Understanding the 2013 Curriculum of English Teaching throughthe Teachers‟and Policymakers‟Perspectives

by Djuwairiah Ahmad

Understanding the 2013 Curriculum of English Teaching through the Teachers' and Policymakers' Perspectives

Djuwairiah Ahmad

Faculty of Education and Teaching Science, Alauddin State Islamic University, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Abstract: This study focused on the 2013 Curriculum (K-13) implementation at the four targeted senior secondary schools of K-13 implementation in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. It involved three policymakers and 11 English teachers using explanatory model of mixed-method design (quan-QUAL). The data were collected in 19 months from 2012 to 2014 and analyzed in multi-stages. The study found and concluded that the issues underlying the change from the School-Based Curriculum (SBC) to K-13 were the failure of the former curricula, the anticipation demographic and economic circumstances in the future, and the benefits offered within the change. In line with the teachers' knowledge and belief system towards the change, their perception on the K-13 led to two main trends: (1) positive, innovative, creative and give impact to the transformation from traditional view of learning to a modern pedagogic dimension; and (2) negative and superficial that only change in conceptual level and would likely to have the same effects with the previous changes. The teachers' interpretation on the K-13 also led to two main trends: (1) the correct and comprehensive interpretation when dealing with the general concepts in K-13 in ELT practices; and, (2) the partial interpretation towards the applicative concepts according to their understanding, procedural knowledge and the convenience of the application offered by the changing elements. The implementation of K-13 in ELT practices was found to be partial, biased and tended to be traditional from the planning to the assessing process. The constraints to successful implementation of K-13 were found to root in the teachers' fixed mindset and within the implementation.

Keywords: curriculum reform, constraints, ELT practices, interpretation, implementation, K-13, perception.

A. INTRODUCTION

This research thoroughly examined perceptions of English language teachers about the K-13 which are regulated by the government in response to the quality improvement of the teaching in Indonesia. As the curriculum was newly regulated, different interpretation was believed to emerge among teachers as the main stakeholders of curriculum development and its implementation. The different perspectives among teachers in perceiving of what is intended by the government of K-13 will lead to different interpretations and will normally end up with a question of a mismatch in the level of implementation. Considering the important role of teachers in implementing reform, and reviewing the history of teacher education in Indonesia, it is evident that teachers' involvement in curriculum decision-making at the school level has been minimal. This is primarily because the use of a centralized curriculum has been mandatory since Indonesia proclaimed its independence in 1945. Teachers have had to teach according to the specific curriculum mandates of each region.

Problems of various kinds arising from curriculum implementation have been recognized as inevitable, and therefore the implementation is inherently more complex than what people can anticipate (Brindley and Hood, 1990; Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991). This complexity can be perceived from several aspects, with stakeholders at different levels interpreting the curriculum policies differently than as originally conceived. First of all, policymakers produce policies with good intentions, but unforeseen and often unwanted results may occur as the policies are interpreted by the local implementing institutions. Second, as the policy interpreters, middle-level administrators may have their own interpretation of the policies. They are likely to encounter institutional or contextual constraints; therefore, their attempts at implementing the policies from the top may get stuck in real operations. Third, the implementation may also be confounded by the resistance of the primary stakeholders, i.e., the teachers (Williams et al., 1994). Teachers may view the revised curriculum either negatively or simply differently than as was the intent of the policymakers (Karavas-Doukas, 1995), or view the innovations[1] favorably but not incorporate the curriculum changes into their day-to-day

---

[1]The term "innovation" is used interchangeably with the terms "change" or "reform" in this research.

clasroom teaching for various reasons (Gahin and Myhill, 2001). This non-implementation or semi-implementation of curriculum is prevalent in both English as a second language and foreign language contexts.

This research aimed to describe the policymakers' perspectives on the issues of the school curriculum reform from the School-Based Curriculum (SBC) into K-13 and English teachers' perspectives and interpretations towards the policy with special reference to ELT program at senior secondary schools in Makassar. Exploring and identifying the issues of how the English teachers respond to reform and implementation of the school curriculums were a step towards establishing successful ELT programs that would meet the needs of all those involved. Explicitly, this research was carried out: (1) to clarify the issues underlying the progressive shift from the School-Based Curriculum (SBC) to K-13 with special reference to the ELT program in senior secondary schools; (2) to describe perceptions and interpretations the English teachers have on the ELT program in K-13; and (3) to find out and describe how the English teachers implement the K-13 in classroom practice and what constraints hindering the way to successful implementation.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

The origin of the word "curriculum" can be traced to Latin. Its first meaning was a running, a race, or a course and its secondary meanings were a race-course or a career (Connelly and Lantz, 1991:15; Egan, 2003:10). During the early years of the twentieth century, most educators held onto the traditional concept and referred to curriculum as "the body of subjects or subject matters set out by teachers for students to cover" (Tanner and Tanner, 1995:151). Later, however, the definitions developed and expanded to mean eithera plan, an experience or a methodological inquiry (Taba, 1962; Foshay, 1969 quoted in Bloom, 2006: online; Westbury and Steimer, 1971, quoted in Connelly and Lantz, 1991). In a narrow sense, curriculum is defined as a plan for learning (Taba, 1962), or a general overall plan of the content or specific materials of instruction that the school should offer the student by way of qualifying him for graduation or certification or for entering into a professional or vocational field (Good,1959, quoted in Connelly and Lantz, 1991:15). According to Pratt (1994:5), curriculum refers to plans for instructional acts, not the acts of instruction themselves. He states that curriculum is analogous to the set of blueprints from which a house is constructed. A curriculum can be viewed as a blueprint for instruction. For teachers, curriculum is often a statement of what the school authorities, the state government, or some group outside the classroom requires the teacher to teach (Doll, 1996).

