

## **THE IMPLICATION OF CURRICULUM RENEWAL ON ELT IN INDONESIA**

**Kristian Adi Putra**

*The University of Arizona, USA*

[kristianadiputra@email.arizona.edu](mailto:kristianadiputra@email.arizona.edu)

+1 520 269 5061

### **Abstract**

There are three criticisms toward English teaching in Indonesia based on the revised curriculum 2004 in 2006 known as KTSP. Following the evaluation of the whole educational system in Indonesia, a new curriculum, i.e. Curriculum 2013 began to be implemented in schools to replace KTSP in 2015. In this paper, I will try to review the criticisms toward the implementation of KTSP in English subject, evaluate the possible challenges of the implementation of Curriculum 2013, and propose some possible suggestions and priorities for the improvement of Curriculum 2013, e.g. in-service and pre-service teacher development program, and alternatives to replace high stakes testing policy. (106)

Ada tiga kritik terhadap pengajaran bahasa Inggris di Indonesia berdasarkan kurikulum 2004 yang direvisi pada 2006, dikenal sebagai KTSP. Setelah diadakan evaluasi tentang sistem pendidikan di Indonesia secara menyeluruh, sebuah kurikulum baru, yaitu Kurikulum 2013 mulai diterapkan disekolah-sekolah untuk mengganti KTSP pada 2015. Dalam artikel ini, saya akan mencoba menelaah kritik-kritik terhadap pelaksanaan Kurikulum 2013, mengevaluasi tantangan-tantangan yang mungkin ada untuk pelaksanaannya, dan memberikan beberapa saran dan prioritas untuk perbaikan Kurikulum 2013, yaitu program pengembangan guru baik saat bertugas (in-service) maupun sebelum bertugas mengajar (pre-service), dan beberapa alternatif untuk mengganti kebijakan tes yang penuh dengan kontroversi.

**Keywords** : Curriculum 2013, English Language Teaching, evaluation.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Hyon (1996) summarizes that genre theories and their pedagogical implications have been intensively developed in three different traditions, namely (1) English for Specific Purpose (ESP), (2) North American New Rhetoric Studies (NRS), and (3) Australian systemic functional linguistics (SFL). ESP scholars, as also mentioned by Hyon (1996), have framed the concept of genre under this tradition

as "oral and written text types, defined by their formal properties as well as by their communicative purposes within social contexts." Therefore, in later development, educational institutions adopting this concept design their programs based on the communicative purposes and the social context at which the learners will use the language, especially in academic and professional settings, e.g. English for Engineering, English for Police, English for Business, etc.

NRS scholars later criticize the explicit teaching of forms and linguistic conventions of texts in ESP, instead of enhancing learners' understanding toward a certain social context surrounding a certain text that will help learners to select the rhetoric that is appropriate for their situations. Hyon (1996) mentions that NRS derives, "from a variety of disciplines concerned with L1 teaching, including rhetoric, composition studies, and professional writing." However, unlike ESP, NRS scholars only provide the definition of genre theory and the contexts, and leave it to teaching practitioners to incorporate and interpret it into their teaching application. In addition, the research of NRS scholars has also mostly focused on the development of genre theory and text analysis, instead of the development of teaching models and materials, so that NRS has a relatively a lack of instructional frameworks.

In contrast, Australian SFL, developed and based on the theory of systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1978), has focused primarily on its teaching application in informal education for immigrants as well as the primary and secondary level of education in Australia, and also concerned about more linguistic features and characteristics of various genres as compared to ESP, which is limited to academic and professional settings. Later development of this genre tradition has also been expanded to the teaching of composition in tertiary level education and the teaching of not only written discourse, but also oral discourse (Hyon, 1996). As a consequence, there has been a lot of research supporting the development of instructional frameworks and teaching materials that uses genre-based pedagogy.

