provide reliable, comparable qualitative data. Cohen et al. (2013) explained that under semi-structured interview, interview questions are standardised. Therefore, comparison and analysis of the data are easier to conduct.

Above all reasons, semi-structured interview was selected in this research since, according to Harell and Bradley (2009), semi-structured interviews are often used in policy research. Since this research is also analysing curricula policy, semi-structured interview will help to ensure that the researcher covers the correct elements to be analysed and protect the participants from any ideas and arguments that might be against government ethics.

3.4 Interviews design

3.4.1 Skype interviews

Because participants live in Indonesia, while the researcher is in the UK, interviews were conducted using Skype. Using an internet application to carry out an interview is not a problem. According to the official website of the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Informatics in 2017, nowadays Indonesia is in a digital uptake. Around 63 million people actively use the internet, with 95 percent using it to access social media. This approach is in line with Iakono et al. (2016), who believed that Skype and other video-call technologies within the internet eliminate distance as a variable that prevents an international representation of participants in most qualitative studies. As a consideration, several challenges in using Skype as the interview media should be noted. Schmieder (2011) stated that not everyone is comfortable talking on Skype. Quality of data and issues of confidentiality also become issues that should be considered.

According to Lichtman (2013), this type of online interview is referred to as a synchronous, pre-planned interview. This involves agreement between participants and the interviewer in which they will go online and use a particular application at the same time. The interviewer will then pose questions, responded to by the participants. The data will be taken after the National Examination in Indonesia to avoid inconvenience for the participants. The time of data collection will be aligned with participants' time, since there is a six-hour time difference between Indonesia and UK.

3.4.2 Validity and Reliability

Traditionally, as stated by Bell (2010), validity refers to what a research instrument measures in relation to what it claims to measure. Even though some researchers have argued that validity is hard to be applied in qualitative research, others have developed their own concepts of validity in qualitative research. Several terms to explain validity in qualitative research are quality, rigour and trustworthiness (Golafshani: 2003). To support this idea, Maxwell (2013) believed that validity is also relative – never something that can be proved or taken for granted.

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained validity in qualitative research as how research findings match the reality. Since the data cannot speak themselves, the researcher has the right to interpret the data, while still keeping the original ideas of the data. It means that the researcher should be able to make the reader understand without changing the main ideas of the real data. Several strategies are provided to ensure validity in qualitative research and they are used in this research.

The first strategy is triangulation, which is related to the use of multiple sources of data in order to compare and cross-check the data. According to Patton (2015), triangulation increases credibility and quality by countering concerns. Johnson (1997) believed that triangulation includes multiple methods of data collection and analysis, but does not suggest a fixed method for all researches. The choice of triangulation elements depends on the criteria of the research. In this research, material used for triangulation is document analysis taken from English syllabuses from all senior high school grades in both curricula.

The second strategy is member check or respondent validation. This strategy is used to avoid bias and misunderstanding in the interview. Member check involves participants checking if our interpretation of what they said rings correctly. Maxwell (2013) explained that even if researchers use their own word choices, participants need to be able to recognise their experiences in the researcher's perspectives.

Another aspect that cannot be separated from validity is reliability. As with validity, reliability is also characterised as problematic in a qualitative study. However, Merriam and Tisdall (2016), simplified the term reliability in quality research into consistency. Campbell (1996), contended that verification through examination of raw data, a data reduction process, and process notes can be used as steps to help the researcher to achieve consistency in qualitative research.

In order to attain reliability, the interview was designed for a consistency of experience for all interviewees. Each participant gets three sections of questions during interview. These are as follows:

1. Warm-up questions: the goal of warm-up questions to open the interview was to establish a connection with and the confidence of the participants. Questions in this section were focused on participants' life experiences related to the research. For instance, 'how long have you been teaching English?'
2. Main questions: this section investigated the main issue of the research. All questions were related to the research problems. For example, 'what is your opinion related to the implementation of dual curricula in your school?'
3. Recommendation: in this final section, participants were given the chance to offer their recommendation to improve the curricula policy in the future.

3.4.3 Recording and transcription

During the process of Skype interviews, recording was made using Skype's recording facility. Lancet (2013) wrote in his blog that Skype features a free video call recorder named v1.02.115 or FVCR. Results of data recorded from Skype were saved in MP4 format.

After recording the data, transcriptions of the interviews were created. The interview was conducted in Bahasa Indonesia and then translated into English. After all

data was in English, data was transcribed. Simon and Goes (2013) explained that when transcribing, it is acceptable to leave some fillers in the speech pattern. It is also acceptable to make grammatical changes. However, researchers should send the transcription back to the interviewees as a part of the member check process. Therefore, in this research transcription of the data has had fillers and grammatical errors corrected. Transcriptions were sent back to the interviewees as member check safeguards to achieve reliability and validity.

3.5 Document analysis

To support the analysis, document analysis is conducted. Documents analysed and compared are the English syllabi of both curricula from every grade of senior high school. The document analysis was completed before interview collection in order to: 1) become familiar with both curricula (where they differ or are similar); 2) to construct relevant interview questions. Denzin (1970) stated that document analysis is often used in qualitative research as a combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon – an approach usually described as triangulation. Triangulation is needed to avoid potential bias in a single study.

Bowen (2009) explained five specific functions of document analysis. First, documents will provide background information that help researchers to understand specific issues and indicate the conditions that influence the phenomena being investigated. In other words, document analysis helps the researcher to contextualise data during interview. Second, information in the documents can provide questions that need to be asked and situations that need to be observed as part of the research. Third, information within a document can provide supplementary research data to help in preparing semi-structured interviews. Fourth, documents can be used by the researcher to compare and identify change and development in a project. Fifth, documents can be analysed to verify findings or to support evidence from other sources.

According to Silverman (2000), skimming, reading, and interpretation are involved in document analysis. This process combines elements of content analysis and thematic analysis. However, even if a document might consist of a lot of important data, the researcher should be critical in analysing and selecting only data that are relevant to the research problem and purpose. Above all, determining the authenticity, credibility, accuracy, and representativeness of the selected documents is important.

3.6 Data analysis

Data analysis plays an important role in achieving a good research result. In this research, both the interview data and document analysis data are analysed using thematic analysis and are integrated in a triangulation system. An explanation of thematic analysis and triangulation follows:

3.6.1 Thematic analysis

Boyatzis (1998) argued that thematic analysis is considered the most appropriate for any study that seeks discovery through the use of interpretation. Clarke and Braun (2013) define thematic analysis as a method in qualitative data research for identifying and analysing patterns. Further, they explained that thematic analysis is theoretically flexible, since it can be applied within the range of a theoretical framework for human beings, experiences, or practices.

Six phases of thematic analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006) is stated as follows:

1. Familiarisation with the data

In this step, researchers should be familiar with their founding data; reading and re-reading their data, listening to their audio recording repeatedly.

2. Coding

Coding is about selecting the data, collating, and extracting the relevant data to be analysed.

3. Searching for themes

Continuing the coding process, searching for themes should be carried out to classify data that have been coded. This step is important in order to identify similarity in the data.

4. Reviewing themes

Reviewing themes is a phase when the researchers begin to define the nature of each individual theme, and the relationship among themes. In this phase, it may happen that several data are collapsed together or split into two or more themes.

5. Defining and naming themes

In this phase, researchers start to conduct and write a detailed analysis of each theme.

6. Writing up

Writing up means that the data is written as an analytic narrative to tell the reader a coherent and persuasive story about the data, and contextualising it to the existing literature.

3.6.2 Triangulation

As already stated in a previous sub-chapter, content analysis can be used in triangulation. Kohlbacher (2006) states that content analysis might be an appropriate analysis and interpretation method for case study research. Yin (2003) found that content analysis might be used to transform unclear evidence of qualitative research into some sort of quantitative evidence.

According to Gillham (2000), the use of different methods accumulated to analyse the same issue is often called a 'multi-methods approach'. It is believed that every method has its strengths and weaknesses. Jick (1979) argued that "when more than one method is being used together, each weakness can be compensated with another's strength. Therefore, triangulation can potentially generate what anthropologists call "holistic work" or "thick description". (Jick 1979, p609).

In this research, results of document analysis and interview are combined. It uses the same code in interview transcript and document analysis. Results of the data are then presented in findings, with a discussion chapter supported by theoretical material. Bowen (2009) explained that codes and themes serve to integrate data gathered from different methods. The combination of interview and data analysis give countered safeguards to trustworthiness, covering factors such as reactivity, researcher bias, and respondent bias.

3.7 Participants

In this research, participants are selected based on Mendikbud Nomor 160 Tahun 2014 / Ministry of Education Decree No. 160 year 2014, which stated that schools that had already implemented the curriculum for three years or more will continue to use the 2013 Curriculum (6221 schools). Others (201,779 schools) that had implemented the 2013 Curriculum for less than three years will revert to the 2006 Curriculum (KTSP). Teachers, headmasters, educational staff and supervisors will receive mandatory training on the 2013 Curriculum from the Government. The 2006 Curriculum will continue to be implemented for a further four years until 2019/2020.

