



## Developing and Implementing School-based Curriculum in Teaching English

**Suciati Anandes**

State Islamic University Of UIN SUSKA Riau

[suciati@gmail.com](mailto:suciati@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*This study aims to investigate and explore school-based curriculum in teaching English at One Elementary School related to the curriculum policy and curriculum instructional of English as a local content in Elementary School. This case-study research employed interview, observation, document analysis and logbook to collect the data about the development and implementation of school-based curriculum (SBC) in teaching English at one elementary. The participants of this study are vice-principal of curriculum affair, teacher of English and student. Evidence from all data sources shows that between the development and implementing are not balance because the instructional documents, facilities, teaching-learning process are not supported each other. In conclusion, all of the aspects in developing and implementing SBC in teaching English at Elementary School should be reviewed and improved.*

*Keywords : School-based curriculum, teaching English*

### 1. Introduction

As a foreign language in Indonesia, English is taught widely at formal schools starting from elementary schools up to universities, even at informal schools. According to Singleton (2005, p. 271), for the purposes of learning languages, the human brain becomes progressively stiff and rigid after the age of nine. It means teaching English for Elementary students is a good decision because their brains are still flexible to acquire the language and it is a good basis for continuously English learning of Educational level.

In teaching learning-process of English, especially at elementary school, teachers should not only make students active, but also make students understand about what the teachers explains. To support the demand of good English ability, education needs something to guide the teaching-learning process. Basically, curriculum is the core to answer the need above.

School-Based Curriculum is used in most of educational unit. This curriculum is developed by each education institution to give an opportunity to adapt the educational program to the needs and the potential of the local region but still base on the contents standards (Standard Isi) and

attainment targets (Standar Kompetensi Lulusan) of National Education (BNSP, 2006, p. 3). In this curriculum, the status of English, for elementary school, is local content which means it is not a main subject, but in fact many elementary schools make English as compulsory local content. This article will discuss about how and why developing and implementing school-based curriculum in teaching English at Elementary school looks like.

**a. Research Question**

The problem of this study was limited on English instruction with SBC at an elementary school, particularly on curriculum policy for English instruction at elementary levels, its implementation, and its strengths and weaknesses. They are:

1. What does curriculum policy of SBC for teaching English at elementary school look like?
2. How is the implementation of English instruction in SBC at one elementary school?
3. What are the strengths and the weaknesses of implementing such curriculum?

**2. Literature Review**

**a. Curriculum (Language purpose)**

Braslavsky (1999, p. 1) states that curriculum is an agreement amongst communities, educational professionals, and the state on what learners should take on during specific periods of their lives. The curriculum defines why, what, when, where, how, and with whom to learn. Curriculum is also known as the content, standards, or objectives for which schools hold student accountable, or curriculum is the set of instructional strategies teachers plan to use. Furthermore, Netherlands Instituted for Curriculum Development (NICD) (2009, p 9) states that the very short definition of curriculum as a 'plan for learning', This simple definition does not easily or unnecessarily narrow the perspective, but permits all sorts of elaboration for specific curricular levels, contexts and representations. NICD represents curriculum into the levels of segment. Although many further refinements are possible, the following divisions have proved to be very useful to understand the different levels to which curriculum products may apply:

Table 1  
*Curriculum levels and curriculum products*

Level	Description	Example
SUPRA	International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common European Framework of References for Languages</li> </ul>
MACRO	System, National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core objectives, attainment levels</li> <li>• Examination programs</li> </ul>
MESO	School, Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School program</li> <li>• Educational program</li> </ul>
MICRO	Classroom, teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching plan, instructional materials</li> <li>• Module, course</li> <li>• Textbooks</li> </ul>
NANO	Pupil, Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal plan for learning</li> <li>• Individual course of learning</li> </ul>

(van den Akker, et. al., 2009)

Reflecting on the table above, the core of curriculum can have contexts and representation based on the levels of curricular, e.g. The National Standard for Indonesian Curriculum (Macro-Level) gives core objectives (context and representation in general) about competency standards and basic competencies that should be the main reference to develop the SBC in every

School (Meso-Level) specifically and so on.