Needless to say, when Indonesia's formal education system begins adopting genre-based pedagogy in its English language-teaching curriculum, (we preferred A SFL model to NRS or ESP) Australian SFL model is preferred over NRS nor ESP. While in tertiary education, the ESP model is more widely implemented. The adoption of genre-based pedagogy, in this case Australian SFL, in the curriculum of English in Indonesian formal schools was begun in 2004 when the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia (Kemendiknas) officially implemented a/the Competence Based Curriculum (CBC) to replace Curriculum 1997, the revised version of Curriculum 1994. The main difference between Curriculum 1997 and CBC was primarily on the addition of the theory of social semiotics (Halliday, 1978) and language literacy (Wells, 1987), besides the theory of communicative competence (Celce-Muria, et.al, 1995), which was adopted earlier in Curriculum 1997.

In 2006, Kemendiknas changed CBC into School-Based Curriculum (KTSP). There was no significant change in these two curriculums, except the modification of types of texts that should be taught to the students in a certain level of education in Indonesian formal education system. Kemendiknas has also continued the implementation of high-stakes testing and gradually increased the

cut off score, namely the National Examination (UN), which was begun in 2005 and used to map the quality of education in each province in Indonesia and to determine the qualification of a student to graduate from grade 9 in junior high school and grade 12 in senior high school.

Considering the mismatch between the ideal concept, the gap and the problems found in the implementation of KTSP in general, and the need for modernization and adjustment toward the future challenges and the social phenomenon happening in the society (Kemendiknas, 2013), Kemendiknas issued Curriculum 2013 to replace KTSP. As has been mentioned in the document of Curriculum 2013, this curriculum is the revised version of CBC and KTSP, with greater emphasis on building students' characters, developing relevant skills based on students' interests and needs, and developing a thematic learning approach that benefits students' cognitive abilities (Kemendiknas, 2013). In the draft of the standard content<sup>1</sup> of Curriculum 2013, standard competence<sup>2</sup>, in which KTSP was specifically designed for a certain subject, was changed into general core competence<sup>3</sup> for all subjects taught in a certain level of education. Therefore, instead of having standard competence and basic competence<sup>4</sup>, currently the curriculum of a certain subject only has a general core competence, which is the same as other subjects, and basic competence.

In English subject, besides the changes of the standard content, Kemendiknas made some other significant changes in Curriculum 2013. They include: (1) removal of English subject from elementary school, (2) reduction of teaching hours at senior high school, (3) reduction of contents of teaching materials (types of texts and speech acts), (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. Therefore, there must be some interrelated consequences of these changes on how the teaching of English in Indonesia will be like. In this paper, I will try to (1) review the criticisms toward the implementation of KTSP in English subject and relate it to how it is answered in the draft of Curriculum 2013, (2) evaluate the possible challenges of the implementation of Curriculum 2013, in terms of its suitability and the practicality toward the objective of the teaching of English in Indonesia according to the theoretical frameworks underlying Curriculum 2013, and (3) propose some possible suggestions for the improvement of Curriculum 2013.

---

<sup>1</sup> Guideline of curriculum that includes core competence and basic competence in each level of education in Indonesian formal school.

<sup>2</sup> Learning outcome of a specific subject in a certain level of education.

<sup>3</sup> Four interrelated general learning outcomes (not specific for one subject) of Indonesian education that consist of: (1) religious values (core competence 1), social values (core competence 2), cognitive skills (core competence 3), and the implementation of knowledge (core competence 4).

<sup>4</sup> Specific competence (contents of materials) that a student learns in a certain subject in a certain level of education.