The education system in Indonesia is mainly organized by the Ministry of National Education and decreed by law Number 20 Year 2003 about the National Education System. Under Article VI, this law sets the forms, levels, and types of education that should be organized by the central government, provincial, regency, and society. The forms can be formal, informal, and nonformal and range from primary, secondary and tertiary level. Such education can be general, vocational, academic, profession, religious, talent, and other types such as children with disability. In secondary education, the government controls the operation of general and vocational senior secondary school in which English is taught as an essential subject matter. The goal of English teaching at general senior secondary school (compared to vocational one) is to equip students with the ability to develop: (1) oral and written communicative competence to the informational literacy level; (2) the awareness of the nature and the importance of English roles played in global competition among nations; and (3) understanding about the interrelationships of language and culture (Attachment of the Regulation of the Ministry of National Education Number 22 Year 2006). The teaching is to be completed in six semesters starting from grade X to grade XII within 34 – 38 effective weeks and allotted in 4 lesson hours (1 lesson hour equals to 45 minutes) a week. Thus, the total lesson hours needed to reach the competence standard for each grade are from 136 to 152 lesson hours a year (Attachment of the Regulation of the Ministry of National Education Number 22 Year 2006).

K-13 is in fact the extension of SBC in several components. The main purpose of this curriculum is to shape the individuals who are faithful in God, good in characters, confident, successful in learning, responsible citizens and positive contributors to the civilization (Ministry of Education and Cultures, 2012). This framework has been supported by Government Regulations Number 32 Year 2013 (The revision of Government Regulations Number 19 Year 2005 about the National Standards of Education). This regulation is elaborated by Education and Culture Ministerial Regulations Number 67, 68, 69, and 70 on Fundamental Framework and Curriculum Structure from Elementary to Senior Secondary and Vocational Secondary School.

K-13 is a curriculum of values that occupied by character building. The values can be tracked from the Core Competences, abbreviated with KI-1 to KI-4. KI-1 is designed for spiritual competence, KI-2 for social competence, KI-3 refers to knowledge competence and KI-4 is for learning process through with the KI-3, KI-2 and KI-1 can be observed. The learning paradigm encompass direct and indirect learning model, and indirect learning model refers to KI-1 and KI-2. These two competences have no specific learning materials as it is integrated into cognitive and psychomotor domains. This formulation is aimed at reducing or eliminating verbalism in learning. Basic Competence which is abbreviated with KD is the reference for teachers to develop achievement indicators. KD in KI-1 and KI-2 is the accumulation of KD in KI-3 and KI-4. KD in KI-3 is linear with KD in KI-4 and the number of KD in KI-3 is

equally sized with the number of KD in KI-4. To map, KD3.1 for example is associated with KD4.1, KD3.2 is associated with KD4.3, and so forth. The learning materials in KD3.1 is taught in KD4.1 and for this reason the number of KD in KI-3 should be equal with the number of KD in KI-4. However, in certain cases, KD in KI-3 is not always linear with KDs in KI-4 as the learning steps in KDs of KI-4 cover some KDs in KI-3. It means that a KD in KI-4 can cover some KDs in KI-3.

For English, there is a slight different perspective for teachers to interpret competences as many of the them are derived from psychomotor domains, specific competences derived from language system (linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence), macro-skills (productive; speaking and writing, and receptive skills; listening and reading) and micro-skills or the elements of language (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and spelling). All these should not be addressed in isolation and covered in integrative manners in all KI and KD. As a consequence, according to Wachidah (2013, cited in Hapsari, 2013), there were numerous incorrect interpretations to the previous curriculum framework such as the policy of one Lesson Plan which covered one KD whereas in English curriculum, one KD is supposed to cover the four skills. K-13 revises these mistakes and in the teaching process these four skills will be integrated as the notion of the competence refers to the notion of communicative competence. Hapsari's (2013) outlines that K-13 is designed to revise or to correct the mistakes of the competence 'meanings' in the previous curriculum. While the previous curriculum combined the ideas of competence, performance and genre-based approach for English subject, this current curriculum has the key words like spiritual and social competence (deal with affective domains), together with cognitive and psychomotor competence through scientific approach and authentic assessment in all subjects.

C. METHODOLOGY

Since the purpose of this research is to understand issues associated with the policy design and teachers' policy perceptions, interpretations and implementation of K-13 with special reference to ELT program at the targeted senior secondary schools in Makassar, this research applied a mixed-method design. A mixed-method design is an approach that incorporates the collection, analysis and combining of quantitative and qualitative data in a single study (Creswell, 2005). For this study, the type of design selected was an explanatory mixed-method or a two-phase model in which the researcher first collects a small portion of quantitative data and followed by a large portion of qualitative data (quan-QUAL). This design enables the researcher to refine or elaborate the findings from the initial quantitative data through an extended and in-depth qualitative exploration of key issues which arise (Creswell, 2005).