Each educational level (Elementary, Junior and Senior High School) has to consider about the components that address ten specific questions about the planning of students' teaching (van den Akker, 2005) in order to ease the process of developing the curriculum:

Table II. 2  
*Curriculum Components*

Components	specific questions about the planning of student learning
Rationale	Why are they learning?
Aims and Objectives	Toward which goals are they learning?
Content	What are they learning?
Learning Activities	How are they learning?
Teachers' role	How is the teacher facilitating their learning?
Materials & Resources	With what are they learning?
Grouping	With whom are they learning?
Location	Where are they learning?
Time	When are they learning?
Assessment	How to assess their learning progress?

(Curriculum Material Development: 2005)

In arranging curriculum for describing and assessing language proficiency for elementary school in an internationally comparable manner, CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) points out

a simple 'global' representation that will make it easier to communicate the system to non-specialist users and will also provide teachers and curriculum planners with orientation:

Table II. 3  
*Common Reference Levels-global scale (CEFR)*

Basic User	A2	Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
	A1	Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.

In this research, the writer is going to investigate the implementation of English instruction in the SBC at elementary school level. According to the table above, attainment targets of teaching English at elementary school is equivalent with Basic Speaker (A1 & A2). It means the development of

teaching English for Elementary School should be considered as the global representation.

Here is the explanation of Breakthrough and waystage (A1 & A2) common reference levels: self-assessment in teaching English for elementary school:

Table II. 4  
Common Reference Levels: self-assessment for A1 & A2 (CEFR)

	A1	A2	
UNDERSTANDING	Listening	I can recognize familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surrounding when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment) I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple message and announcement.
	Reading	I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences. For example on notice and poster or in catalogues.	I can read very short, simple text. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisement, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.
	Spoken Interaction	I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself.
SPEAKING	Spoken Production	I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know	I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job.
	Writing	I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form.	I can write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate needs. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something.
WRITING			

From the table above, Indonesia can make the standardization of

teaching English for Indonesian students at Elementary School. As a

local content in elementary school, English can be arranged appropriately based on the common level framework for Beginner or Elementary (A1 & A2) and also is relevant with situation and needs of a region. To ease the development of curriculum in classroom level, stakeholders can refer to the components of curriculum (see Table 2).

### b. School-based Curriculum for teaching English

The criterion for developing English as a local content generally (for class 4-6) in Elementary School is Competency Standard and Basic Competence.

Table II. 6  
Competency Standard and Basic Competence

Standard Competence	Basic Competence
<b>Listening</b> 1. Understanding very simple instruction and information both actions as well as the language in context about participants learners	1.1 Responding to very simple instruction with actions is acceptable in activities inside and outside the classroom/school. 1.2 Responding very simple instruction verbally
<b>Speaking</b> 2. Expressing very simple instruction and information both actions as well as the language in context classroom/school.	2.1 Having conversation for language accompanying action which include: giving example of doing something, giving command, and giving direction 2.2 having conversation for asking/giving service/things which include: asking for help, helping, asking for thing, giving thing. 2.3 having conversation for asking/giving information which includes: introducing, inviting, asking permission, giving permission, accepting, not accepting, and prohibiting. 2.4 expressing politeness which includes: <i>thank you, sorry, please, excuse me, shall we, do you mind, would you please, and may i</i>
<b>Reading</b> 3. Understanding very simple English written language in context classroom/school.	3.1 Reading aloud with expression, emphasis, and precise intonation involving: words, phrases, simple sentences, and very simple the text 3.2 understanding very simple sentence and written message
<b>Writing</b> 4. Spelling and Copying simple English text	4.1 Spelling very simple English expression appropriately and acceptably to the punctuation that includes: words, phrases, and very simple sentences. 4.2 Copying very simple English written language appropriately and acceptably for congratulating and messaging.