## **CRITICISM TOWARD THE IMPLEMENTATION OF KTSP**

There have been at least two criticisms regarding the result of the teaching and learning of English in Indonesian formal schools during the implementation of KTSP. The first criticism concerns the mismatch between the goals of the curriculum, in this case the teaching of English in Indonesia in general, and the evaluation used to measure the success of the teaching and learning process. The goals of the English teaching in KTSP, according to Kemendiknas (2003), are as follows: (1) developing communicative ability in the target language, both in oral and written form. Communicative ability consists of listening skill, speaking skill, reading skill, and writing skill; (2) stimulating students' awareness of the importance of the mastery of English as a foreign language; (3) developing students' understanding toward the relation between language and culture and shaping the knowledge of culture, so that students will have an insight of cross cultural understanding, which enables them to engage in diverse sociocultural contexts.

It is, therefore, clear that the main target of the curriculum is mainly developing students' intercultural communicative competence, in which according to Aguilar (2007), is defined as "the ability to interact with people from different cultures and countries in a foreign language, where the knowledge of the participants of another culture is linked to their language competence through their ability to use language appropriately and their awareness of the specific meaning, values, and connotations of the language."

However, the implementation of the National Examination (UN) for students in grade 9 and 12, which only tests listening and reading, has misled the direction of the teaching and learning of English in Indonesia (Setiyadi, 2009; Putra, 2012). Instead of focusing on teaching students communication skills in English, in this case speaking and writing, most teachers focus on preparing their students to face national examinations. As a result, more portions on the strategies of answering reading and listening comprehension test are given, but there are only fewer portions providing students opportunity to practice using the language in communication in the classroom which are commonly found.

The claim that a higher score indicates students' high competence in English and success in learning English is of course a fallacy, since, although students pass cut-off score or get perfect grade in UN, it does not necessarily guarantee that they are able to communicate in English. Some studies have shown that a high percentage of senior high school graduates, during the period of the implementation of KTSP, has low proficiency in English communication, although the percentage of students who passed cut-off score is close to 95% (Lengkanawati, 2002; Setiyadi, 2009; Putra, 2012). Considering that the UN will still be implemented in Curriculum 2013, the possibility of the occurrence of similar practices will be likely still high. Otherwise, Kemendiknas replaces UN with another type of examination that assesses not only reading and listening skills, but also speaking and writing skills in equal balance and does not merely use score in UN to determine whether or not students qualify for graduation from grade 9 and grade 12, so that it will not make any pressure to teachers only to prepare their students to face the UN, but to teach English.

The second criticism is related to the question why teachers focus more on teaching the students receptive skills, instead of productive skills, so that it finally causes students to have low proficiency in communication. Lengkanawati (2005) mentions that close to 50% participants in her study, English teachers in West Java, are not qualified to teach English, because they have very poor English proficiency. Although the sample of the data is considered small, but considering that West Java is located in an urban area and its capital city, Bandung, is the third biggest city in Indonesia, which has relatively better facilities, e.g. public library and connectivity of internet, there seems to be a higher percentages of teachers who do not fulfill the minimal requirement to teach English in the other areas outside Java island.

This indicates that although the concept of KTSP is in line with the latest theoretical framework for second language acquisition, teachers who have a duty to implement the curriculum are not ready. Therefore, if Curriculum 2013 is going to be implemented, Kemendiknas should have ideally mapped the quality of teachers, in terms of their English proficiency and teaching professionalism, in all areas in Indonesia, for both teachers who have sufficient qualification to teach and teachers who need additional in-service teacher development program. The recruitment process for pre-service teachers should also be focused on looking at not only their cognitive ability, but also language proficiency and teaching ability. By having such programs and stricter teachers' recruitment process, teachers are expected to have required qualifications before the new curriculum is fully implemented in all levels of education in Indonesia.