Therefore, Senior High School 9 Semarang is chosen because it uses both curricula in teaching English. Four English teachers and the vice principal responsible for curricula implementation will be the participants. The vice principal was chosen since in qualitative research, it may help the researcher to gain clarity, and refine, or falsify, teachers'

perception (McCormick & James: 1990). Teachers are all over 18 years old. The principal's institutional consent for the participation of teachers undertaking the interview process has already been sought. Each teacher is also asked for his or her individual consent.

3.7.1 Ethical consideration

As stated in Hamilton and Whittier (2013), ethical practices are essentials in all research. Some challenges might be found in conducting research. However, the adage 'first, do no harm' should be kept in mind during or after research is conducted. Based on Resnik (2010), ethics is described as 'norms of conduct' that separate acceptable and unacceptable behaviour.

The British Educational Research Association (BERA), The American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the Scottish Educational Research Association (SERA) are three research associations which share two guiding principles as a basis for research. These are to respect the person(s) involved in the research, and researchers also have responsibilities to participants, sponsors, and the community of educational research (BERA, 2004).

In this research, I am an independent researcher affiliated with a UK university. I do not therefore currently hold a position of authority in relation to the participants. I was an extra-curricular teacher, as a debate coach, in the proposed case study school for two years. As an extra-curricular teacher, I taught in the school after class hours and I am familiar with the school context. However, I had only brief contact with one of the possible participants, in relation to the organisation of the room where I taught. Therefore, I would not consider this proposed participant as a 'colleague' as we did not share the same work environment. I have no relationship with the other proposed participants (English teachers or the vice-principal).

For the purposes of the research, a letter of invitation and a Principal Consent Form both in Bahasa Indonesia and English respectively (see appendix 2 and 3) were sent to achieve permission to collect data from the school as an educational institution. At an individual participant level, the teachers and vice-principal are provided with an information sheet and consent form (in both Bahasa Indonesia and English). Cohen et al. (2013) states that “qualitative data analysis frequently concerns individual cases and unique instances, and may involve personal and sensitive matters, it raises the question of identifiability, confidentiality and privacy of individuals.”

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, results of the interview and document analysis are presented. Results of interview are divided into six sub-chapters. The first sub-chapter is related to the background of the interview. The next sub-chapters follow the interview chapters. These report on the views/perceptions/experiences of English language teachers who are

delivering/teaching both the 2013 curriculum and the KTSP curriculum in senior high school in Indonesia simultaneously, challenges they face and their strategies to deal with those challenges, which curriculum they think better in relation to teaching English in Indonesia and their recommendations for further English curricula.

Besides the findings of the interview, findings of document analysis are also presented. Document analysis used in this research is a comparison between syllabi of the 2013 curriculum and the KTSP curriculum. Presentation of the document analysis is categorized into five sub-chapters. These cover background of document analysis, general overview, materials, activity, and learning indicator.

To summarise the findings, the conclusion is presented at the end of this chapter. Findings of the interview will then be combined with results of document analysis as a triangulation. Along with those triangulation results, literature reviews will be presented to support the findings. This will all be presented in the discussion section in the next chapter.

4.1 Interview results

This interviews were conducted in a semi-structured format. Cohen et al. (2012) explained that semi-structured interview can provide reliable, comparable qualitative data. He also explained that under semi-structured interview, questions are standardised. Therefore, comparison and analysis of the data are easier to conduct. There are five questions in the interview. These are as follows:

1. What is your opinion about the implementation of the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum simultaneously?
2. How long have you been teaching English using both curricula?
3. What are your challenges in teaching English using the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum simultaneously?
4. What are your strategies to deal with those challenges?

5. Which curriculum do you think better in relation to teaching English?

Besides the English teachers, the vice-principal curricula was also interviewed, and the six questions asked were:

1. What is your perspective about the implementation of the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum simultaneously?
2. Since when does this school use two curricula simultaneously?
3. Why does this school implement two curricula simultaneously?
4. What are the challenges faced in implementing two curricula simultaneously?
5. Until when will this school use both curricula simultaneously?
6. What curriculum do you think is better to implement?

As stated in the previous chapter, the interview was conducted using an Indonesian language since participants are not confident in speaking in English. In this chapter, results of the interview were translated into English without changing the sentences.

Code is used to keep the participants' confidentiality, as agreed by both the researcher and participants in the ethics form. Even if there are some different questions for the vice-principal of curricula, the analysis of those interview results is being intertwined with those of other participants. This is done to maintain anonymity and avoid obvious information since there is only one vice-principal in this research. Participants will be described as P1 to P5, in which P represents the word 'participant'. The use of code to make the research participants anonymous is important since, according to Wiles et al. (2008), essential factors in social research are the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants. Researchers should be able to guarantee that the data that they present cannot be traced back to them in reports, presentations and other forms of dissemination. Some quotations are taken from the participants to explain their opinions as the results of the interview.

4.1.1 Background of the participants in relation to teach both curricula

All participants said that they have one year's experience in teaching 2013 and KTSP simultaneously. However, they have been teaching the KTSP curriculum since 2006 when it was created. Even if the name of the curriculum is the 2013 curriculum, P5 explained that this school had implemented the 2013 curriculum only since 2016. This is because in Semarang city only one school has become *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI)* (translated as the Pioneer International Standard Schools), the class of existing schools that had been selected to implement the teaching and learning process that complied with international standards to improve the country, and that used the 2013 curriculum since 2013 as a trial. This is in line with Mendikbud Nomor 160 Tahun 2014 / Ministry of Education Decree No. 160 year 2014 which is summarised as:

1. Schools that have already implemented the curriculum for three semesters, will continue in using the 2013 curriculum (6,221 schools)
2. Others (201,779 schools) that had implemented the 2013 curriculum for less than three semesters will revert to the 2006 Curriculum (KTSP). Teachers, headmasters, educational staff, and supervisors will get the training in the 2013 curriculum from the government (it was considered that they are not ready yet). This 2006 curriculum implementation will be implemented for four years up until 2019/2020.

In 2016, the Ministry of Education announced new regulations regarding the curriculum. It was stated that from July 2016, the 2013 curriculum was to become the national curriculum. This means that all schools should use the 2013 curriculum as their curriculum. However, grades that already used KTSP can continue with the KTSP curriculum. Therefore, P5 explained, now in that school, the 2013 curriculum is used by grade X and XI, but grade XII will use KTSP until 2018.

4.1.2 Views of English Language teachers who are teaching both the 2013 Curriculum and the KTSP Curriculum in Senior High School in Indonesia simultaneously

Based on the interview, all participants agree that the implementation of double curricula simultaneously is doing more harm than good for several reasons. Two participants argued that 2013 Curriculum is new for them, so they have to learn more about the curriculum. This makes them focus more on the 2013 curriculum than on the KTSP. However, now the KTSP curriculum is used by XII grade, which needs more attention since they will take the national examination which will determine their success in graduating from the school.

“We have to learn more about the new curriculum. Meanwhile, we also have students in XII grade that rely on us to make sure they will have good results in their national examination. As a teacher, I feel guilty since I can’t teach them maximally.” (P2)

“I think the implementation of double curricula is not effective. It is because 2013 Curriculum gets reduction to two hours teaching only, so we have to do the adaptation and focus more on the newest curriculum rather than the old one.” (P1)

Other opinions on teaching English in KTSP and 2013 simultaneously are related to the extra work that has to be done by teachers. They need to prepare lesson plans for both curricula following different concepts. Teachers also need to carry out observations in both classrooms using different curricula to make sure that all students under both curricula are having good lessons. Even if the syllabuses are prepared by the government, the teachers are still have to prepare their own teaching materials based on their students’ ability.

“It is not effective because we should prepare the lesson plan in both curricula which have different goal, approach, and aim of teaching.” (P3)

“My job is getting harder. As a teacher, I really need to do a lot of observations to guarantee that the students are learning English well even if one of them should use the new curriculum.” (P4)

“Even if the syllabuses are there along with the example of the materials, students’ abilities are different. That is why we must prepare our own learning material based on the syllabus of KTSP and 2013 curriculum by ourselves.” (P5)

4.1.3 Challenges of teaching English in using KTSP curriculum and 2013 curriculum simultaneously

When participants are asked about what challenges they face in using double curricula to teach English simultaneously, their answers are mostly related to the challenges that they have in dealing with the new curriculum, the 2013 curriculum. The first challenge regards time allocation. P1 and P4 believed that the time reduction in teaching English for senior high school students from four hours per week to only two hours per week, is too much.