(BSNP, 2006)

Department of National Education Standard (BNSP) stated key concept and learning approach in School-Based Curriculum. These are stated, either explicitly or implicitly in the curriculum policies:

- a. Student-centered learning
- b. Active Learning
- c. The role of the teacher as facilitator

- d. Students' interaction as a means of promoting learning
- e. Assessment for learning
- f. A thematic approach to learning

### 3. Research Methodology

This study adopted case study as a strategy of qualitative research. *Single-Case study* focused on investigating the developing and implementing of school-based curriculum in teaching English at one Elementary School on Kampar Regency. The type of this single-case study is *exploratory research*, with the aim to analyze or explain why or how something happens or has happened, because the research questions in this case are more likely to be of the “how” or “why” type. Data collecting is one of the processes of a research that plays an important role. The data collections were used:

#### a. Interview

The interview focused on school-based curriculum and English as a local content. It was conducted by interviewing vice principal for curriculum affairs and teachers of English. This method was aimed to answer research question about curriculum policy and also the strength and weaknesses of curriculum for teaching English at Elementary School. The interview was mainly conducted in the local language, Indonesian, to suit the participants' preference. All interviews were recorded with the participants' permission.

#### b. Observation

This method used a rubric to assess the implementation of school-based curriculum in teaching English as a local content for elementary students. The observation focused on teaching-learning process of English at one elementary school.

#### c. Document Analysis

In document analysis conducted three types of curriculum development analyses; MACRO (National level), MESO (School level) and MICRO (Classroom level) by using rubrics.

#### d. Logbook

Logbook is a writer's note which was taken throughout the entire program or research process. It was aimed at supporting the data gained by the writer about the implementation of school-based curriculum. To make it easier for the writer, the logbook was written in Indonesian. The logbook was written when the writer found some information related to the problems investigated out of the three of main data collections.

### 4. Results

The Interview and document analysis of data collection revealed that English as one of the subjects in the Elementary Schools which has been implemented since the policy from the Department of Education and Culture Republic of Indonesia (DEPDIBUD RI) No. 0487/14/1992, Chapter VIII. It is stated that Elementary School can add subjects in the curriculum; the subject should not be contradicted with the purpose of National Education. This policy is supported by Decree by Minister of Education and Culture No. 060/U/1993 about the possibility of English as a local content in Elementary Schools.

In School-Based Curriculum, which has been implemented since 2006, the developmental of local content is supported by:

- a. The Law No. 32/2004 about local government (autonomy area). Chapter 13 article 1 states that the authority of local government (province) is provincial level; one of them is the implementation of education and the allocation of potential human resources.
- b. The Law No. 20/2003 about the system of national education. Chapter 37 article 1 states that the

curriculum of education must contain some educational contents; one of them is local contents.

- c. Government Regulation No. 19/2005 about Standard of National Education. Chapter 7 articles 3 suggests that the group of science and technology subjects at Elementary Schools are implemented through content and/or language, math, Natural science, Social Science, skills/vocational, and local content which are relevant.

The definition of local content from BSNP (2006, p. 10):

“Local content is curricular activities to develop competencies that are tailored to the hallmark and the potential of the region, including primary areas, which the material is not suitable to be a part of other subjects and or there are many subjects that should be the subject of its own. The substance of local content is determined by unit education (school), not limited to the subjects of skills. Local content is the subject, so that the unit education should develop Competency Standards and Basic competence for each type of local content organized. Education units can be held the local content subjects each semester. It means that within one year of education units can organize two local content subjects.”

In connection with the definition above, the vice principal in the Elementary School of Kampar Regency in this study stated that there are 2 local

contents which are still implemented; *Arab Melayu* and *English*. Teaching English in the school has been responded positively and broadly by the community. In the course of its development, formerly, English was an optional local content but it has become a compulsory local content in some schools, one of them is at the school in Kampar. The status as a local content subject basically means: (1) the society in which the school is located requires it; (2) the school meets certain qualifications such as the availability of the teachers and the facilities to accommodate teaching-learning process. This definition indicate elementary school decided to teach English because it is a requisition by the society and one of the school prestige, but it has to followed by the school qualification such as teachers and facilities to support teaching-learning process of local content.