As mentioned by Kemendiknas (2013), Curriculum 2013 is going to be implemented in grades 1, 7, and 10. Then, in second year or in 2014, it will be implemented in higher grades, 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, and 11. In 2015, Curriculum 2013 will be implemented at all levels of education. In the first academic year, 2013-2014, in-service teachers, who have the required qualification to teach, might be assigned to implement the curriculum, while teachers who do not should take an in-service teacher development program for a year until they reach the required standard and start teaching using Curriculum 2013 in 2014. A follow up program and periodic evaluation should then be done in order to see how teachers implement the curriculum and how successfully it has achieved the objectives of the teaching of English in Indonesia based on Curriculum 2013.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF CURRICULUM 2013**

As in CBC and KTSP, Curriculum 2013 uses four theoretical frameworks that consist of (1) model of competence, (2) model of language use, (3) model of language literacy, and (4) stages of language learning. The model of competence refers to the expected learning outcomes resulting from the teaching and learning process using this curriculum. KTSP, in this case, refers to the theory of communicative competence proposed by Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, and Thurrell (1995) for its model of competence, while in Curriculum 2013, the new revision of communicative competence theory (Celce-Murcia, 2007) is going to be adopted. The model of language use relates to the theory of what language and language learning are for. In both KTSP and Curriculum 2013, Halliday's systemic

functional linguistics (1978) and social semiotics (1978), which mention that language is a means of communication and meaning-making functioning in social setting, are used as theoretical frameworks of its model of language use. The model of language literacy in this curriculum is defined as the literacy levels expected to be acquired by students in a certain level of education. In this case, Wells' literacy level framework (1987), which mentions four levels of literacy: performative, functional, informational, and epistemic, is adopted. Then, stages of language learning are based on the order of how language learners learn a language: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

As has been mentioned previously, in the model of competence, Curriculum 2013 refers to the concept of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia, 2007). In her revision of earlier model of communicative competence in 1995 (Celce-Murcia, et.al. 1995), Celce-Murcia (2007) mentions six competences: (1) sociocultural competence, (2) discourse competence, (3) linguistic competence, (4) formulaic competence, (5) interactional competence, and (6) strategic competence. Sociocultural competence refers to the pragmatic knowledge of L2 learners in appropriately using L2 in a social and cultural context of communication. Discourse competence refers to L2 learners' ability to construct and interpret oral and written discourse in the target language. Linguistic competence relates to L2 learners' knowledge on L2 phonological, lexical, morphological, and syntactic systems. Formulaic competence is related to L2 learners' knowledge about languages frequently used in daily life interaction both in formal and informal contexts. Interactional competence relates to the knowledge of how to perform speech acts, maintain conversations, and use non-linguistic components, e.g. gestures, eye contact, etc. in interaction. Then, strategic competence refers to the learning strategy used by L2 learners to learn the target language. Therefore, in the implementation of Curriculum 2013, these six competences are the main target competences to be developed and should be reflected in both teaching and learning process and students' learning outcome.

Referring to the problems of the implementation of KTSP discussed earlier, teachers have focused more on developing students' linguistic competence and discourse competence, but ignored other competences that students should also develop. In discourse competence, however, teachers have misinterpreted the term "genre-based curriculum" as purely "text based curriculum", which means that they should focus more on enabling students to produce written discourse, instead of both producing both written and oral discourse. The focus on the explicit teaching of grammars and forms of a certain genre of text has, therefore, been given a lot of portions before students start producing texts. This misinterpretation becomes more obvious as the test items in mid-term semester tests, final semester tests, and UN designed by Kemendiknas are mainly about reading comprehension. Speaking and listening skills are frequently ignored because it will not help students in the tests, except if the students have been in grade 12, as they will have listening comprehension test in UN. In short, students will only achieve this ideal model of competence, only if the testing system is re-evaluated and students are provided a lot of exposures to (1) culturally authentic and meaningful rich input so that they have a model of how the target language is used in a particular sociocultural context appropriately, (2) modified and

negotiated interaction activities in the classroom that let students develop the six competences, and (3) contextual and adequate practices of interpreting, discovering, and constructing oral and written discourse of a certain genre of texts and talks.