“Since 2013 curriculum is new, I have to adapt with that, especially in terms of time allocation. Before, it was four hours and now we just have two hours. In that limited time, some materials cannot be covered.” (P1)

“KTSP Curriculum gives us more more more times. 2013 curriculum is only two hours and it is not enough.” (P4)

However, one of the participants believes that the reduction of time allocation is not really a problem. It is because she believes that actually all students already have basic English, since they have been learning English since elementary school.

“Even if time allocation for English subject might be limited, I think it is fine. Students already have basic from elementary schools. All material also related like grammar, text types.”

English subject materials, students' evaluation and learning activity also become concerns of the participants. They explained that some materials in the 2013 curriculum are being decreased to deal with the time reduction. They also explained that some changes are needed in relation to the implementation of the new curriculum.

“In 2013 curriculum, grammar, text, and expression are not as coherent and linear. It is different with what we have in KTSP curriculum. For example, in KTSP we have analytical, expression is about opinion, and the grammar is about modal. Therefore, it is connected between one and other materials. 2013 Curriculum does not have that.” (P1)

“Actually, the implementation of new curriculum is a great idea since we are not only building the knowledge, but also character of the students. However, we do not have enough time to use new development of teaching methodology. That is because we only have 2 x 45 minutes each week and not every week is effective. Sometimes we have holiday, sometimes school activities.” (P2)

“English learning in Indonesia is actually simple. It has the continuity between one material and other materials. The difference is only in terms of upgrading the vocabulary. For example, introduction. First is about introduction of our self, then introduce our family, our friends, and soon. However, most of the materials are reading. If we discuss all reading material in class, it will consume a lot of time. We need to discuss about content of the text, vocabulary, language features, etc. That is why actually students must actively read the material before class, However, reading habits in Indonesia are still very low.” (P4)

“Actually, 2013 curriculum has good learning setting. However, some materials in 2006 that has been coherent are changed in 2013 Curriculum. There are some changing in the sequence. It is then being a problem for teachers that get used to teach using the KTSP curriculum for several years. Moreover, now they are still teaching both curricula simultaneously.” (P5)

Another challenge mentioned by some participants is related to students' readiness. It is mostly caused by the nature of Indonesian students who depend on the teacher. It is

because since elementary school, they get used to have the teacher as the centre of information and activity. Not only students' readiness, but also teachers' readiness also becomes the challenge. Some participants stated that sometimes they are confused and forget about which grade is using the 2013 curriculum and which grade is using the KTSP curriculum when they want to prepare materials.

“Nature of most of students in Indonesia are they want the teacher to be the sources and get everything from the teachers. It makes a fundamental challenge in applying 2013 Curriculum.” (P4)

“For me, the challenge is how to change students' mindset to be active, not depend on the teacher. It is also important to make sure that all teachers are ready to apply the new curriculum when they still have to teach in another curriculum.” (P5)

“Sometimes I forget. I feel like I am splattering and get confused in using methods. Because we use two different curricula, I have to think which curriculum should I use in this class when I am already inside the class. It is like mix in my brain.” (P2)

“It makes me always prepare the materials in two curricula. Just to avoid that I forget which grade is using this and that curricula.” (P3)

4.1.4 Strategies to deal with the challenges

The question given to the participants is: what is the strategy that they use to deal with the challenge? Since there are various answers related to the challenge that they faced in teaching English in double curricula, the answers for this question related to strategy also vary. Some participants answered this question by suggesting a strategy to deal with the 2013 curriculum as the new curriculum. Some others were answering this question by explaining the strategies that they use in dealing with teaching in both curricula simultaneously.

“Strategies that I use to deal with the challenge are since we only have limited time to teach in the 2013 curriculum, I select some topics that are more interesting and more important to be given to the students. Not all materials. If the material is similar with another material, I will just pick one and leave the others behind. Just to make sure that I am not repeating the same materials, so I can cover all materials to make sure that students get all materials that they needed. It is because they need those all materials for their national examination.” (P1)

“Even if the 2013 curriculum teacher cannot give homework to the students, I am still giving them some easy work at home like reading. I think this is a good strategy to make sure that students are also ready to come to the class whatever the curriculum is.” (P2)

“As a teacher, I need to remind myself that the 2013 curriculum is different from the KTSP curriculum. Therefore, I have to be able to teach my students in different ways based on what is the aim and focus of each curriculum. For KTSP, I will search material that students are interested, so they can be happy when I have to explain the materials in front of the class. For 2013 Curriculum, as a teacher I need to be energetic and give more fun activity like games and songs, so students can learn independently and actively in the class.” (P3)

“The best strategy that I can do is make sure that I am ready in every situation. I am searching the material as many as I can. I try to always join the training about the curriculum given by the government.” (P4)

“As a teacher, we have to be ready and try to be flexible. I think that is the way to deal with all challenges about the changing of curriculum.” (P5)

4.1.5 Better curriculum in relation to teaching English

The last question that I asked the participants is which curriculum they think better in relation to teaching English. Based on the question, almost all of the participants believe that the 2013 curriculum is actually better in all aspects to be applied. Four of the five participants stated that the 2013 curriculum is more suitable with what is needed by Indonesian students nowadays. However, the time limitation is still becoming a problem.

One participant said that actually there is an issue that there will be a questionnaire given by the government to the English teacher regarding the improvement of time allocation in teaching English. However, until now that is still just an issue.

“In my point of view, KTSP is better. The materials are more complete and more coherent. Reading text, grammar, and expression is linear.” (P1)

“I think the 2013 curriculum is better than KTSP because all materials are more useful in students’ daily life and more realistic. The 2013 curriculum also assess both affective and psychomotor aspects. If the time allocation is also four hours, I think it will be the best curriculum that can change Indonesian students to be more active. There is an issue said that there will be a questionnaire to add more time for English subject. However, up to now, it is just an issue.” (P3)

“In my opinion, 2013 is better because this curriculum makes students be more active in learning. It shapes the students to be more critical and independent in getting the knowledge. Students are then required to be ready when they are in the class. It is match with English subject. As a language subject, this curriculum provides big chance for students to practise more.” (P3)

“Actually, the 2013 curriculum is better than the KTSP curriculum because it facilitates the students to have more opportunity to use the language as a media of communication. However, because of the limitation of time, the teacher cannot provide much time to assess their students deeply.” (P4)

“If we compare both curricula, I think the 2013 curriculum is better. The curriculum is focusing on students’ activeness. It is good to erase the perception in Indonesian students that they need to always depend on the teacher.” (P5)

4.2 Document analysis

Based on what is already explained in the previous chapter, document analysis is used in this research to support the interview results. Bowen (2009) explained five specific

functions of document analysis. After the interview, those five functions have been proven. First, documents provide background information that help researchers understand specific issues and conditions explained by the interviewee. Document analysis helps the researcher to contextualise data during an interview. Second, document analysis helps the researcher in preparing and framing questions to ask the interviewee. Third, information inside of the document can be used as material for the semi-structured interview. Fourth, documents can be used by the researcher to compare and identify the change and development in a project. Fifth, documents can be analysed to verify findings and become a support evidence for the interview results.

In this research, documents analysed are syllabi from both the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum. The documents were being compared. Some similarities and differences were then analysed as findings of document analysis. Findings of document analysis presented in this chapter are divided into sub-chapters based on the differences found in the analysis process.

4.2.1 General overview

Before the analysis of each grade syllabus's comparison is presented, a general overview of the difference between the syllabus of the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum will be outlined. This is to help the reader in understanding context and contents of the English syllabi in Indonesia.

Actually, there are no specific differences on the syllabus format between the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum. The syllabus of the KTSP curriculum includes standard competence, basic competence, learning materials, learning activities, indicator, assessment, time allocation, and learning sources. This is similar to what we can find in the 2013 curriculum. Both the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum has 12 standard competencies in each grade. Those competencies are divided into four skills, listening,

speaking, reading, and writing. The contents of standard competence and basic competence in both curricula are also exactly the same.

According to Abdul Majid (2012), standard competency is a framework that explains the basic development of a structured learning programme. It means that standard competence has been determined by the developers. Standard competence is then developed within basic competence. In other words, basic competence is about minimum knowledge, skills, and behaviour that should be achieved by students to show that they have mastered the standard competence that has been set. Therefore, basic competence is the development of standard competence. Meanwhile, the indicator is characteristics and signs of what should be achieved by students to indicate and measure their levels of basic competence (See the example of syllabuses in appendix 5).

However, there are two additional points in the syllabus of the 2013 curriculum. First are national character and cultural values. Second are entrepreneurship and creative economy. Other differences could be found in some contents of the learning materials, learning activities, indicator, and time allocation. Explanations of those differences will be described in the next sub-chapters.