In the developmental English as a local content, it has been arranged by the school, it means that every school could develop English differently from the aims of teaching English until the material of teaching English. The developmental of English in each school should be based on:

- a. Decree of National Education Minister No. 22/2006 about content standard. It is stated that the substance of local content is determined by the school with the guidance of competency standard and basic competences, each of local content has time allocation 2 hours/week.
- b. Decree of National Education Minister No. 23/2006 about Attainment Targets. Attainment Targets are basic measurement guidelines for determining the graduation of the students. For Elementary Schools, competency

standards for English as a local content subject generally are:

a) *Listening*

To understand instructions, information, and simple stories through conversations within the context of classroom, schools, and the neighborhood.

b) *Speaking*

To verbally express the meaning of simple interpersonal and transactional discourses in the form of instructions and information within the context of classroom, schools, and the neighborhood.

c) *Reading*

To be able to read aloud and understand the meaning of the instructions and information as presented in short and simple functional, descriptive, and pictorial texts within the context of classroom, schools, and the neighborhood.

d) *Writing*

To be able to write words, phrases, and short functional texts with correct spelling and proper punctuation.

c. Decree of National Education Minister No. 20/2007 about Assessment Standard, in the part of mechanism and procedure of measurement explain that the assessment of local content is following the measurement of relevant subject, means that the measurement of English is similar to the measurement of bahasa Indonesia.

d. Decree of National Education Minister No. 41/2007 about Standard Process. This decree explains about planning the learning process, implementation of the learning process, assessment of learning

outcomes, and the supervision of the learning process.

The developmental of curriculum in Indonesia at macro level based on the vision of national education is the realization of educational system as a mediator for empowering Indonesian citizens and developing them to be qualified and proactive people so they can respond to the challenges of globalization. The introduction of English in the early age of schooling has become more common in this globalized world.

In connection with the explanation above, comparing the attainment targets as stated in decree of National Education Minister No. 23/2006 with CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Language) in teaching English for elementary school students, there are some similar purposes of teaching English for young learners (A1 Breakthrough or beginner and A2 Waystage or elementary). Competency standards for teaching English at elementary schools is understanding and expressing simple instruction and information in class/school context, while in CEFR (A1 and A2), the purposes of teaching English are the students can understand and use familiar everyday expression and also the students can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas.

At the school where this study was conducted, the development of curriculum policy for the main subjects is already appropriate with the guidance of the national government. For the local content, especially English, the curriculum policies in that school are focused on these aspects:

a. The process of teaching English is starting from first grade to the sixth



- grade. This policy may be different from other schools. Most of the elementary schools introduce English in the third or the fourth grade.
- b. The school provides different teachers for teaching local contents. There are 2 (two) teachers of English and 1 (one) *Arab Melayu* teacher. Teachers are divided into 2 groups; a group of 1<sup>st</sup> - 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and a group of 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - c. The instructional documents (e.g., annual programs, semester program, syllabi, lesson plans, criteria of assessment and measurement, etc.) are planned and developed in teacher groups or the so-called *Kegiatan Kelompok Guru (KKG)*. All teachers of English from different elementary schools make a group discussion to collaboratively design instructional documents.
  - d. The teaching-learning process of English in each class takes 2 hours per week, consisting of 2 x 35 (70) minute class meeting.
  - e. The main source of teaching English is students' worksheet. The vice principal said that the school committee has the right to select a textbook and worksheet to be used in line with the materials developed by the teachers.
  - f. The assessment of English is focused on performances (Knowledge, skills, and attitude) and product (homework and school work) with the scoring formula =  $(\text{Total score} / \text{total maximum score}) \times 10$ . Therefore, minimum passing grade for English is 76 for 1<sup>st</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade.

The decision for local content at this elementary school was made based on the result of the meeting among the principal, the teachers and the relevant stakeholders who were involved in the development of the curriculum. The

instructional documents for English were designed by the teachers in reference to the existing standards, such as annual program, semester program, syllabi, and lesson plans. After analyzing and comparing the teacher documents with national standard for curriculum, it is revealed that the teachers are responsible for developing MESO (school) level curriculum or instructional documents accurately and appropriately in reference with the competency standards and basic competences provided by the national government.