The quantitative data were complemented by the collection of qualitative data from the participating teachers, giving depth to the study. Qualitative design was mainly located within constructivism paradigm, which was also used interchangeably with interpretivism (Mertens 1998; Bogdan and Biklen, 2003; Guba and Lincoln, 2005). This research paradigm was under the broad umbrella of qualitative study that views the world as having multiple realities with emphasis on meaning and integration of values as facts. Qualitative data were collected through classroom observation, informal discussion after each observation, interviews, and document collection which included teachers' lesson plans, materials selected and samples of assessment instruments. Classroom observation was chosen as it allows information to be recorded as it occurs in a particular setting, and enables the actual behavior of the teachers and students to be studied. The post-observation discussions and more formal interviews, particularly as they were face-to-face, provided the teachers with the opportunity to describe and explain their teaching practices, thereby adding meaning to the observations. Additionally, the discussions provided the opportunity to adjust questions, explore interesting responses which emerged and clarify meaning (Robson, 2011).

The data gathering of this research was formerly planned to be conducted in 10 months, was then prolonged in 19 months from October 2012 to April 2014. As the data analysis was processed in multi-stages, the report writing was done progressively according to the accomplishment of the data analysis. The report writing was finally accomplished in April 2014 and along with some confirmations and clarification regarding the data validity and reliability. Moreover, this research was conducted in the four targeted senior secondary schools of the K-13 implementation in Makassar and involved three policymakers at different levels and 11 English teachers disregarded the qualification of whether they have finished the process of teacher certification or not, of whether they were civil servant or honorary. As long as they were teaching English for at least three years successively, they fulfilled the requirements as the informant sample of this research.

D. RESEARCH FINDINGS

1. Issues Underlying the Shift from SBC to K-13

The results show that the release of K-13 in a number of schools Indonesia on July 15, 2013 last year was based on five essential reasons according to the policymakers in education system at the national, provincial and city level. The five

essential reasons are world future challenges, government regulations, failure of the former curriculum, potential benefits of the enacted curriculum and planning a better education through a better curriculum. These five key points which are believed as the reasons behind the change, are derived from the follow-up prompts as the coding memo used by the researcher when the aspects were not told or not covered in their initial answers.

The curriculum shift from SBC to K-13 is not a hasty decision taken by the government as it is not easy to design a single model to suit all. The curriculum change is admitted to involve a complex and difficult process, and requires careful planning, adequate time, funding and support and all opportunities to involve all the stakeholders in the design process. The complexity of the change process means that, as research seeks key concepts, it must also recognize the dynamics of each innovation as being uniquely different. Thus, smooth and successful curriculum change is enormously difficult and time consuming and cannot be accomplished without potential implementers becoming personally involved and accepting the change on their own terms and according to their own constructs of reality. While many systems currently mandate change from above, and will continue to do so, there is a need to find compromises which enable users to find their own meaning and ownership of new ideas.

From the perspectives of the policymakers, the shift from SBC to K-13 is concluded as a result of combining the perspective of problems occurred in the past implementation, some demographic projections and benefits offered towards the change. The problems of the past implementation were found to emerge in the former curricula system as it did not support students to achieve sustainable development in the future, content load, goals, competence domains, affective or characters building, social changes, teaching standards, assessment standards and teachers' mindset. Demographic projections were mapped in terms of world future challenges, the quality of human resources that will affect in sustainable development, government regulations, and plan for better education. The potential benefits offered towards the change are covered in the areas of the outcome competence standards, the content standards, the process standards, and the assessment standards. Therefore, the first frame of theoretical constructs underlying the curriculum change in Indonesia is that, "Every curriculum change is subjected to the failure of the former curriculum, anticipation of the world projections of Indonesia in the future and benefits offered within the change".

2. The Teachers' Perceptions and Interpretations of the K-13 in ELT

The study of perceptions and beliefs in language teaching and learning have long been explored by many researchers and much has been written about the role of perception in foreign language teaching and learning as it has impacts on teachers and learners' behavior. Perceptions and beliefs also influence the way teachers view the policy and may act incongruently with the intended policy. As a newly implemented curriculum, the intended policy or regulation behind the implementation is often results in discrepancy due to the process of perceiving and receiving (Connelly and Lantz, 1991; Elmore and Sykes, 1992; Karavas-Doukas, 1995; Markee, 1997; and Bekalo and Welford, 2000). O'Sullivan (2002) even described the curriculum policy as a 'black-box' that contains challenges, complexities and potential incongruent relationship with its practice.

For the newly implemented curriculum, K-13 is perceived by the teachers in six broad perspectives, namely: (a) the view of practicality; (b) the students' acceptance; (c) learning activities; (d) learning materials; (e) scientific approach; and (f) authentic assessment. From these six areas of the policy, the major idea with regard to the teachers' perception of the K-13 in relation to ELT practice was found.