4.2.2 Learning materials

Several changes were found in the learning materials. Some materials in the 2013 curriculum are decreased compared to the KTSP curriculum. Some materials that are reduced are presented as follows:

Table 4.1
Results of syllabuses materials comparison: Grade X

Grade X

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
3.2	Express the meaning of transactional conversation (to get things done) and formal informal interpersonal conversation using simple spoken language accurately, fluently, and acceptably in daily context and include expressing feelings, showing sympathy, and giving instruction	Speaking	Showing sympathy, expressing happiness, giving instruction in informal way.	Showing sympathy, expressing happiness, giving instruction in formal and informal ways.
6.1	Express the meaning of the written text in the daily context and use them to access knowledge in the form of announcement, invitation, and advertisement	Writing	Make written announcement in pairs and publish it in the class/school	Arrange recount text; and analyse the following questions: 1. What do people usually write when they use recount text? 2. What sort of advantages can people get from writing it?

8.1	Respond to the meaning of simple verbal functional text (announcement, advertisement, invitation, etc) formal and informal accurately, smoothly, acceptably in various daily life contexts.	Listening	Notification, advertisement, invitation	Narrative text
11.2	Respond to the meaning and rhetorical steps in a simple essay accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life contexts and access knowledges in narrative, descriptive, and news item texts	Reading	Written narrative text, written descriptive text, written news item text, passive voice, reported speech	Identify meanings and information in narrative, descriptive, and news item texts. Read and understand narrative texts.

Table 4.2
Results of syllabuses materials comparison: Grade XI

GRADE XI

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
6.2	Express meaning and	Writing	• Noun phrase	Writing report,

	<p>rhetorical steps in an essay by using various written languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably, in daily life contexts in some types of text: <i>Report, narrative, and analytical exposition</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjective clause • Written narrative text • Written report text • Analytical exposition text 	<p>narrative, and analytical exposition text.</p>
11.2	<p>Respond to meanings and rhetorical steps in an essay which is using various written languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably, in daily life context and to access knowledge in some types of text: narrative, spoof, and hortatory exposition</p>	Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written narrative text • Written spoof text • Written hortatory exposition text • Complex sentences • Modals 	<p>Reading narrative, spoof, and hortatory exposition text</p>

Table 4.3

Results of syllabuses materials comparison: Grade XII

GRADE XII

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
-----------	-------------------------	--------------	-------------	-------------

5.2	Respond to meaning and rhetorical steps in an essay which is using various written languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life context and to access knowledge in various types of text: <i>narrative, explanation, and discussion.</i>	Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Written narrative text •Written explanation text •Written discussion text •Conjunction that show cause/effect relationships •If clause type 1 (future condition) •Conjunctions that show contrary 	Reading and identifying the structure of narrative, explanation, and descriptive text
11.1	Respond meanings of short functional texts (banner, poster, pamphlet, etc) in formal and informal ways by using various written languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life context	Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Banner •Pamphlet •Poster 	Reading about intercultural communication

4.2.3 Learning activity

Anitah (2008) stated that there are various methods that can be used by teachers depending on the learning situation and objective that they want to achieve. Teachers have

their own preferences in delivering materials to students. They have full rights to create their own activity and lesson plans. That is why when we look at the syllabi, we will find general learning activity. This general activity just becomes guidance for the teachers to create their own learning activity. However, several differences are found between the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum.

Table 4.4
Results of syllabuses learning activity comparison: Grade X

GRADE X

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
3.2	Express meaning of transactional conversation (to get things done) and interpersonal (socialisation) in formal and informal.	Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the act of speech and its respond in pairs. • Doing role play in pairs • Doing interview • Doing a drama show 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the act of speech and its respond in pairs. • Doing role play in pairs
4.2	Express the meaning of simple monologue text by using various verbal languages in various contexts in the daily life in different types of text: <i>recount, narrative</i> and <i>procedure</i>	Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the differences between the use of verbal and written language in a group • Discuss how to make a story and tell the story 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the differences between the use of verbal and written language in a group • Discuss how to make a story and tell the story

			continuously in a group • Create a story individually and tell it to classmates	continuously in a group
--	--	--	--	-------------------------

Table 4.5
Results of syllabuses learning activity comparison: Grade XI

GRADE XI

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
3.2	Express meaning of transactional conversation (to get things done) and interpersonal (socialisation) in formal and sustained by using various verbal languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life context and involve speech act: advise, warn, grant requests, and express feelings of <i>relief</i> , <i>pain</i> , and <i>pleasure</i>	Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the speech acts being used and its responds in the conversation that are being listened to in a group • Doing group role play 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the speech acts being used and their responds in the conversation that are being listened to in a group

Table 4.6
Results of syllabuses learning activity comparison: Grade XII

GRADE XII

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
9.1	Express the meaning of transactional conversation (to get things done) and interpersonal (socialisation) in formal way and sustained accurately, smoothly, and acceptably by using various verbal languages in daily life context and involve speech acts: persuade, encourage the spirit, criticise, express hope, and avoid	Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practise using the speech acts and its responds in pairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the meaning of the speech acts • Respond the speech acts • Try to use the speech acts
9.2	Express the meaning of transactional conversation (to get things done) and interpersonal (socialisation) in formal	Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing a group role play 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the speech acts that are being used and their responds in conversations that are already being

	<p>way and sustained accurately, smoothly, and acceptably by using various verbal languages in daily life context and involve speech acts: regrets, discloses/asks plans, objectives, intentions, predicts, speculates, and gives an assessment.</p>			<p>listened to in a group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing a group role play
12.2	<p>Express the meaning and rhetorical steps in an essay by using various written languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life context in various narrative and review texts</p>	Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watch a classical movie to understand the story • Discuss in a group to review a movie that has been watched • Write a narrative/review individually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watch a classical movie to understand the story • Discuss in a group to review a movie that has been watched • Write a narrative/review individually • Make a review of an entertainment • Read the results of a review that has been written

4.2.4 Learning indicator

D. Parmenter (2015) explained that learning indicators are expected to be a set of learning expectations for students. Indicator is given to be a guidance for students as well as teachers in achieving curricular expectations and learning outcomes. This is why learning indicators are important. When they are written in the syllabus, teachers can make them parameters in assessing students.

In this document analysis, several differences are found in the learning indicators. This might be different because the focuses and goals of the curricula are also different. Differences in the learning indicator between the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum can be stated as follows:

Table 4.7
Results of syllabuses learning indicators comparison: Grade X

GRADE X

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
2.1	Respond the meaning accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in short verbal functional text (for examples: announcement, advertisement,	Listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify topic of a verbal announcement• Identify specific information from the announcement• Identify the	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answer some questions related to verbal short simple functional text (for example: announcement, advertisement,

	invitation, etc) formal and informal in various context of daily life		function of an announcement that has been listened to	invitation, etc) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing simple verbal functional text (for example: announcement, advertisement, invitation, etc) • Present short simple functional verbal text (for example: announcement, advertisement, invitation, etc)
4.2	Express the meaning of simple monologue text by using various verbal languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in various context of daily life in some types of texts: <i>recount, narrative, and procedure</i>	Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using past tense to deliver an event • Do a monologue to tell an experience • Do a monologue to deliver a procedure • Storytelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond a simple monologue recount text • Do a simple monologue recount text • Answer some questions of simple monologue procedure text • Do a monologue to deliver a procedure

Table 4.8
Results of syllabuses learning indicators comparison: Grade XI

GRADE XI

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
6.2	Express the meaning and rhetorical steps of an essay by using various written language accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life context in various types of texts: <i>report, narrative, and analytical exposition</i>	Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use <i>adjective clause</i> sentence in delivering news • Use <i>adjective phrase</i> sentence in making a report • Produce report text • Produce narrative text • Produce analytical exposition text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify meaning of words in the reading text • Identify meaning of sentences in the reading text • Identify complication in a narrative text • Identify an event in the reading text • Identify a process in an event • Identify pro and con arguments in a text • Identify rhetorical steps in a text

Table 4.9
Results of syllabuses learning indicators comparison: Grade XII

GRADE XII

NO	Basic competence	Skill	KTSP	2013
4.1	Express the meaning of simple functional text in formal and informal accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in various context of daily life	Listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use verbal language in delivering short functional text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify topic of a short functional text that has been listened to • Identify specific information from short functional text that has been listened to • Identify the purpose of short functional text that has been listened to
8.2	Understand and respond meaning of monologue text which is using various languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life context in narrative and review text	Listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify characters from story that has been listened to • Identify events in text that has been listened to • Identify assessment of a movie/song/novel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand and respond a narrative monologue • Determine the message of a story

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify suggestion in a review that has been listened to 	
11.1	Respond meanings of short functional text (for examples: banner, poster, pamphlet, etc.) in formal and informal which is using various written languages accurately, smoothly, and acceptably in daily life context	Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading written discourse loudly with correct pronunciation and intonation • Identify topic from text that has been read • Identify specific information from short functional text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond written discourse that has relation to the socio-cultural • Identify topic from text that has been read • Identify specific information from short functional text

4.4 Summary

This chapter presented information from interviews and also syllabus comparison as a document analysis. The results show there are various challenges felt by teachers in teaching English using the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum simultaneously. It is in line with several differences found in syllabus comparison. The next chapter will discuss the degree of agreement between the results of interview and document analysis and previous research literature which has been written in the literature review chapter or additional research literature as a support literature.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS

This chapter will discuss each research question by showing results of interview which is triangulated with the results of document study. Along with the results of triangulation, agreement and disagreement within the previous research will be noted. Based on what has been stated in the research methodology chapter, writing up as the final part of thematic analysis in analysing the data will be carried out in this chapter. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), writing up is the process when the data that has been found is written as an analytical narrative, and it is contextualised to the existing literature. Several literatures from the literature chapter will be linked to the results of study as well as new literatures to support the analysis.

