

## LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION POLICY ON PRIMARY EFL: THE CASE OF INDONESIA

Subhan Zein  
*The University of Queensland, Australia*

### ABSTRACT

This paper examines language-in-education policy on teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in primary schools in Indonesia that has undergone massive changes in recent years. The paper provides an overview of primary EFL education focusing on policy development, instructional aspects and primary EFL teachers. The paper employs Baldauf & Kaplan's (2005) framework of language-in-education policy goals to analyse policy on primary EFL in Indonesia and makes recommendations on access policy, community policy, resourcing policy, curriculum policy, methodology and material policy, personnel policy and evaluation policy. These recommendations are relevant to the present context of primary EFL education in Indonesia and may help inform policymaking in other countries.

**Keywords:** English as a Foreign Language (EFL); Indonesia; Language policy; Primary education

### INTRODUCTION

Although English is not a compulsory subject in primary schools in Indonesia, its importance cannot be underestimated. A great majority of the 177,985 primary schools in the country offer English instruction to approximately 26 million children (Supriyanti, 2014). This occurs amidst recent policy changes affecting the implementation of primary EFL.

Conducting a language-in-education policy analysis of primary EFL education in Indonesia, this paper attempts to outline sustained and systematic solutions within the language planning and policy framework in order to address pedagogical concerns (Diallo & Liddicoat, 2014; Liddicoat, 2014). In doing so, the paper places pedagogy within the purview of language planning and policy, that is, under a language-in-education policy framework, rather than treating it as a lower level issue being assigned to micro agents (Liddicoat, 2014).

The presentation of the paper is as follows. First, the paper provides an overview of primary EFL education focusing on policy development, instructional aspects and primary EFL teachers. This is followed by a description of language-in-education policy goals framework (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005). The paper then uses the framework to make policy recommendations that are relevant to the present context of primary EFL education in Indonesia. Concluding remarks are provided at the end of the paper.

### PRIMARY EFL EDUCATION IN INDONESIA: AN OVERVIEW

#### Policy development

The Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) officialized English as a local content subject through the Decree No. 060/U/1993. This means children from Grade 4 onwards can learn English in a primary school as long as the society requires it and there are qualified teachers and proper facilities. In the early 2000s there was a strong demand for early English

instruction. This led to the proliferation of primary EFL education as tens and thousands of schools offered English instruction despite not having qualified teachers and facilities (Lestari, 2003). The Ministry of National Education (MoNE) was aware of the situation and released the Decree No. 22/2006 about The Structure of National Curriculum. The decree gives freedom to schools to teach English earlier than Grade 4 for 2 x 35 minutes per week and requires teachers to teach English based on the guidelines in the Curriculum Developed at Educational Unit (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan - henceforth KTSP) (Departemen, 2006).

It was announced in 2012 that a new curriculum, called Curriculum 2013, was going to replace KTSP. The full implementation of Curriculum 2013 means the removal of English from the primary school timetable nationwide in the 2016/2017 academic year. MoNE feared the fact that schools opt for making room for English in the timetable instead of local language(s) might contribute to language loss (Hadisantosa, 2010). Thus, it piloted Curriculum 2013 in 2,598 model primary schools and removed English from these school's timetables, while some provinces also banned regular schools from teaching English. Parents and teachers disagreed with the decision; they went on demonstrations to voice their concern (Wahyuni, 2014).

When MoNe changed into Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) in 2014, the MoEC Minister called for a revision of Curriculum 2013, and soon thereafter he exhorted schools to teach Indonesian as the national language, a local language of the school's choice and English as a foreign language in preparation of ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations) Economic Society. This is in alignment with parents' views that upgrading English language mastery is vital in the enhancement of their children's competitiveness as well as their participation in a globalized economy. However, the exhortation was also made in relation to the aspiration of the Minister himself to implement the Act No. 24/2009 that stipulates the necessity to teach the national language, the local languages and foreign languages (Zein, 2016a).

The exhortation has not materialized in any form of policy decree, however, since a recent cabinet reshuffle occurring in August 2016 saw the departure of the MoEC Minister from the office. It is unclear as to whether the recently appointed MoEC Minister would follow up the previous Minister's political stance in primary EFL because he has not made his views public. It also remains obscure as to whether and when the educational funding and resources that have insofar been made available to secondary English education will reach the primary level.

## **Instructional aspects**

### *Curriculum*

The government requires teachers to use the guidelines of the KTSP curriculum in the development of their syllabi. The syllabi need to conform to the curricular objectives in the form of Graduates Competency Standards as endorsed through the Decree of Ministry of National Education No. 23/2006. These Standards place an emphasis on learning competencies, stressing the need on what students are expected to know and do in terms of linguistic competencies (Departemen, 2006). For example, in terms of speaking, students are expected to be able to verbally express the meaning of simple interpersonal and transactional discourses in the form of instructions and information within the contexts of classroom, schools, and the neighbourhood.