After carefully studying the teachers' perception and interpretation regarding some concepts or conflicting case that highlighted the change in K-13, and as to this point still was not clear whether the responses made by the teachers based on what they know, or what they believe, or what they believe they know, then the researcher decided to draw conclusions in two major findings. The two major findings in this chapter refer to the teachers' perception and interpretation of K-13 in relation to ELT practices based on their knowledge and experiences in their schools as the target of K-13 implementation.

The concept of perception and interpretation in this research was the combination of what the teachers believe, what the teachers know, what the teachers believe that they know and what was happening in their mind when they perceived the stimulus, and what they described was regarded as their interpretation (Green, 1971; Kagan, 1990; Pajares, 1992; Maddox 1993; Richardson, 1994, 1996, 2003; Woods, 1996; Kennedy, 1997; Basturkman, Loewen and Ellis, 2004; Errington, 2004; and Senior, 2006), and therefore, all the teachers' perception and interpretations were considered to be subjective. The conclusions are: First, the teachers seemed to positively perceive and accept the curriculum change only if their knowledge and their practical skills are in line with the change. Moreover, the teachers' workload in administrative matters of the teaching and learning preparation should be reduced to the lowest level. To support this, the government should provide a detailed curriculum guideline that allows teachers to implement the curriculum in their daily teaching practice that significantly shows impact on learners' behavioral change. Second, the teachers have a tendency to show their lack of 'subject matter knowledge' and 'pedagogical knowledge' (Richardson, 1996) as they showed a holistic understanding of general concepts but remain partial in procedural knowledge and on some new complex procedures grounded in teaching. Some teachers have a tendency to stay in their old belief viewing that

learning materials are above all and lead them direct the teaching and learning process. They also tended to stay in their comfort zone and hold a belief that administrative works for physical evidence are more important than genuinely planning the lesson for the sake of students' learning experience as the authoritative gives more attentions and appreciations on what were written on paper than what were practiced in class. Thus, in-service training on curriculum implementation did not play a significant role to influence the teachers' knowledge on the targeted areas of the curriculum. The last reminds the researcher of what Thornbury said, "the effects of training may be only superficial" (Thornbury, 1996:284).

Therefore, the researcher concluded that the perception of the English teachers towards the curriculum change from SBC to K-13 in English language teaching leads to two main trends. The first trend mainly looks at the change from SBC to K-13 as a positive, innovative, and creative change in the English teaching practice for the future of Indonesia. The change also gives impact to the change in the way teachers and students viewed the English learning from traditional view of learning to modern pedagogic dimension. The second trend viewed the curriculum changes from SBC to K-13 as something superficial and conceptual, and would likely to have the same effects with the previous curriculum changes. Both the trends in teachers' perception seem to be in line with the knowledge and the teachers' belief system towards the change. The knowledge and belief system that the teachers have will be linked to their experiences on the implementation of the previous curriculum.

The English teachers' interpretation to some main concepts of the curriculum change from SBC to K-13 with regards to English teaching in senior secondary schools leads to two types of interpretation: comprehensive and partial interpretation in viewing the change. To the general concepts in K-13 with regards to English teaching, the teachers had a tendency to interpret them correctly and comprehensively. However, to the applicative concepts, the teachers tended to interpret the concepts partially according to the teachers' level of understanding and procedural knowledge and the convenience of the application offered by the changing elements. Thus, the second frame of theoretical constructs underlying the curriculum change in Indonesia based on the teachers' perception and interpretation is that, "The teachers' perception and interpretation on K-13 in relation to ELT is in line with their knowledge and belief, mindset in teaching practice, government policy demands in teacher administrative tasks and disregards their individual capacity to better create new learning atmospheres for students as highlighted by K-13".

3. The Implementation of K-13 in ELT Practice and Some Constraints to Successful Implementation

One major point to be discussed in this part was the main finding on the implementation of the K-13 in English teaching practices. In implementing the K-13, the teachers were found to be entangled in some old practices and traditional view of learning and seemed to implement the curriculum incomprehensively with a number of deviations in the three levels of implementation: the teaching plans, the teaching process and the assessment process.

In the teaching plan, the teachers were only required to design their own lesson plans based on some principles set by the authoritative government. The syllabus and learning materials which were designed and developed by the teachers in the former SBC, had been taken over by the government. This reassignment was aimed to minimize the teachers' administrative tasks and it was expected that the teachers could focus more on the teaching practices in classrooms. Hence, the teachers still found it challenging to design their own lesson plans. Based on the teachers' statements, the designing of the lesson plan was quite difficult as they had not fully equipped with the procedural knowledge and skills in designing the appropriate lesson plans in English lesson. As a result, the teachers were still entangled in the old practice of administrative tasks in which the teachers tended to acquire a sample of lesson plan of other subjects and made some adaptations.