The second theoretical frameworks used in Curriculum 2013 as also mentioned earlier are systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1978) and social semiotics (Halliday, 1978). In this theory, as quoted by Hyon (1996), "The forms of language are said to be shaped by key features of the surrounding social context, defined by Halliday as field (the activity going on), tenor (the relationship between the participants), and mode (the channel of communication). These three elements together determine the register of language (in texts)." Therefore, studying different genres of written and oral texts also means understanding the context of situation and discovering the context of culture, in which the text is created, used, and addressed to. Halliday (1978) also clarifies that in any context, the use of language will serve three functions: (1) ideational function (to express and construct ideas or information), (2) interpersonal function (to interact), and (3) textual function (to construct coherent and cohesive texts). Then, in the teaching and learning process, after students listen and read, which means that they have learnt the texts and the contexts (of various genres), they are going to be guided to be able to use the language for these three functions both in written and oral form.

In KTSP, it is found that teachers focus only on the use of language in the ideational function and the textual function in written form, but not in oral form. However, students are also actually not guided to discover the context of culture and the context of situation in the text and how they affect the register and the forms of the text, but students are explicitly taught about language features and generic structures of a certain text, then followed by translation activities, reading comprehension practice tests, and writing practice using the provided generic structures. Such procedures of teaching result only in students' memorization of function, language features, and generic structures of a certain genre of text, and not result in deep understanding of how and why in such context they should use the register. As a consequence, students' creativity is constraint by inflexible text forms provided by teachers and textbooks, which are rarely found in authentic texts, e.g. magazines and newspapers. Therefore, the challenge that teachers need to do is to provide students a variety of authentic use of language in texts and talks and provide students the opportunity to discover the context of culture and the context of situation that affect the forms of the text, so that they can produce texts that are more socio culturally relevant.

The third theory that also becomes the basis of the development of Curriculum 2013 is the model of language literacy. Wells (1987) describes four levels of language literacy: performative, functional, informational, and epistemic. At the performative level, students are able to listen, speak, read, and write in the target language. At the In functional level, students are able to use the target language for a variety of functions, e.g. to read magazines. At informational level, students can access any information in the target language. Then, at epistemic level, students are expected to be able to talk about the information that they have accessed. In the guidelines of Curriculum 2013, it is explained that students in

junior high schools, grade 7-9, are expected to reach the functional level, as it is the level of survival language, while students in senior high school, grades 10-12, are expected to reach the informational level. Then later in college, although not the focus of this discussion, students are hoped to reach the epistemic level.

As a consequence, the proportion of the materials in junior high school is focused more on the use of the target language in interaction to enable them to reach the functional level. Then in senior high school, the materials are designed to be a balance between the teaching of written and spoken discourse. However, during the implementation of KTSP, students graduating from both junior and senior high school still have difficulty to reach either the functional or 5h3 informational level (Lengkanawati, 2002; Setiyadi, 2009; Putra, 2012). Then, if students, for instance, reach only the partial performative level when they graduate from junior high school, in this case only reading and writing, the more exposures onto texts conditioned by the educational system in senior high school will make them arguably unable to reach the informational level when they graduate from senior high school. Therefore, it seems to be more realistic, if English is taught early since grade 1 in elementary school, which is aimed to make students able to reach the performative level, then to reach the functional level in junior high school, and the informational level in senior high school.

In the fourth theory adopted by Curriculum 2013, model of stages of language learning, the teaching and learning process is designed to be in order from listening, speaking, reading, to writing, called as priorities for L2 activities in the development of interpersonal competence (Saville-Troike, 2011). It indicates that the focus of this curriculum is primarily on enabling students to produce oral and written discourse, as there are two cycles in the curriculum: the speaking cycle and the writing cycle. The speaking cycle is taught earlier than the writing cycle because of the higher complexity of the written form as compared to the oral form. Therefore, this stage indicates that the teaching and learning process is designed based on the theory of how language is acquired and based on the difficulty level of language skills to be learned by language learners. To implement this, there is a demand for textbook authors to design textbooks, based on Curriculum 2013, for teachers that cover four integrated skills, and not merely focus on texts, grammars and reading comprehension tests, so that teachers are not trapped into teaching students only receptive skills, but also productive skills.