### **Implementation of SBC in Teaching English at Elementary School**

Learning English at elementary school level is based on the idea that learning a foreign language or a second language will be better if it is started earlier (Hammerly, 1982, p. 265). An assumption about age and language learning is that children can learn language better than adults. Furthermore, Ur (2009, p. 288) said that there are 3 sources of concern for children in the classroom: pictures, fairytales, and games. These activities (learning language by using 3 sources of concern) are kinds of fun learning for children or usually called as *recreational time out activities*. The curriculum in general tends to fail because of poor implementation at classroom level. In many cases, the ideal curriculum (annual program, semester program, syllabus, lesson plan) is good, but the curriculum in practice is poor, and teachers are not well prepared to be good learning facilitators to create valuable activities. In this condition, the teaching-learning process will not be able to improve student achievement.

In the real teaching-process of English, students at the elementary

school in Kampar were commonly taught by using students' worksheet. The government states that the educational system should apply a student-centered instruction with the focus on communicative competences. Such interaction is thought to facilitate language acquisition as learners have to work to understand one another and to express their own meaning (Larsen-Freeman, 2000), but there was misinterpretation of student-centered learning here. In that school, the teachers used the student worksheet as a main source to teach the students. For instance, the teachers asked the students to answer the tasks, the teachers asked the students to memorize the vocabulary in that task, and sometimes the teachers asked the students to translate the sentence in the task. It means that the students worked individually. Although the students' worksheet in this school generally is suitable with the competency standard and basic competences, but it is less precise in its use and monotonous. This is contrary with the student-centered approach in which the students work together in groups or pairs as per the demand and purpose of the activity. This way, teaching and learning becomes an enjoyable and friendly active and

rewarding activity, hence making it easier for the students to understand the lesson since they are actively involved in the learning not only giving the students responsibility to find the answers of worksheet individually. The role of the teachers and the students are also balanced. The teachers and the student are both active participants since they share the learning responsibility of the learners, helping to identify how the students should use the language (Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, & Curran, 2003).

Using textbook or students' worksheet as a main sources has not only happened in that school. Faridi's study on the development of context-based English learning resources for elementary schools in Central Java, Indonesia, also revealed that teachers depended much on textbooks as their primary teaching resources (2010). In this case, teachers also play an important role in teaching-learning process; it means that the students-centered approach should be supported by taking the advantages of teacher-centered approach (Al-Zu'be, 2013). Below is the comparison between teacher-centered and students-centered approach.

Table VI. 1

*Teacher-centered Approach and Students-Centered Approach*

<b>Teacher-Centered</b>	<b>Students-Centered</b>
Focus is on instructor	Focus is on both students and instructor
Focus is on language forms and structures (what the instructor knows about the language)	Focus is on language use in typical situations (how students will use the language)
Instructor talks; students listen	Instructor models; students interact with instructor and one another
Students work alone	Students work in pairs, in groups, or alone depending on the purpose of the activity
Instructor monitors and corrects every student utterance	Students talk without constant instructor monitoring; instructor provides feedback/correction when questions arise
Instructor answers students' questions about language	Students answer each other's questions, using instructor as an information resource

Instructor chooses topics	Students have some choice of topics
Instructor evaluates student learning	Students evaluate their own learning; instructor also evaluates
Classroom is quiet	Classroom is often noisy and busy

Related to explanation above, every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, between people (inter-psychological) and then inside the child (intra-psychological) (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57). It means that when both approaches are used together, students can enjoy the positives of both types of education. Instead of getting bored with teacher-centered education or losing sight of their goals in a completely student-centered classroom, pupils can benefit from a well-balanced educational atmosphere.

Another goal as stated in the curriculum policy of teaching EFL is to increase students' communicative competences. The relationship between plan and reality is not always in harmony. For example, Nishino (2008) study in Japan found that while the policy endorsed the development of students' communicative competence and emphasis on four macro skills in learning English, teachers, on the other hand, emphasised accuracy, memorization, and the use of written mode which are not suitable for developing student communicative competences. Communicative competence refers to a learner's ability to use language to communicate successfully, but memorization and written mode activities would not be much helpful for communicative competence and it also happened at the elementary school in Kampar.