In the teaching process, the teachers also seemed to be dominant and controlling. In many parts, the teachers used Bahasa Indonesia at most and very few efforts were made to use English in teaching. The class situation was commonly quiet and no enrichment indicators were developed that aimed to help the fast learners achieve more in the target competence. The topics and tasks to be used in learning were also determined by the teachers and the students were required to do the tasks as prescribed. In the classroom interaction, the dominant pattern was a duo-traffic interaction; teacher-students – students-teacher which is also considered as rooted in traditional view of learning. The teacher initiated the interaction, the students responded and the teacher in turn gave feedbacks. The teachers as usual began the lesson by explaining and confirmed the students' comprehension by asking of whether they understand or not- which is old fashioned-, and the students replied the teachers' stimulation in chorus that they understood. The interactions between students or among students occurred only when their learning activities were paired-interaction or small-group discussions. Another part of the results that contributed to the findings was the classroom setting. The classroom setting in most of the schools tended to be in-conducive to be used in learning and teaching process. Like the typical characteristics of classrooms in Indonesian schooling system, the longer desks for students were generally occupied by two students to sit and arranged in four columns from four to five rows. The desks were commonly not enough to sit more than 32 students and the classrooms were mostly crowded. Therefore, in some classrooms, it was commonly

found three students sat in a desk that originally aimed for students to sit in two. The type of the desk used in the typical classrooms also contributed to the problems in teaching and learning process. As it was a type of longer desk, it usually took time to rearrange for certain activities. Also, the lockers for students and secured bookcase to keep the students' portfolios were not available. The thing to underline here with regards to the K-13 implementation was the needs of relevant learning and teaching facility to support the process.

In the assessment process, the teachers seemed to partially implement the authentic assessment as the class size was quite large. K-13 had recommended the use of various types of Authentic Assessment such as Performance Assessment, Attitudinal Assessment, Self-Assessment and Portfolio Assessment. The teachers, of course, may choose the assessment type that suits their teaching design. However, in the implementation practice of the assessment, the teachers mostly used the three types of the assessment simultaneously or respectively. In this case, the teachers probably misunderstood in interpreting the policy of the assessment. As the assessment process had also been described in the syllabus, all the teachers needed to do was suited the assessment and all its components with the competence-of-today the teachers planned the students to achieve. The mostly used techniques and instruments described in the lesson plan were attitude observation, performance test, oral/written test, assignments, and portfolio. The instruments were check-list, rating scale, notes, and various types of objective test. The competences they assessed were attitudes, knowledge and skills. In the actual process of assessing the students' competences in the three domains, however, the teachers did not do the steps that had been described in their lesson plan. They argued that it was sometimes it was too much in the lesson plan and class size was a hindrance in actualizing the proper assessment.

Changing the teachers' perspectives and mindset from the old or traditional view of English language teaching practices in classrooms to the new or modern pedagogic dimension would be an investment in successful implementation of K-13. This study discovered the teachers' practices in three levels; teaching planning, teaching process and assessment process. Besides, this study also found two main constraints to successful implementation of K-13 in English teaching practices.

Although a big portion of the teachers' administrative workloads had been covered by the government, the teachers were still reluctant to design lesson plans on their own as the single task of administrative work left to the teachers. This reluctance was caused by the teachers' lack of procedural knowledge and skills in designing the appropriate lesson plans in English lesson which is related to the K-13. Besides, they were also accustomed to use the ready-made lesson plans from many resources. It was also evident that the teachers were having a problem in developing the competence achievement indicators that mapped from the SKL, KI and KD, not to mention their consideration of learners' characteristics in designing the lesson plans. However, the more insensible reason was that the lesson plan was only needed by the school management and the authoritative government to fulfill the formal requirements in administrative tasks.

In the teaching process, the teachers were also entangled within the traditional views of learning. The lesson delivery was partly scientific and partly traditional. In structuring the lesson, the teachers gave very few attentions to the opening and closing stage. In teaching, the teachers also seemed to be dominant and controlling, used Bahasa Indonesia at most, the class situation was commonly quiet, and the topics and tasks were determined by the teachers. The classroom interaction was a duo-traffic and initiated by the teachers. Moreover, the classroom setting was commonly in-conducive for the best learning environment. The incongruence between the description of the learning and teaching activities and the actual performance executed by the teachers in their classrooms was also occurred. In the assessment process, the teachers seemed to partially implement the authentic assessment as the class size was quite large. Therefore, the teachers' implementation from the planning to the assessing process indicated a strong point that in some part of the K-13, the teachers tended to change the policy based on their classroom realities.

The constraints to successful implementation of K-13 in the teaching English practice at the targeted senior secondary schools in Makassar were found to root in the teachers as the implementer and the implementation itself. The teachers as the implementer of the K-13 in the teaching English was found as the main source of inner constraints when the teachers had a fixed mindset to refuse the curriculum change. The pessimistic views towards the change were occurred when they found that the change did not give individual or personal benefits or profits to the teachers. As mentioned earlier, this mainly happened to the teachers who were about to retire and who formerly got profits in the former curriculum. This fixed mindset would lead to pessimistic views of the curriculum change. Besides, some teachers were also pessimistic due to their own capacity to deal with the change. The teachers of this type were commonly found to lack of procedural knowledge in implementing some parts of the curriculum change. Another root of the constraints was dealing with the implementation itself. A number of outer constraints form would also contribute to the failure of implementation. The outer constraints the teachers found during the implementation were related to the class size, learning and teaching facilities, ill-timed of in-service training in K-13, the needs for specific subject in-service training of K-13 and the official teacher handbook and student textbooks.