### **Challenges of the Implementation of Curriculum 2013**

As mentioned earlier, there is a reduction on the number of hours of the teaching of English in each level of education in Indonesia in the Curriculum 2013. In KTSP, English is taught 2 hours a week in elementary school from grade 4-6, 4 hours a week in junior high school, and 4 hours a week in senior high school (Kemendiknas, 2006). But, in Curriculum 2013, English subject will not be taught at elementary school. It will still be taught 4 hours a week in junior high school, but only 2 hours a week in senior high school, for students majoring in social and science programs. Then, for students who major in language programs, they will have 3 hours a week of English subject in grade 10, and 4 hours a week in grade 11 and 12 (Kemendiknas, 2013).

One of the main reasons for the deletion of English subject in elementary school is that students from grade 1-3, especially in the area where students' L1 is not Indonesian, will use students' L1, which is mostly an indigenous language, as the language of instruction, until students can be taught completely in Indonesian. Kemendiknas (2013) also argues that students need to have more proficiency in Indonesian before they start learning English. This pattern can also be seen from the increasing number of hours of the teaching of Indonesian, 8 hours a week in grade 1-2, 10 hours a week in grade 3-6, 6 hours a week in grade 7-9, 2 hours a week in grade 10-12 in social and science class, 3 hours a week in grade 10 in language class, and 4 hours a week in grade 11-12 in of language class.

However, this argument is basically unjustified, since practically starting from grade 4-6 in elementary schools, Indonesian is completely used as the language of instruction in all subjects. In a predominantly diverse community, moreover, students' L1 is also mostly Indonesian, so that they have started using Indonesian since grade 1, not only in the class but also outside of the class when they communicate with other peers, at home, and in their neighborhood. Meanwhile English in KTSP is only taught 2 hours a week as a purely a subject from grade 4-6. In teaching the subject, Indonesian is also mostly used as the language of instruction. Therefore, assuming that English will constraint the acquisition of Indonesian is undoubtedly a fallacy.

The reduction of the teaching of English in senior high school from 4 to 2 hours a week in grade 10-12 will also create a problem. Referring back to the criticisms on the implementation of KTSP, 4 hours of teaching is not adequate to make students able to communicate in English (Lengkanawati, 2002; Setiyadi, 2009; Putra, 2012). In addition, the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Indonesia also means making students rarely find at community in which they can use English outside the classroom. Therefore, if the number of hours of teaching is reduced to 2 hours a week, it will also practically reduce the number of hours of exposure for students toward English and the opportunity for students to practice using the language.

The condition of the reduction of the number of hours of teaching, from 4 to 2 hours a week, between Indonesian and English, in which both of them were formerly taught 4 hours a week in KTSP in grade 10-12, is different. Indonesian has an advantage of being the language of instruction of all subjects at school and used outside of school, meanwhile English does not. Therefore, regardless of the decreasing number of teaching in Indonesian subject, students will still have ability to use the language, not only for communication, but also for academic purposes. With the assumption that students graduating from junior high school, who still have 4 hours of classes a week in grade 7-9, graduate with high English proficiency, the setting of teaching and learning in senior high school, however, will still not be enough to support the development of students' English proficiency.