Some experts said that teachers are the men behind the gun', and become the chiefs in the implementation of curriculum policy at school level. Teachers' teaching styles and teachers' perceptions of their

students' needs are very influential. The writer found that the reason why the teachers might rely on commercial textbooks is because English is a local content for the elementary school and it does not significantly affect the student achievement. There are some reasons as mentioned by the vice principal why English is included in local content and not one of the main subjects in elementary school:

- a. English in Indonesia is a first foreign language; it will be different from a country, where English is a second language (medium of communication in daily life). It means that teaching English in Elementary school is not a must.
- b. Teaching English at the elementary school is only intended for the introduction of a foreign language for children, so they have basic knowledge and skill of English to continue their learning at next educational levels.
- c. The increasing demands of parents and the community who see English as the key to their children's educational success have become another pressure to the policy of introducing English in primary school curricula. But the government concerns with the nationalist sentiment of elementary school students will decrease if teaching English and *Bahasa* are equalized.

From the document analysis and class observation, the writer found that the implementation of SBC in teaching English at the school was still far from the expectation. It is because most of teaching-learning process in English

directs the students so they can analyze and understand English for the next level of education. It makes the students have little opportunities for practicing what they have learnt in a communicative situation. Commonly, English class in Indonesia is more emphasized on “learning about English” not “learning how to use English”.

The teachers usually use teaching materials by simply following the sequences in the textbook. It means that the teachers still have fewer skills to select, adapt, and develop the materials appropriate with students’ need. The teachers suggested several reasons related to this issue: 1) sufficient time allocation, 2) English hours/week for elementary students should be enough, so the teacher can design the activities and the time appropriately, and (3) to many pupils in a classroom (big class). It is a fact that most of the schools in Indonesia experience. That is why using task-based learning can be more helpful, and (3) lack of knowledge, skills, and motivation. The surprising statement from the teachers of English in that school was that they had low motivation to teach English well because English is a local content in Elementary school. Their positions as teachers of English thus made them unable to be civil servants because elementary schools do not need state employed teachers of English because of the English status.

Comparing the lesson plan made by the teacher with the curriculum components in classroom level by van den Akker, there are some unclear explanations in contents and materials as well as sources of the lesson plan. The content in the lesson plan is not specifically explained, what the topic is going to learn. Materials and sources in the lesson plan are dependable on the textbook, teaching media, and other sources, but in fact the teachers just

used students’ worksheet in the process of teaching-learning and it made the students learn individually. The class observation done by the writer also showed that content, teachers’ pedagogy, and technology in that school are not linked with one another.

The students claim that they got good scores in their school report, because the teacher provided the test based on the topics that have been studied by the students in their worksheet, but the question is “can this teaching style help the students acquire the language?”. The reality shows that Indonesian students have learnt English for almost 12 years, but they still get difficulties with English.

The study also found out that such gaps were a result of the lack of teacher professional development and teachers’ belief in teaching English for young learners. Teachers of English preparation programs only prepare the teachers of English for junior and senior high schools. They were mostly offered only a two-credit hour course for teaching English to young learners (TEYL), and it is not enough to be a good teacher of English at elementary level. Teachers’ attitudes also contribute to the implementation of curriculum. Young & Lee stated that:

“...teachers’ attitudes are a crucial variable in a dynamic of EFL curriculum innovation; without affecting a change in teachers’ attitudes any systematic innovation in the curriculum...will not have a significant effect on what goes on elsewhere” (1984: 184).

This indicates that teachers’ attitudes are compatible with a proposed innovation, and the implementation of the innovation is likely to harvest a positive result. The teachers influence curriculum implementation by deciding

which topics and activities are appropriate for their students.

### **Strength and Weaknesses of Implementing SBC in Teaching English at the Elementary School**

From the interviews, observations and document analyses, there were some strengths and weaknesses in implementing the SBC in teaching English at the school. First, the school made English as a compulsory local content in order to prepare the students for the next level of education, but the school was not well-prepared to apply this policy.