Thus, based on the conclusion above, the third frame of theoretical constructs underlying the implementation and constraints in successful implementation of the K-13 in ELT practices was that, "The ultimate goal of designing and changing curriculum is not to design the best and ideal curriculum, but to put it into practice successfully. In order to enable the curriculum to take effects, teachers as the implementers should show their readiness, willingness and absolute capability to implement the curriculum by changing their mindset from old and traditional views of learning to modern pedagogic dimension. Through these changes, the constraints would become a new challenge rather than hindrances to the implementation".

E. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The shift of SBC into K-13 is not a thoughtless change and this study refuses the sound political arguments that "changing the minister will change the curriculum". This refusal is based on the findings and discussions in the previous chapters. The study concludes the three main findings based on the research questions posed earlier about the issues behind the curriculum reform from SBC to K-13, perceptions and interpretations the teachers have on K-13 in ELT, implementation of K-13 and constraints to successful implementation. The issues underlying the curriculum change from SBC to K-13 are concluded to be relatively similar to the issues in any curriculum changes in Indonesia. For the K-13, the issues are the failure of the former curricula, the anticipation on the world projected of Indonesian demographic and economic circumstances in the future, and the benefits offered within the curriculum change.

The perception of the English teachers towards the curriculum change from SBC to K-13 in English language teaching mainly leads to two main trends. The first trend is coming from the teachers who mainly look at the curriculum change as a positive, innovative, and creative change in the English teaching practice for the future of Indonesia. The change also gives impact to the transformation in the way teachers and students viewed the English learning from traditional view of learning to a modern pedagogic dimension. The second trend views the curriculum change as a superficial and conceptual change, and would likely to have the same effects with the previous curriculum changes. Both the trends in teachers' perception seem to be in line with the knowledge and the teachers' belief system towards the change. The knowledge and belief system that the teachers have will be linked to their experiences on the implementation of the previous curriculum.

The interpretation of the teachers towards the curriculum change from SBC to K-13 in ELT practices leads to two types of interpretation. The first type is the correct and comprehensive interpretation when dealing with the general concepts of K-13 in ELT practices. However, towards the applicative concepts, the teachers tend to interpret the concepts partially according to the teachers' level of understanding and procedural knowledge, and the convenience of the application offered by the changing elements. Therefore, the perception and interpretation that the teachers have on K-13 in relation to the ELT practices are postulated to be in line with their knowledge and beliefs, mindset in teaching practice, government policy demands in teacher administrative tasks, and disregards their individual capacity to better create new learning atmospheres for students as highlighted by K-13.

It is postulated that the ultimate goal of designing and changing curriculum is not to design the best and ideal curriculum, but to put it into practice successfully. In order to enable the curriculum to take effects, teachers as the implementers should show their readiness, willingness and absolute capability to implement the curriculum by changing their mindset from old and traditional views of learning to modern pedagogic dimensions. Through these changes, the constraints would become a new challenge rather than hindrances to the implementation. The implementation of K-13 in ELT practices at the schools is considered to be partial, biased and tends to be traditional in all levels. Although the teachers' administrative task to design the lesson plan is relatively simple as some parts have also been described in the syllabi, the teachers choose to design it mainly for the purpose of fulfilling one of the formal requirements in administrative tasks. They design it by adapting the sample provided by the trainers from other subjects. The English teaching process is inconsistent as it is classroom decision that the teachers execute it based on their own decision or ignore what have been described in their lesson plan. The assessment is also partially implemented as they found it problematical to deal with the common large class size. Therefore, the teachers' implementation from the planning to the assessing process indicate a strong point that in some part of the K-13, the teachers tend to change the policy based on their classroom realities.

The constraints to successful implementation of K-13 in the teaching English practice at the targeted senior secondary schools in Makassar is found to root in the teachers as the implementer and in the implementation itself. The teachers' fixed mindset to refuse the curriculum change is the hardest inner constraint, as they tend to be pessimistic. This pessimistic view is relatively stable when they find that the change does not give personal benefits or profits to the teachers. It mainly happens to the teachers who are about to retire and who formerly get profits in the former curriculum. Besides, some teachers are also pessimistic due to their own capacity to deal with the change. The teachers

of this type are found to lack of procedural knowledge in implementing some parts of the curriculum change. The other outer constraints root in the implementation itself. A number of outer constraints also contribute to the unsuccessful implementation. The outer constraints that the teachers find during the implementation are related to the class size, in-conducive learning and teaching facilities, ill-timed of in-service training in K-13, lack of specific subject capability in K-13, and the lack of official teacher handbook and student textbooks.