5.1 Views/perceptions/experiences in delivering/teaching both the 2013 curriculum and the KTSP curriculum simultaneously

Research question: What are the views/perceptions/experiences of English language teachers who are delivering/teaching both the 2013 curriculum and the KTSP curriculum in senior high school in Indonesia simultaneously?

Results of the interview showed that the teachers tend to give more attention to the new curriculum than to the old one. When there is a new curriculum, teachers need to learn about that curriculum, do some training, and make new lesson plans and teaching materials. Sahirudin (2013) stated that the implementation of a new curriculum always puts pressure on the educational institution as well as on the teacher. Research conducted by Castro (2013) supported this finding by saying that the implementation of a new English curriculum makes teachers feel fear, uncertainty, anxiety and insecurity about their capabilities in adapting the new curriculum into their lessons. They need time to assimilate all the changes slowly and to understand what is expected from the new curriculum. Results of document analysis in this research by comparing the syllabus of the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum showed that standard competency and basic competency between both curricula are not different. However, learning materials, activities, and indicators showed some differences that need to be addressed.

Actually, the Ministry of Education officials have already begun provided training that will help the teachers to deal with the new curriculum. As stated by Ashadi (2015), there are some demands from the teachers to get adequate socialisation and training before they have to teach using the new curriculum. However, a participant in this research explained that some efforts to master the new curriculum result in the teacher putting behind those students working under the old curriculum. The problem is that students who are using this old curriculum (in this research, the KTSP curriculum) are XII grade students or students in the final year. In the Indonesian context, students in this final year will face national examination to determine their success in graduating from senior high school.

Another perception in teaching English by using double curricula is related to the teachers' burden in preparing materials. In Indonesia, teachers need to prepare their own

lesson plan based on the syllabus provided by the government. Different approaches, aims of teaching, and various students' abilities then should become the attention of the teacher in making the lesson plan. One difference that teachers should address is the character building aspect that become the focus of the 2013 curriculum. There are two additional points in the syllabus of the 2013 curriculum. Those are character and cultural values, and entrepreneurship and creative economy (see the example in appendix 5). Nur and Madkur (2014) describe the 2013 curriculum as the curriculum that not only focuses on students' cognitive aspects, but also on students' character. Ariatna (2016), explained that the 2013 curriculum shifted the former structure-based methods of ELT to a communication-based approach. Therefore, those aspects should be included in the process of making the teaching materials and assessment.

5.2 Challenges in teaching English using the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum simultaneously

Research question: What challenges do English language teachers face in teaching English using the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum simultaneously?

5.2.1 Time allocation

Reduction in time allocation for English subject in the 2013 curriculum presented a new challenge to teachers. Most of the teachers feel that two hours per week is not enough time in which to teach English. This is because a lot of materials should be covered by the teachers to be given to the students. As summarised by Putra (2014), reduction of teaching hours at senior high school becomes one of the changes in 2013 curriculum policy.

If we look at the syllabi of both curricula, some materials that should be covered are still the same. For example, syllabus number 3.2 for X grade (See table 4.1). The basic competence is "Express the meaning of transactional conversation (to get things done) and

formal informal interpersonal conversation using simple spoken language accurately, fluently, and acceptably in daily context and include expressing feelings, showing sympathy, and giving instruction”. Both the KTSP and the 2013 curriculum have the same materials that should be covered: showing sympathy, expressing happiness, and giving instruction. However, KTSP allocates four hours to cover all the materials while the 2013 curriculum offers only two hours.

To deal with that limitation of time, speaking activity number 3.2 for grade X is reduced. In KTSP, the activities are using the speech act of speech and its respond in pairs, doing the role play in pairs, doing interview, and doing a drama show. Meanwhile, in the 2013 curriculum, interview and drama should be deleted to cope with the limitation of time. However, one of the teachers believes that time reduction is not a big problem because students had been learning English since elementary school. Moreover, all materials were also related between one another. This idea is supported by Prasad (2013) who explained that nowadays almost all language teaching will be focused on communicative competences such as: language skills, content, grammar, vocabulary, and functions.

5.2.2 Contents of curriculum

As an impact of the time allocation reduction, other changes of the 2013 curriculum summarised by Putra (2014) are related to reduction of contents of teaching materials (types of texts speech acts), limitation of topics and discussion, and limited explicit grammar points. Some teachers regret those changes since the KTSP curriculum already provided coherent and connected materials. For instance, in KTSP there is a material related to analytical text followed by giving opinion as an expression, and modal as a grammar material. This is proven by the syllabi comparison which shows that grammar and speech acts are becoming an implicit material.

As an example, in Grade XII no 5.2 (see table 4.3), KTSP still has conjunction that shows cause or effect relationships, if clause type 1 (future condition), and conjunction that shows contrary. However, the 2013 curriculum only has identifying the structure of the text as the material. The learning indicator (see table 4.9) also indicates that there are some explicit grammatical features as the learning indicator. For example, use adjective clause sentence in delivering news in the KTSP curriculum. However, the 2013 curriculum indicator is more about identifying meaning rather than direct grammatical points. Some previous research has been discussed about this issue, whether teaching grammar implicitly is better than explicitly.

Some researchers showed that each approach has its own effectiveness in facilitating English learning. Muranoi (2006) described the effectiveness of explicit learning by explaining that explicit grammar teaching will provide linguistic information that can make learners pay more attention to linguistic forms as an input. It makes the learner more sensitive to his/her grammatical errors and to correct them. Therefore, learners may accelerate the speed of development of the interlanguage. In contrast, Burgess and Etherington (2002) explained that explicit grammar teaching makes students focus more on the language forms. Actually, it makes students able to make sentences grammatically accurate. However, trouble in using English communicatively has always been a problem where they give too much focus on grammar, but not fluency. By using implicit grammar teaching, the classroom atmosphere will be more active, because teachers and students will have more chance for interaction. Thus, the output of students is more efficient and accurate.

However, according to UNESCO's draft scheme (2004), language teaching should follow learners' needs, because learners have different needs, abilities, interests, backgrounds, and different ways of learning. Those are all based on the differences of language backgrounds, cultures, costumes, and experiences. If we look back at the reason the government created the 2013 curriculum to replace the KTSP curriculum, it is clear that implicit grammar teaching is the appropriate approach. Rachmat (2015) said that the hope

was that the 2013 curriculum would be a good bridge to help Indonesian students compete in globalisation era. Therefore, according to Tantra (2013), the learning paradigm of the 2013 curriculum has shifted from students getting knowledge directly from the teacher to students getting knowledge by themselves.

5.2.3 Teachers' confusion

Besides the challenges of adapting to the new curriculum, different approaches and focuses of both curricula also become a new challenge for the teachers in term of preparing learning activity and materials. Even if they have been teaching English for several years, some participants stated that sometimes they get confused when they are preparing materials and determining the method. They need to think twice whether the class they are to teach is using the KTSP curriculum or the 2013 curriculum. Research conducted by Seven and Engin (2007) shows that nearly all students believe that language teaching materials have an essential role in their learning process. It is not possible to say that learning materials are not important in language learning. Therefore, in relation to teacher readiness, dual curriculum can be considered as ineffective since it makes teachers feel splatter in preparing the lesson.

According to Olivia and Pawlas (2008), there are six competencies that should be followed by teachers to make students achieve effective learning. These are: following a systematic approach, following a model of instruction, writing instructional goals and objectives, applying taxonomies of instructional objectives, describing and analysing learning tasks, and organising instructional plans. Therefore, in this context, teachers should be careful in giving materials and methods since the KTSP curriculum and the 2013 curriculum have different approaches, models of instruction, instructional goals and objectives, learning tasks, and instructions.

Differences between both curricula also relate to the different learning objectives. As has been stated before, the 2013 curriculum emphasizes critical thinking and character building as the main focuses. In syllabus, it is shown by the learning indicators of the 2013 curriculum. It is hoping that students will learn to identify rather than to use or produce something. According to the Ministry of Education (2013), the 2013 curriculum was developed to uphold students' future competency, communication skills, ability to think critically and solve problems. Lai (2011) described that nowadays, Partnership for 21st Century Skills has identified critical thinking as one of the learning and innovation skills really needed by students to face the globalisation era. Research conducted by Vdovina (2015) concluded that critical thinking plays an essential role since it offers benefits in language learning. Critical thinking is associated with quality thinking that can make learners have a more skilful way of communicating with others, acquiring new knowledge, and dealing with ideas, beliefs, and attitude.