In the contents of the materials of Curriculum 2013, there are also some modifications from its earlier version in KTSP, especially in the reduction on the number of texts, and transactional and interpersonal communication expressions to be taught to the students. In KTSP, there are 6 texts taught to the students in grade 7-9 (descriptive text, narrative text, recount text, procedure text, report text,

and anecdote) and 6 additional texts for the students in grade 10-12 (explanation text, hortatory exposition text, analytical exposition text, discussion, news item, and review text). In Curriculum 2013, there are only 4 texts taught in grade 7-9: descriptive text, recount text, procedure text, and analytical exposition text, and only 8 texts in grade 10-12: explanation, hortatory exposition text, discussion, descriptive text, procedure text, narrative text, report text, and review text. Students in grade 10 will also study proverbs, idioms, and metaphor used in a poems, while students in grade 12 will study expressions used to criticize a movie adapted from a novel: expressions of sympathy, happiness, sadness, and disappointment. Curriculum 2013 also includes short functional texts to be taught only to only students in grade 7: announcement, invitation, short message, advertisement, and label, interpersonal communication expressions: greetings, introduction, initiating a conversation, and leave taking, and transactional conversation expressions for students in grade 8-9: asking for confirmation, showing enthusiasm, showing curiosity, and asking for information.

Kemendiknas (2013) claims that the reduction will benefit teachers from not having too much load of materials and having an opportunity to focus on developing students' competence optimally on a certain topic. However, the distribution of texts in each semester will have a tendency of creating a problem, as there will only be one to two texts to be taught in a semester, e.g. explanation text in semester 1 and hortatory exposition text in semester 2 of grade 10, discussion and descriptive text in semester 1 and procedure text and narrative text in semester 2 of grade 11, and report text in semester 1 and review text in semester 2 of grade 12. There is also a case of repetition as found in grade 7 and 8, in which recount text is taught in semester 2 of grade 7 and semester 1 in grade 8.

Besides giving an advantage of being able to employ four language skills in teaching by using only a certain type of text in a semester, this such design, however, will also demand teachers to creatively create materials for teaching, unless students will be demotivated for being exposed to the same things for a whole meeting in a semester, especially also since the topic determined by the curriculum has been narrowed and the syllabus is made by Kemendiknas. In grade 12, for instance, the topic is about local and international culture and tourism for two types of texts in an academic year. This limited scope will undoubtedly limit the possibility of teacher's' creativity in developing their teaching materials using variety of topics in the same genre. The making of the syllabus by Kemendiknas, which suggests the strict orders of teaching to be followed by all teachers, will also undermine the differences between students in urban areas and students in sub-urban areas, who have less facility in learning and the diversity that exists in a classroom.

The distribution of short and longer functional texts, interpersonal and transactional conversation expressions only appear in the curriculum for students in grade 7-9. In grade 10-12, the major portions of materials are on texts, except in grade 12, in which students will study about expressions used to criticize a movie adapted from a novel: expressions of sympathy, happiness, sadness, and disappointment. Referring back to the criticism on KTSP, although the materials are relatively balanced between texts and interpersonal and transactional

conversation expressions, teachers tend to focus on teaching the students reading and writing, including the generic structure and the language features of a certain text, and ignore the teaching of listening and speaking (Bire, J, 2010; Putra, 2012). Therefore, if the interpersonal and transactional conversation expressions are no longer presented in the syllabus, the similar teaching pattern will also be likely to occur in the implementation of Curriculum 2013.

Unlike in KTSP, language features in Curriculum 2013, in this case grammar used in a certain type of text, are described explicitly in the curriculum, then there is a tendency that the grammar presented is not related to and used in the texts taught. In addition to that, it is likely that there would be a tendency of misleading orientation, in that the teaching and learning process in this curriculum will be more about grammar and reading, instead of achieving the real target of the curriculum: enabling students to produce oral and written discourse. The following is one of the standard competences in grade 12 (Kemendiknas, 2013): "Understanding and applying language features: subjunctive and causative, spelling, pronunciation, intonation, word stress, punctuation, clear and neat handwriting."

In grade 12, the texts taught are review text, narrative text, report text, and discussion and the speech acts taught are expression of sadness, happiness, disappointment, and anger. Therefore, it will be misleading as the language features of the four texts and the speech acts above do not contain too many uses of subjunctive and causative. Students will learn the form, but they will not use it in both speaking and writing practice in the classroom.