Implications

The findings on the curriculum change from SBC to K-13 with regards to the ELT practices have certain implications to some stakeholders; the government and associated policymakers in all levels, the teachers, the school management, parents and students. For the government and associated policymakers, the implications are to transform the policies into a more operational term as the policy implementation encompasses those actions by public and private individuals that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions. Beside the needs for time and money efforts to transform decisions into operational terms, they also need to continue efforts to achieve the large and small change mandated by the policy decision. As the curriculum reform with regards to ELT practices is targeted to the attempts of the specific quality improvement in English teaching, the teachers should have prepared for the changes to create a new learning atmosphere for students in a modern pedagogic dimension. This can be achieved through regular subject specific trainings, particularly in designing lesson plan, applying scientific approach, and conducting the authentic assessment for a better English learning and to achieve the quality improvement as mandated by the implementation policy.

The school management should have prepared the corresponding school environment for students to learn better and for teachers to teach more creatively. This can be done through the reform of the typical formal classrooms to the more flexible; IT-based classroom learning resources and productive natural environment as the implication to the policy. Parents should also change their perspectives as private individuals in managing their children's formal education. The learning targets of their children should also change from merely to achieving certain competences in specific subject matters or passing the national examination to anticipating the future by preparing their children with multidimensional competence that are expected to further take over sciences and technology in Indonesia.

Recommendations

With regards to the findings that have been concluded in the previous section, a number of recommendations should be addressed to the most relevant listed stakeholders as follows: (1) The government and associated policymakers in all levels should have anticipated the policy implementation with a minimal constraint mechanism. A subject specific (such as English) in strictly controllable in-service trainings for senior secondary school teachers should be conducted on periodical basis. Some revisions and reforms in regulations that contain certain promotions, rewards (teacher certification allowance) and punishments for teachers in relation to their achievement of the curriculum implementation should be done. The implementation of the revised and reformed policies through regular supervisory programs must be established; (2) The teachers as the main implementer of the policy reform must improve their conceptual and procedural knowledge within the policy and content specific, pedagogic, personal, and social competence and performance in teaching that are mainly directed to: (a) changing fixed mindset; (b) designing and using the appropriate and applicable lesson plan in teaching; and (c) regular self-training in peer-teaching activities to apply the Scientific Approach and Authentic Assessment; (3) The school supervisors and headmasters should work together to find the problems or constraints in implementation, analyze the problems, and find the best solution through regular and sustained supervisory programs for teachers at schools. All constraints must be eliminated or at least reduced to achieve the targets of implementation.

REFERENCES

[1]. Basturkman, H, Loewen, S and Ellis, R. 2004. Teachers' Stated Beliefs about Incidental Focus on Form and Their Classroom Practices. Applied Linguistics, 25 (2):243-72.
[2]. Bekalo, S., and Welford, G. 2000. Practical Activity in Ethiopian Secondary Physical Sciences: Implications for Policy and Practice of the Match between the Intended and the Implemented Curriculum. Research Papers in Education, 15 (2):185-212.
[3]. Bloom, J. 2006. Selected Concepts of Curriculum. (Online), (www.jeffbloom.net/docs/SelectedConcepts Of Curriculum. pdf,retrieved on March 2nd, 2013).
[4]. Bogdan, R. C. and Biklen, S. K. 2003. Qualitative Research for Education: An introduction to Theories and Methods (4th Edition). Pearson Education, New York.
[5]. Brindley, G., and Hood, S. 1990. Curriculum Innovation in Adult ESL. In G. Brindley (Ed.), The Second Language Curriculum in Action (pp. 232-248). National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Sydney.
[6]. Connelly, F. M., and Lantz, O. C. 1991. Definitions of Curriculum: An Introduction. In A. Lewy (Ed.), The International Encyclopaedia of Curriculum, (pp. 15-18). Pergamon Press, New York.
[7]. Creswell, J. W. 2003. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (2nd Edition). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

[8]. Doll, R. 1996. Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process. Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.

[9]. Egan, K. 2003. What is Curriculum? Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, (Online), Vol. 1, No.1, pp. 9-16. (http://www.csse.ca/CACS/JCACS/1.1/CACS.1.1.c.egan.1978.pdf, retrieved on August 19, 2011).

[10]. Elmore, R., and Sykes, G. 1992. Curriculum Policy. In Philip W. Jackson (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Curriculum: A Project of the American Educational Research Association. Macmillan, New York.

[11]. Errington, E. 2004. The Impact of Teacher Beliefs on Flexible Learning Innovation: Some Practices and Possibilities for Academic Developers, Innovations in Education and Teaching International. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 41 (1):39-47.

[12]. Fullan, M., and Stiegelbauer, S. 1991.The New Meaning of Educational Change (2nd Edition). Teachers College Press, New York.

[13]. Gahin, G., and Myhill, D. 2001. The Communicative Approach in Egypt: Exploring the Secrets of the Pyramids. TEFL Web Journal, (online), Vol. 1, No. 2.(http://www.teflweb-j.org/v1n2/GahinMyhill. html, retrieved on July 24, 2011).

[14]. Green, T. 1971. The Activities of Teaching. McGraw-Hill, New York.

[15]. Guba, E.G., and Lincoln, Y.S. 2005. Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds), The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd Edition), (pp. 191-216). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

[16]. 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. Proceedings 60th TEFLIN International Conference: Achieving International Standards in Teacher Education, (pp. 360-364). Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.

[17]. Kagan, D. 1990. Ways of Evaluating Teacher Cognition: Inferences Concerning the Goldilocks Principle. Review of Educational Research, 60 (3):419-69.