Along with critical thinking, character building also characterises the identity of the 2013 curriculum. Nugraheni (2015) explained that the 2013 curriculum was created as a reaction to the reality of students' behaviour. Many Indonesian students are involved in drugs, free life, and fighting. Veugelers (2008) said that values are part of teaching. Values will always be embedded in the curriculum, curriculum materials, and educational practices.

5.3 Strategies to deal with the challenges

Research question: What are their strategies to deal with challenges in teaching English using double curricula simultaneously?

Some strategies are being used by teachers to make sure that students can learn English effectively. Some of the participants are explaining about their strategies to adapt to

the 2013 curriculum as the new curriculum. Some others are explaining their strategies to deal with implementation of dual curricula simultaneously.

As explained in previous discussion, the biggest problem of the new curriculum is limitation of time; participants try to be selective about which topics to give to the students. The topic that is more important, interesting and necessary to the students in facing the national examination will be taught first. Ashadi (2015) stated that teachers tend not to always follow the syllabus of the curriculum, but will just do what they believe can help their students better. This is supported by Ring, Nyquist, and Mitchell (2016) and Fullan (2007), who say that the curriculum needs to be renewed in order to follow the needs and interests of current and future societies. Therefore teachers, who are key to the implementation of curriculum, need to build a deep understanding of what should be changed in the practice of any new curriculum.

Meanwhile, other strategies are implemented by teachers who teach English by using double curricula simultaneously. Being flexible is one of the strategies mentioned by the participants. They explained that as teachers, being ready to try to be flexible in every situation included being ready for every change in curriculum. The example given by one of the participants is using different methods of teaching based on the aim and focus of each curriculum. For the KTSP curriculum, material that uses interesting media will make students interested and will attract their attention when the teacher is explaining in front of the class. For the 2013 curriculum, the teacher said that they should be more energetic and provide more fun activities, such as games and songs, so students can learn independently and happily in the class.

Richards (2013) explained that creative teaching provided by teachers improves learners' quality in developing learners' capacities for original ideas and creative thinking. It also improves learners' experience and increases their motivation in learning language. Another thing that is important for teachers is to have the ability to cope with an unusual degree of awareness of what is happening both above and below the surface, and an ability

to respond unpredictability as the action unfolds (Maley and Peachy, 2015). According to Clipperton in Takahashi, Austin, and Marimoto (1998), to achieve success in teaching a foreign language, classroom interaction in that language should be purposeful, interactive, and creative. To create this learning environment, language teachers should be able to tailor instructions and guide interaction for a variety of learners.

Besides the readiness of the teacher, preparing to maximise students' flexibility and motivation in learning English has also become a crucial factor. Based on the results of interviews, another strategy to deal with dual curricula is preparing students before they attend class, so they can be ready for all curricula. One thing that students must do is independent reading by themselves. However, a study conducted by E. Iftanti (2012) in Indonesia showed that Indonesian EFL students do not have regular English reading practice, since they do not understand the content of English reading passages and encounter a lot of unfamiliar words that obstruct their reading comprehension. According to Mustafa (2012) this low reading habit in Indonesia is influenced by Indonesian culture in the past which prefers oral culture to reading. In today's era, factors such as modern technology also makes students lazy about reading; they prefer to watch. Based on those problems, if teachers want to foster independent reading as a learning strategy, they have the responsibility to habituate students to reading by themselves.

5.4 Better curriculum for English teaching

Research question: Which curriculum do they think is better in relation to teach English

As a final research question, which curriculum do they think is better in relation to teach English is being discussed. Since the objective of this research is to provide information about teachers' voices on both curricula, in the hope of contributing to current debate on developing teaching curricula, teachers' voices about which curriculum they think

is better can be a consideration to the curriculum makers when they have to decide the future curriculum after 2020.

Based on the results of the interviews, four of the five participants believed that the 2013 curriculum is a better curriculum in relation to English teaching in Indonesia. Almost all participants argued that the main factor that makes the 2013 curriculum better is its suitability for students' current needs. The materials are more realistic and useful in students' daily life. By using the 2013 curriculum as a base, students also get more chance to practise their English as a communication tool because it has active learning as the basis of the curriculum. Research conducted by Manara in 2007 showed that in Indonesia, where English is regarded as a foreign language, students do not have a chance to practise their English since their environments still use Bahasa Indonesia and local languages in every aspect of daily life, including signs, reading materials, documents, and speaking.

Therefore, when Indonesian students have more opportunities to practise English in their class, rather than just listen to their teachers, they will have more chance to improve their language. Several researches prove that classroom interaction benefits students in foreign language learning. According to Hall and Verpaetse (2000), much language learning occurs in the classroom. Brown (1991) stated that classroom interaction provides non-native learners with a chance to practise their English which will improve their structural automaticity, making them more fluent in English. Classroom interaction enables the learner to achieve a practical application of academic knowledge gained in the class. Hedge (2001), explained that interaction in the classroom gives students opportunities to get feedback from the teacher or from other students, leading to improving their language systems. This means that in ELT practice, interaction pushes learners to produce appropriate language when they are working as individuals, in pairs, or in groups.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

In this final chapter of conclusions, limitations of the study and future research will be presented. These conclusions of the study are based on the data analysis discussed in Chapter Five. Limitations of study and future research are presented in order to give information and guidance for other researchers who want to conduct research in the same field or issue.

6.1 Final Conclusions

This research is aimed at understanding the experience of English teachers who teach two different curricula in a senior high school in Indonesia. Data was taken from a case study in Senior High School 9, Central Java, Indonesia. It is hoped that the study will provide useful information about teachers' voices, perspectives, and challenges on both curricula as well as knowing which curriculum they prefer in relation to English teaching. As explained in the rationale in Chapter One of this research, results of this study can inform current debate on developing future curricula. After reviewing previous research literature and the findings of this current study, it can be summarised that teachers are facing some difficulties in relation to teaching English using two different curricula simultaneously. Supported by syllabus comparison as a document study, many differences from both curricula are found.

Several innovations such as the focus of the curriculum, approach, and materials in the 2013 curriculum as a new curriculum make it necessary for teachers to adapt. However, they cannot focus on the process of adaptation to the new curriculum since they also still have responsibility to teach English using the KTSP curriculum. Moreover, in the status quo, this KTSP curriculum is being used in the XII Grade that will have the national examination as their final examination to determine their success in graduating from senior high school.

Those differences then prevent the participants from carrying out the teaching process effectively. This is proven by interview results demonstrating that they have double work in preparing teaching materials and methods. Some participants also feel splatter and confusion since they should teach many classes with different curricula. As a result, teachers tend to teach English by using their own approach, as long as they can cover materials that need to be taught, and make sure that they still have same goals and principles as those demanded by the curriculum. Another important result revealed by the voices of the English teachers and vice-principal curricula related to the better curricula in teaching English. For several reasons, almost all of the teachers as participants of this

research believe that the 2013 curriculum is the better one to implement in Indonesia, especially in English teaching.

It can be concluded that the findings of this research have answered the research questions. Findings and discussion of the research also fulfil the aims of the research which is to understand the experience of English teachers who teach English using two curricula by providing relevant voices from interviews allied with syllabus analysis as a document study. It is hoped that, supported by analysis of previous studies, this research can add to the current debate on developing any future curriculum. This research proves that dual curricula in teaching English is not effective; therefore it is hoped that there will be no dual curricula policy again in the future.

6.2 Limitations of the study

What may be of concern in this research is that the curriculum policy involves the Ministry of Education, the highest authority of education. Participants, in particular the vice-principal, may not be comfortable in sharing their views or criticising the Ministry's opinion. This is in line with Schostak (2002), who believes that it is important for researchers to be careful in conducting research that might impact on the participants' future career. Schostak also argues that participants might not tell the truth if there are significant consequences for them.

In that particular case, active and informed consent is gathered from all teachers. They are given full written information on the purpose and method of the research; thus they sign a consent form agreeing to be participants throughout the research. The participants are advised about the option of withdrawal in the consent form and informed that those who withdraw will not suffer any sanctions or adverse consequences. Furthermore, decision would not affect their relationship with the researcher, the school, or

Queen's University Belfast. All participants are reminded that they are free to withdraw at any time up until such times as the data is anonymised.

All participants are assured that their contribution will be kept confidential and that their privacy will be protected. All data collected is identified by an individual participant code. All recordings of the interview are saved confidentially for the purpose of data analysis of the study from which transcripts will be written. The recordings are stored on a password protected and encrypted laptop and will be deleted once data analysis has been completed.

Another potential limitation in this research was the fact that this study involved limited participants. Cohen et al. (2012) point out the risks of compromising the generalisability of a conclusion when it is owned by a small research sample. However, the document study has been conducted in order to support findings from limited participants.