Second, the development of instructional documents in teaching-learning English was in line with the curriculum policy from the government. Devolution of authority in SBC was providing an opportunity to the school (educational unit) to arrange the curriculum to school's need. But this authority was not fully supported by the teachers' performance in implementing the curriculum. As explained previously, the teachers just taught English not how to use English. The curriculum documents seemed to be formality of the curriculum in-action.

Third, teaching-learning process of English started from 1<sup>st</sup> grade to 6<sup>th</sup> grade. The consideration about the importance of English was already good. But the facility to support English instruction for young learners was not sufficient. Even though the teachers could make their own teaching media, it was temporary. Lack of money and energy made the teachers unwilling to prepare their teaching professionally. Moreover, the way the teachers taught (teaching style) the students was not appropriate enough for young learners because teacher education programs in Indonesia only prepare pre-service

teachers of English for teaching English at junior and senior high schools and not at primary schools. This is because the national curriculum for English language education in Indonesia focuses on junior and senior high school students.

Fourth, teacher of English provision was adequate, but on the other hand, the school created a policy that encouraged teachers of English to help *Arab Melayu* instruction because the school had only one *Arab Melayu* teacher for all of classes. This situation caused teachers of English at this school unfocused and not maximally teaching English.

### **5. Conclusion**

As the result of data collection by interviewing the vice-principal and teacher of English, Analyzing the curriculum documents developed by School, and observing the teaching-learning English in the classroom, there is a gap between the development and the implementation of curriculum policy and curriculum instructional of teaching English for elementary School in School level. The curriculum development was good enough, but in the implementation there were still some problems that need to be reviewed and fixed. Mostly the problems come from the facilities and the ability of the teacher to teach young learners.

In brief explanation of the result, the development of local content is given to the school referring to the national standard and instruction by the government and local government. Teachers of English develop their instruction, approved by the principal, such as year's program, semester's program, syllabi, and lesson plans. In addition, the teachers also implement the curriculum in teaching-learning in

classroom. In the other side, the teachers are not well prepared to teach English at the school because they here lack of knowledge and skills in teaching English for young learners. This is because the previous education did not prepare them to teach the level. Teachers' role in implementing the curriculum is very crucial as a facilitator in teaching-learning process. Teacher's style (beliefs, approach, method, and strategy) in teaching can influence the students learning achievement and also the facilities provided by the school do not support the teaching-learning process.

Teaching English at elementary schools has been carried out with various kinds of obstacles and problems. Therefore, the development and implementation of the curriculum in teaching English need to be reviewed and improved. Teaching English for Elementary School basically should be based on the theory of teaching language (In Indonesia, English as a foreign language) for young learners. Related to the policy of School-Based Curriculum, English is a local content for Elementary School and give the authority to the school to develop and implement English, but the development and the implementation should be still on the Regulation of National Standard of Education arranged by the National government and National Education Minister.

## References

- Ansyari, M. (2014). *Curriculum and Material Development: Grounding theories to practice*. Pekanbaru: UIN Suska Riau.
- Al-Zu'be, Ahmad. (2013). *The difference between the learner-centered Approach and the*

- teacher-centered approach in Teaching English as a foreign language*. Saudi Arabia: Majmaah University. ISSN-L: 2307-3713, ISSN: 2307-3721 Vol. 2 No. 2 October 2013
- Ben-Peretz, M., & Dor, B.Z. (1986). *Thirty years of school based curriculum development: A case study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research association (67th), San Fransisco, CA. ERIC database. (ED 274 096)
- Brady, L. (1992). *Curriculum development* (4th ed.). Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- Brady, L., & Kennedy, K. (1999). *Curriculum construction*. Erskineville, NSW: Prentice Hall
- Braslavsky, C. (1999) *Rehaciendo escuelas: haciaun nuevo paradigma en laeducación latinoamericana*. Buenos Aires : Santillana. (Translated: [http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/file\\_download.php/3c70bf409f9a7d3e072f80d8c7dcc597cecilia+e.pdf](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/file_download.php/3c70bf409f9a7d3e072f80d8c7dcc597cecilia+e.pdf))
- BSNP. (2006). *Panduan penyusunan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan jenjang pendidikan dasar dan menengah [A guideline to develop school-based curriculum for primary and secondary schools]* Jakarta: Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan [Board of National Standard of Education], Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- CEFR. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Unit. [www.coe.int/lang-CEFR](http://www.coe.int/lang-CEFR)
- Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and*