[18]. Karavas-Doukas, E. 1995. Teacher Identified Factors Affecting the Implementation of A Curriculum Innovation in Greek Public Secondary Schools. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 8 (1):53-68.

[19]. Kennedy, C. 1988. Innovating for A Change: Teacher Development and Innovation. English Language Teaching Journal, 41 (3):163-170.

[20]. Kennedy, M.M. 1997. Defining An Ideal Teacher Education Program. National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, DC. (Online). (http://www.msu.edu/user/mkennedy/ publications/Kennedy%20to%20NCATE.pdf., retrieved on March 11, 2012).

[21]. Maddox, H. 1993. Theory of Knowledge and Its Dissemination. Freshet Press, Castlemaine, Victoria.

[22]. Markee, N. 1993. The Diffusion of Innovation in Language Teaching. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics: Issues in Second Language Teaching and Learning, (13):229-243.

[23]. _____. 1997. Managing Curricular Innovation. Cambridge University Press, New York.

[24]. Mertens, D. M. 1998. Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Sage, London.

[25]. O'Sullivan, M. C. 2002. Reform Implementation and the Realities Within which Teachers Work: A Namibian Case Study. Compare, 32 (2): 219-237.

[26]. Pajares, F. 1996. Self–Efficacy Beliefs in Academic Settings. Review of Educational Research, (66):543–578.

[27]. Pratt, D. 1994. Curriculum Planning: A Handbook for Professionals. Toronto: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Toronto.

[28]. Richardson, V. 1994. The Consideration of Teachers' Beliefs. In V. Richardson (ed.), Teacher Change and the Staff Development Process: A Case in Reading Instruction, (pp. 90-108). Teachers College Press, New York.

[29]. Richardson, V. 1996. The Role of Attitudes and Beliefs in Learning to Teach. In J. Sikula,T. J. Buttery, and E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (2nd Edition), (pp. 102-119). Macmillan, New York.

[30]. Richardson, V. 2003. Constructivist Pedagogy. Teachers College Record, 105 (9):1623-40.

[31]. Robson, C. 2011. Real World Research : A Resource for Users of Social Research Methods in Applied Settings (3rd Edition). Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, West Sussex Hoboken New Jersey.

[32]. Senior, R.M. 2006. The Experience of Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, New York.

[33]. Taba, H. 1962. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. Harcourt Brace, New York.

[34]. Tanner, D., and Tanner, L. N. 1995. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice (3rd Edition). Merrill/Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

[35]. Theisen, G., Huges, J., and Spector, P. 1991. Curriculum Development in Indonesia. In Marsh and P. Morris, Curriculum Development in East Asia. Teachers College Press, London.

[36]. Thornbury, S. 1996. Teacher's Research Teacher's Talk. ELT Journal, 50 (4):279-89.

[37]. Wachidah, S. 2013. The Why, What, and How of the 2013 Curriculum. Presented on Educational Linguistic Conference 2013, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

[38]. Williams, P., Williams, M., Guray, C., Bertram, A., Brenton, R., and McCormack, A. 1994. Perceived Barriers to Implementing A New Integrated Curriculum. Curriculum Perspectives, 14 (1):17-23.

[39]. Woods, M. 1996. Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Government Regulations:

Attachment of the Regulation of the Ministry of National Education Number 22 Year 2006 Education and Culture Ministerial Regulations Number 67, 68, 69, and 70 on Fundamental Framework and Curriculum Structure from Elementary to Senior Secondary and Vocational Secondary School. Government Regulations Number 32 Year 2013 (The Revision of Government Regulations Number 19 Year 2005 about the National Standards of Education) The Regulation of the Minister of National Education Number 24 Year 2006 Article 2 Verses 1 – 2
The Regulation of the Ministry of National Education Number 24 Year 2006

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

1. Name   : Djuwairiah Ahmad
2. Place and Date of Birth   : Makassar, June 19, 1970
3. Sex   : Female
4. Home Address/
   Address for Correspondence : Kompleks Hasanuddin Blok B No. 17, Gowa,
   South Sulawesi, Indonesia, 92114
   Phone Number: +62 411 866116
   Mobile : +62852 4259 4567
   e-mail: riahmad70@gmail.com
5. Current Occupation   : Lecturer at Faculty of Education and Teaching
   Science, Alauddin State Islamic University of
   Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia
6. Current Work Address   : Jl. Sultan Alauddin No. 36, Samata-Gowa,
   South Sulawesi, Indonesia

7. Educational Background   :

No.	School/College	Graduated	Place	Program
1	SDN (Primary School)	1982	Ujung Pandang	-
2	SMP (Junior High School)	1985	Ujung Pandang	-
3	SMTK (Senior High School)	1988	Ujung Pandang	Food & Beverages
4	S1 (Undergraduate) at Education and Teacher Training Institute (IKIP)	1992	Ujung Pandang	English Education
5	S2 (Postgraduate) at Victoria University, Melbourne (VIC) Australia	2006	VIC, Australia	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

8. Marital Status   : Married

Understanding the 2013 Curriculum of English Teaching throughthe Teachers"and Policymakers"Perspectives