6.3 Further research

The study also generated ideas for further research. Most of the participants stated that the 2013 curriculum has its plus and minus points. Results of the interview showed that the biggest challenges in applying double curricula simultaneously in relation to English teaching also related to the 2013 curriculum: limited time allocation in teaching English, the nature of Indonesian students still depending on their teachers, and low reading habits in Indonesia prevent teachers from maximising their English teaching.

Although several previous researches had been conducted in relation to teachers' voices concerning the 2013 curriculum, such as Ashadi in 2015 and Musthafa and Hamied in 2014, deeper research about the 2013 curriculum as the newest curriculum is needed. More researches related to teachers' voices, students' voices, parents' voices, or even analysis on the contents of the curriculum can be added to the current debate about future

curricula in Indonesia – always be a problematic issue. Even if Ring, Nyquist, and Mitchell (2016) argued that renewing the curriculum is a must, since the curriculum should follow the needs of current and future societies, it is widely believed that implementing a new curriculum should be balanced with good preparation by the government. Research related to the English curriculum, especially in an EFL country, is important due to the fact that not only in Indonesia, but also – as stated by DeSegovia and Hardison (2009) in Sulfasyah et al (2015) –in Thailand, English teachers had difficulties in implementing a new curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Adi, S.S., 2013. Character building in language learning: Immersion principle in the implementation of responsible, fair, and care values in developing EFL classroom activities. In *5th NELTAL Conference, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang*.
- Ahmad, D., 2014. Understanding the 2013 Curriculum of English Teaching through the Teachers' and Policymakers' Perspectives. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development (IJERED)*, 2(4), p.7.
- Allwright, R. L., 1981. What do we want teaching materials for? 1. *ELT journal*, 36(1), 5-18.
- Ariatna, 2016. The Need for Maintaining CLT in Indonesia. *TESOL JOURNAL*, 7(4), pp.800-822.

- Ashadi, A., 2015. Indonesian EFL Teachers in the Swing of Curricula. *Beyond Words*, 3(1), pp.100-122.
- Bell, J., 2010. *Doing Your Research Project: A guide for first-time researchers* (5th ed.). Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.
- BERA, 2004, Revised ethical guidelines for educational research: Southwell: British Educational Research Association, <http://www.bera.ac.ukguidelines.html>.
- Bongolan, L.S. and Moir, E., 2005. Six key strategies for teachers of English language learners. *Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education*.
- Bowen, G.A., 2009. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), pp.27-40.
- Boyatzis, R.E., 1998. *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. sage.
- Braun, H., Kanjee, A., Bettinger, E. and Kremer, M., 2006. Improving education through assessment, innovation, and evaluation. *Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences*.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), pp.77-101.
- Brown, J. D., 1991. Do English and ESL faculties rate writing samples differently?. *Tesol Quarterly*, 25(4), 587-603.
- Burgess, J., & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: Explicit or implicit? *System*, 30(4), 433-458.
- Campbell, T., 1996. Technology, multimedia, and qualitative research in education. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 30(9), 122-133.
- Castro, A.F., 2013. *Making sense of curriculum change: Teachers' perspectives implementing a communicative English language curriculum at the Tertiary level in the Dominican Republic* (Doctoral dissertation, PhD. Thesis, Exeter: University of Exeter).
- Chairani, N., 2015. 2013 Curriculum Reflected in an International Oriented Senior High School, Yogyakarta. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 12(8), pp.568-574. Achmad Dahlan University. Available at <http://utic.pbi.uad.ac.id/proc/108-Teguh%20Sarosa-Implementing%20Curriculum%202013.pdf>) Accessed: 7 March 2017). ISBN: 978-602-18907-1-4
- Clarke, V. and Braun, V., 2013. Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The psychologist*, 26(2), pp.120-123.
- Clipperton, R. (1994). Explicit vocabulary instruction in French immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 736-49.

- Cohen, D.J. and Crabtree, B.F., 2008. Evaluative criteria for qualitative research in health care: controversies and recommendations. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 6(4), pp.331-339.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K., 2011. Planning educational research. *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge Editors.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K., 2013. *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Crow, G., and C. Pope. 2008. Editorial foreword: The future of the research relationship. *Sociology* 42, no. 5: 813–19.
- Dailey, A., 2010. Difficulties implementing CLT in South Korea: Mismatch between the language policy and what is taking place in the classroom. UK: University of Birmingham. [Online] Available: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/sociolinguistics/ADaileyDifficultiesImplementingCLTInSouthKorea2.pdf> (March 13, 2017).
- Dardjowidjojo, S., 2003. *Psikolinguistik: Pengantar pemahaman bahasa manusia*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Denzin, N., 1970. Strategies of multiple triangulation. *The research act in sociology: A theoretical introduction to sociological method*, 297, p.313.
- DeSegovia, L. P., & Hardison, D. M., 2009. Implementing education reform: EFL teachers' perspectives. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 154–162.
- Edwards, R. and Holland, J., 2013. *What is qualitative interviewing?*, A&C Black.
- Fiktorius, E. and Salam, U., 2014. A Validation Study on National Examination of Junior High School in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 3(6).
- Fitria Rachmat, Y., 2015. Teachers' perspective on the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in teaching English (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).
- Fullan, M. G. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Gillham, B., 2000. *Case study research methods*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Goodson, I.F. (1994). *Studying curriculum*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Greenberg, J. and Baron, R. 2008. *Behaviour in Organizations*. 9th edition. Upper Saddle River. Prentice Hall.
- Griffin, C., 2004. The advantages and limitations of qualitative research in psychology and education. *Scientific Annals of the Psychological Society of Northern Greece*, 2, pp.3-15.

- Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (Eds.), 2000. *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Routledge.
- Hamilton, L. and Corbett-Whittier, C., 2013. Defining case study in education research. *Research Methods in Education: Using case study in education research*. Lontoo: SAGE Publications Ltd, pp.3-22.
- Handler, B., 2010. Teacher as curriculum leader: A consideration of the appropriateness of that role assignment to classroom-based practitioners. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 3(3), pp.32-42.
- Hapsari, A., 2013. Making sense the character building in the curriculum framework: Conceptualizing culture as a local wisdom and culture as the product of interaction. In *Proceedings 60th TEFLIN International Conference: Achieving International Standards in Teacher Education* (pp. 360-364).
- Harrell, M.C. and Bradley, M.A., 2009. *Data collection methods. Semi-structured interviews and focus groups*. Rand National Defense Research Inst Santa Monica ca.
- Hedge, T., 2001. *Teaching and learning in the language classroom* (Vol. 106). Oxford,, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Howartt, A. P. R., 1984. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 279.
- Huberman, M., 1989. On teachers' careers: Once over lightly, with a broad brush. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(4), pp.347-362.
- Huda, N. (2000). Kedudukan dan fungsi bahasa asing (The Position and Function of Foreign Languages). In H. Alwi dan D. Sugono, *Politik Bahasa: Risalah Seminar Politik Bahasa* (Language Politics: Proceedings of the Seminar on Language Politics), Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa dan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, pp. 59-78.
- Iacono, V.L., Symonds, P. and Brown, D.H., 2016. Skype as a tool for qualitative research interviews. *Sociological Research Online*, 21(2), p.12.
- Iftanti, E., 2012. A survey of the English reading habits of EFL students in Indonesia. *Teflin Journal*, 23(2), pp.149-164.
- Jawarskowa, E. and Porte, G., 2007. *Forty years of language teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Jick, T.D., 1979. Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative science quarterly*, 24(4), pp.602-611.
- Johnson, B. R., 1997. Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education*, 118(3), 282-292.
- Kelly, A. V., 1999. *The curriculum: theory and practice* (4th ed.). London: Paul Chapman.