## **CONCLUSION**

To sum up, Curriculum 2013 does not answer the challenges faced in the implementation of KTSP. The design of the curriculum will predictably still drive the teaching of English in Indonesia to become reading and grammar oriented, test-preparation based teaching oriented, less focus on its real target: developing students' English oracy and literacy, and undermines the diversity of quality spread of education in Indonesia and the real situation in the classroom. Therefore, there should be a reevaluation of the design of the curriculum before it is implemented, especially on the distribution of teaching hours of English subject in the three levels of education, reevaluation of national examination policy, and reevaluation of the contents of curriculum.

As mentioned by Clark (1987), curriculum renewal practically and theoretically results in some interrelated effects that need to be taken into account for improvement: the change of theoretical and methodological frameworks, the design of in-service and pre-service teacher development program, monitoring of the implementation of the curriculum, and the development of evaluation materials. Considering some mismatches found in the draft of Curriculum 2013, the following are some suggested approaches for the improvement of the draft of Curriculum 2013: (1) English should be taught 4 hours a week in elementary school from grade 1-6, 4 hours a week in junior high school from grade 7-9, and 4 hours a week in senior high school from grade 10-12; (2) The focus of the teaching at elementary school should be on building students' speaking ability in

communication, while in junior high school and senior high school it should be distributed equally between oral and written discourse; (3) There should still be a possibility for teachers to design their own syllabus based on national curriculum guidelines and create their own teaching materials based on the available facilities and the level of students' language proficiency in a certain area; (4) National examination should be reevaluated and test speaking and writing, instead of reading and writing, so that it is in line with the objective of the curriculum. It should also no longer be used to determine students' qualification to graduate from junior and senior high school, but merely to map the quality of education in general for educational policy making purposes; (5) Government should prepare a program for in service teacher development and pre-service teacher program that fits to the need of the curriculum renewal.

## REFERENCES

- Aguilar, M.J.C. (2007). *"Dealing with Intercultural Communicative Competence in the Foreign Language Classroom."* E. Alcon Soler and M.P. Safont Jorda (eds.), *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, 59-78. Springer.
- Agustin, H. I. (2004). *"Setting Up New Standards: A Preview of Indonesia's New Competence Based Curriculum."* TEFLIN Journal. Vol. 15, No. 1.
- Bire, J. (2010). *"Mismatch English Education in Indonesia."* Linguistika. Vol. 17, No. 01.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Z. Dornyei, S. & Thurrel. (1995). *"Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications."* Issues in Applied Linguistics, Vol. 6, No. 2, 5-35.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). *"Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teaching."* E. Alcon Soler and M.P. Safont Jorda (eds.), *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, 41-57. Springer.
- Clark, J. (1987). *"Curriculum Renewal in School Foreign Language Learning."* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *"An Introduction to Functional Grammar."* London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *"Language as Social Semiotics: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning."* London: Edward Arnold.
- Hyon, S. (1996). *"Genre in Three Traditions: Implications for ESL."* TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 4, Winter 1996.
- Kemendiknas. (2006). *"Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan."* Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Kemendiknas. (2013). *"Kompetensi Dasar."* Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Lengkanawati, N. 2002. *"Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi."* A paper presented at a Workshop Teaching Models Based on Competency Based Curriculum on November 2002.

- Lengkanawati, N. 2005. "*EFL Teacher's Competence in the Context of English Curriculum 2004: Implications for EFL Teacher Education.*" *TEFLIN Journal*. Vol. 16, No. 1.
- Putra, K.A. (2012). "*Mengurai Benang Kusut Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris.*" *Radar Lampung*, 18 April 2012.
- Setiyadi, B. (2009). "*The Challenges of the Teaching of English in Indonesia.*" Paper presented at professorship inauguration at the University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, on August 20, 2009.