- qualitative research (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Deny Setyaningrum. (2009). *the implementation of KTSP in teaching English at the second year of SMPN 1 Wedarijaksa Pati*. An alumnus at Sebelas Maret University: Teacher Training and Education Faculty
- Fraenkel, J.R and Norman E.W. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Fullan, M.G., & Pomfret, A. (1997). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. *Review of Educational Research*, 47, 335-397.
- Gronlund, Norman E & Robert L. Linn. (1990). *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- Hammerly, Hector. (1982). *Synthesis in Second Language Teaching*. Blaine: Second Language.
- Hatch, A.J. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Setting*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Law, Edmond Hau-Fai. (2011). *School-based curriculum innovations: A case study in mainland China*. Department of Curriculum and Instruction The Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 1 No. 2; February 2011.
- Linse, Caroline & David Nunan. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Young Learners*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Margono. (2000). *Metode penelitian pendidikan*. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta
- Maria Dewinta Ratri S. & Christine Manara. (2012). *Teachers' Opinion of the teaching of English in the Elementary School Curriculum in Amabarawa, Central Java*. (English Edu. Vol. 10, No. 1, January 2012: 27-46)
- Marsh, C. (1992). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum*. London: Falmer Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussing and analysis*. San Francisco. CA: Josset-Bass
- Miles, M.B and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An expended sourcebook, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Muhaimin, H., Sutiah, Hj. , & Prabowo, S.L. (2008). *Pengembangan model Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) pada sekolah dan madrasah [The development of School-Based Curriculum (SBC) model in public and islamic schools]*. Jakarta: Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development (NICD). (2005). *Curriculum Development re-invented*. Leiden: the Netherlands
- Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development (NICD). (2009). *Curriculum in Development*. Leiden: the Netherlands
- Nisino, Takako. (2008). *Japanese Secondary School Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Regarding Communicative Language Teaching: An Exploratory Survey*. Temple University Japan: JALT Journal, Vol. 30, No. 1, May, 2008.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Penfield, W. & Roberts, L. (1959). *Speech and Brain Mechanisms*. Princenton, NJ: Princenton University Press.

- PP No 19, *Standar Nasional Pendidikan [Government Regulation No. 19, The National Standard of Education]* (2005).
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional No 22, *Standar Isi [Ministerial of National Education Decree No 22, Content Standards]* (2006a).
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional No 23, *SKL [Ministerial of National Education Decree No 23, Graduate Competency Standards]* (2006b).
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional No 24, *Pelaksanaan SI dan SKL [Ministerial of National Education Decree No 24, The implementation of Content Standards and Graduate Competency Standards]* (2006c).
- Posner, G. J. (2004). *Analyzing the Curriculum*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Richards, J.C. and D. Nunan (eds). (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Singleton, D. (2005). *The Critical Period Hypothesis: A coat of many colors*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* vol. 43: 269-285.
- Slavin E, Robert. (1992). *Research Methods in Education*. University of Virginia: Allyn and Bacon.
- Syafi'i S. (2011). *The Effective Paragraph Developments: The Process of Writing for Classroom Settings*. Pekanbaru: LBSI.
- Tim Pustaka Yustisia. (2008). *Panduan lengkap KTSP [A complete guideline of School-Based Curriculum (SBC)]*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Yustisia.
- Thomas, G. (2011). "sonia is typing.... A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse and structure". *Qualitative Inquiry*. 17 (6): 511–521. doi:10.1177/1077800411409884. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Case\\_study#cite\\_note-Thomas-7](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Case_study#cite_note-Thomas-7)
- Undang-undang No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional [Law No. 20 year 2003 about the System of National Education]
- Ur, Penny. (1966). *A course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, M.A.: The MIT Press
- Weinstein, C. S., Tomlinson-Clarke, S. & Curran, M. (2003). *Culturally responsive classroom management: Awareness into action*. *Theory into Practice*, 42(4).
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Doing case study research. 4th ed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.