- Kementrian Komunikasi dan Informatika Republik Indonesia/Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Informatics., 2017. Retrieved from https://kominfo.go.id/index.php/content/detail/3415/Kominfo+%3A+Pengguna+Internet+di+Indonesia+63+Juta+Orang/0/berita_satker
- Kennedy, C.H., 2005. *Single-case designs for educational research*. Prentice Hall.
- Kohlbacher, F., 2006, January. The use of qualitative content analysis in case study research. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 7, No. 1).
- Kusumaningrum, D.E. and Triwiyanto, T., 2015. *Review of centralization and decentralization approaches to curriculum development in Indonesia*. In Proceedings International Conference on Engineering of Tarumanagara (Vol. 1, No. 1).
- Lai, E.R., 2011. Critical thinking: A literature review. *Pearson's Research Reports*, 6, pp.40-41.
- Lancet, Y., 2013. Review: Free Video Call Recorder for Skype records unlimited video and audio for free. Retrieved from <http://www.pcworld.com/article/2031430/review-free-video-call-recorder-for-skype-records-unlimited-video-and-audio-for-free.html>.
- Lauder, A., 2010. The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara Hubs-Asia*, 8(3).
- Lestari, Asih, and Wahyuni., 2016. *Blended learning in teaching reading: a pedagogical practice to teaching English as a foreign language in an Indonesian university context*. In: The 61 TEFLIN International Conference, Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Lichtman, M., 2013. *Qualitative research for the social sciences*. Sage Publications.
- Lo Iacono, Valeria, Symonds, Paul and Brown, David H.K., 2016. Skype as a tool for qualitative research interviews. *Sociological Research Online* 21(2)12. Retrieved from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/21/2/12.html>
- Lowenberg, P.H., 1991. English as an additional language in Indonesia. *World Englishes*, 10(2), pp.127-138.
- Madya, S., 2008. Curriculum Innovations in Indonesia and the Strategies to Implement Them. In Y. H. Choi & B. Spolsky (eds.), *ELT Curriculum Innovation and Implementation in Asia* (pp. 1-38). Seoul, South Korea: eduKLC *Materials Development in Asia and Beyond: Directions, Issues, and Challenges*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia. September 17—18, 2014, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Majid, Abdul. 2012. *Perencanaan Pembelajaran*. Bandung : PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Manara, C., 2007. The use of L1 support: teachers' and students' opinions and practices in an Indonesian context. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4(1), pp.145-178.

- Maxwell, J.A., 2012. *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- McCormick, R. and James, M., 1990. *Curriculum evaluation in schools*. Routledge.
- McDaniel, A.K. 1998. Character Education: Developing Effective Programs. *Journal of Extension*. April Volume 36 Number 2 (<http://www.joe.org/joe/1998april/a3.php> accessed January 2,2012)
- Merriam, S.B. and Tisdell, E.J., 2015. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Moore, A., 2014. *Understanding the school curriculum: theory, politics and principles*. Routledge.
- Muhamad, B. and Saparahayuningsih, S., 2016. An Attitude and Character Instructional Development Based on Curriculum 2013 in Elementary School. *Creative Education*, 7(02), p.269.
- Mukhlisun, 2015. *PGRI Minta Penerapan Kurikulum Ganda Dihentikan*, west sumatera: sumbar.antaraneews.com.
- Muranoi, H., 2006. *Effective English learning and teaching based on second language acquisition research*. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Murray Print, 1993. *Curriculum development and design*. Allen & Unwin.
- Mustafa, B. 2012., Indonesian People Reading Habit is Very Low: How Libraries can enhance the People Reading Habit. (Online). http://consalxv.perpusnas.go.id/uploaded_files/pdf/papers/normal/ID_B_Mustafapa-per-reading-habit.pdf. (retrieved August 8, 2017)
- Mustafa, B. and Hamied, F.A., 2014. Teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesian schools in the reform era: what do teachers have to say? *The New English Teacher*, 8(2).
- Njeng'ere, D., 2014. *The role of curriculum in fostering national cohesion and integration: Opportunities and challenges*. UNESCO-IBE.
- Nugraheni, A.S., 2015. Controversy a Policy Change in the Curriculum in Indonesia in Terms of the Point of View of Indonesian Language Subject. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(2), pp.53-61.
- Nur, M.R. and Madkur, A., 2014. Teachers' voices on the 2013 curriculum for English instructional activities. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 1(2), pp.119-134.
- Olivia, P., & Pawlas G. (2001). *Supervision for today's schools* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Parmenter, D., 2015. *Key performance indicators: developing, implementing, and using winning KPIs*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Patankar, P. and S., Jadhav, M., S (2013) Role of teachers' in curriculum development for teacher education [interactive]. [accessed 2015-10-17]
- Patton, M. Q., 2015. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peachey, N. and Maley, A., 2015. *Creativity in the English language classroom*. British Council.
- Prameswari, U. 2004. Langkah Awal Majukan Pendidikan. *Jawa Pos*, 4 Mei 2004.
- Prasad, V., 2013. Persistent reservations against the premedical and medical curriculum. *Perspectives on medical education*, 2(5-6), pp.335-339.
- Print, M. (1993). *Curriculum development and design*. Sydney: Murray Print.
- Putra, K.A., 2014. The Implication of Curriculum Renewal on ELT in Indonesia. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 4(1 April), pp.63-75.
- R. Wiles, *et al.*, 2008. *Visual Ethics: Ethical Issues in Visual Research* National Centre for Research Methods
- Resnik, D.B., 2010. Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology. Retrieved from <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/selt.2010.4.1/selt.2010.4.1.1124/selt.2010.4.1.1124.xml>
- Richards, J.C., 2013. Creativity in Language Teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(3), pp.19-43.
- Richards, J.C., 2013. Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *Relc Journal*, 44(1), pp.5-33.
- Ring, J., Nyquist, J. and Mitchell, S., 2016. *Curriculum for culturally responsive health care: The step-by-step guide for cultural competence training*. CRC Press.
- Sahirudin. (2013). The Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum and the Issues of English Language Teaching and Learning in Indonesia. In *The Asian Conference on Language Learning* (pp. 567–575). Osaka, Japan.
- Sanjaya, Wina., 2005., *Pembelajaran dalam Implementasi Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Sarosa, T. 2014., Implementing curriculum 2013 by using communicative language teaching?. Proceedings of The 3rd UAD TEFL International Conference 2014.
- Saukah, A. and Cahyono, A.E., 2015. National exam in Indonesia and its implications to the teaching and learning of English. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 19(2), pp.243-255.

- Savignon, S.J., 2002. Communicative Curriculum Design for the 21st Century. In Forum (Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 2-7). <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/>.
- Schmieder, C., 2011. Initial thoughts on interviews via Skype. Retrieved from <http://squaremethodology.com/2011/01/initial-thoughts-on-interviews-via-skype/>
- Schostak, J.F., 2002. *Understanding, designing and conducting qualitative research in education: Framing the project*. Open University Press.
- Schutt, R.K. and Check, J., 2012. *Research methods in education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Seven, M.A. and Engin, A.O., 2007. The Importance and Effect of Using Aid Materials in Foreign Language Teaching. *Online Submission*.
- Silverman, D., 2000. Doing qualitative research: A practical guide. London: Sage. Simon, H.(1991) *Bounded rationality and organizational learning, Organization Science*, 2(1), pp.125-34.
- Simon, M.K. and Goes, J., 2013. *Assumption, limitations, delimitations, and scope of the study* (Doctoral dissertation, Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success).
- Sri Anitah, W., 2008. *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.
- Stenhouse, L., 1975. *An introduction to curriculum research and development* (Vol. 46). London: Heinemann.
- Su, S.W., 2012. The various concepts of curriculum and the factors involved in curricula-making. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), pp.153-158.
- Suderadjat, H., 2004. *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi*. Bandung: CV Cipta Cekas Grafika.
- Sulfasyah, 2013. *Investigating the Implementation of the Indonesian KTSP (school-based Curriculum) in the Teaching of Writing in Year Two*. Edith Cowan University.
- Sulfasyah, S., Haig, Y. and Barratt-Pugh, C., 2016. Indonesian Teachers' Implementation of New Curriculum Initiatives in Relation to Teaching Writing in Lower Primary School. *International Journal of Education*, 7(4), pp.53-72.
- Sulistyo, G.H., 2015. English as a Measurement Standard in the National Examination: Some Grassroots' Voice. *TEFLIN Journal-A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 20(1), pp.1-24.
- Takahashi, E., Austin, T., & Morimoto, Y., 2000. Language Development in a FLES Classroom. *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*, 139.
- Tantra, D. K., 2015. Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia: A Literature Review. *Lingual: Journal of Language and Culture*, 4(1), 1-5.

- UNESCO., 2004. *United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development 2005-2014: Draft International Implementation Scheme*, UNESCO, Paris.
- Us, Kasful Anwar dan Harmi, Hendra., 2011. *Perencanaan Sistem Pembelajaran Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)*, Bandung: Alfabeta
- UTOMO, H.W., 2016. *The effect of picture cued to the eighth grade students' writing ability of SMP Negeri 2 Papar in academic year 2015/2016* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri).
- Vdovina, E. and Gaibisso, L.C., 2013. Developing critical thinking in the English language classroom: A lesson plan. *ELTA Journal*, 1(1), pp.54-68.
- Veugelers, W., 2010. Moral values in teacher education. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 7, pp.650-655.
- Wachidah, S., 2013. The Why, What, and How of the 2013 Curriculum. In *Presented on Educational Linguistic Conference*.
- Williams, M. and Vogt, W.P., 2011. *The SAGE handbook of innovation in social research methods*. Sage Publications.
- Yin, R.K., 2009. *Case study research: Design and methods*. 4 uppl. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Yulia, Y., 2014. *An evaluation of English language teaching programs in Indonesian junior high schools in the Yogyakarta Province* (Doctoral dissertation, RMIT University).
- Yuwono, G., 2005. English language teaching in decentralised Indonesia: Voices from the less privileged schools. In *AARE Education Research Conference*, pp.1–19.