### *Assessment*

Since the KTSP curriculum places emphasis on the mastery of learning competencies, paper-based tests with multiple-choice questions emphasising on syntactical and lexical knowledge are the norms of assessment, conducted typically at the end of each semester. The use of paper-based tests has been criticized as contributing to: 1) lessons being designed for test-preparation; 2) discrepancy between the objectives of learning and teachers' pedagogy; and 3) a counterproductive learning environment that places pressure on children and damages the development of their communicative competence (Lestari, 2003; Hawanti, 2011).

### *Methodology*

There is no officialized methodology for English Language Teaching (ELT) in Indonesia. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is the underlying methodology for the implementation of the competency-based KTSP curriculum, as it requires teachers to assist learners to achieve competencies on the four macro-skills (Madya, 2007). A corollary of the CLT methodology is an emphasis on the student-centred learning. But this brings a major challenge to teachers, as there is a cultural barrier distinguished by teacher-authority and lack of student participation. This is exacerbated by the fact that teachers also have to orchestrate lessons while accommodating the needs of typically more than 40 students in one single classroom (Dardjowidjojo, 2000).

### *Teaching materials*

English teaching materials comprise of a large number of imported books from ESL (English as a Second Language) countries such as Singapore as well as local books. It has been asserted that the imported course books are generally not appropriate to the local Indonesian cultures; teachers find it difficult to adjust the contents to the local Indonesian cultures. Course books produced by local publishers, on the other hand, do not place emphasis on the cultural preservation of Indonesia and rely much on superficial illustrations. In addition, the proliferation of the theme-based instruction in local course books is reading-based; it does not allow space for exposure to listening to authentic native-speaking discourses (Aydawati, 2005).

### **Primary EFL teachers**

Based on their types of employment, primary EFL teachers in Indonesia can be divided into: 1) specialist EFL teachers; and 2) generalist EFL teachers. On the basis of their educational qualifications, teachers can be categorized into: 1) teachers without relevant English qualifications; and 2) teachers with relevant English qualifications.

### *Specialist and generalist teachers*

Specialist primary EFL teachers teach English only to children at various grades. They are generally non-civil servant teachers, as their employment is on contractual basis. Depending on the schools, they only receive one-third to one sixth of the full-scale salary with no additional benefits. Generalist teachers, on the other hand, are civil servant teachers who receive full salary, remuneration and health insurance attached to their permanent employment. These teachers are assigned to teach general subjects such as math's and science as well as English to students in their classroom only (Zein, 2016a).

There has been a steady increase in the employment of specialist primary EFL teachers but they are not the majority nationwide. However, there are only 62,883 specialist teachers

in approximately 95% of the 177,985 primary schools that teach English across the country, meaning the rest are generalist teachers (Zein, 2016a).

### *Teachers without relevant qualifications*

These are teachers who undertook their pre-service teacher education in one of the following: 1) School for Teacher Education (Sekolah Pendidikan Guru – henceforth SPG); 2) Primary School Teacher Education (Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar – henceforth PGSD); and 3) university graduates of general majors such as Physics, Biology, Mathematics, etc. While teachers graduating from SPG and PGSD are generalist EFL teachers, those graduating from general majors are specialist EFL teachers.

Only some proportion of this group of teachers consists of those graduating from SPG and general majors, whereas those graduating from PGSD constitute the bulk of the group. These teachers overall have limited exposure to English learning as they only study the compulsory four-credit point of English course at pre-service level. However, those graduating from PGSD will have acquired knowledge and skills related to young learner pedagogy, theories of teaching, educational philosophies and assessment, as they have been prepared with these during their pre-service education (Zein, 2016b).

Studies have reported that teachers without relevant English qualifications are not proficient language users (e.g. Asriyanti, Sikki, Rahman, Hamra, Noni, 2013; Zein, 2016c). Their pronunciation is problematic, and the majority of them lack the confidence in using English for instructional purposes (Chodidjah, 2007). Furthermore, their pedagogy is marked with unsatisfactory performance in areas such as language skill integration (Gunawan & Suharno, 2008) and teacher-centred learning (Asriyanti, et al., 2013).

### *Teachers with relevant qualifications*

They are specialist primary EFL teachers who graduated from English departments. These teachers may come from either one of the two majors: 1) English Study Program (ESP); 2) English Language Education Program (ELEP). First, ESP is a four-year undergraduate degree focusing on (1) Linguistics; (2) English Literature; and (3) Translation. Second, ELEP equips prospective teachers with training on English language as well as knowledge and skills related to curriculum, syllabus, assessment, teaching methodologies and materials development, so that they are ready to teach English in secondary schools (Zein, 2016b).

Reports from various studies suggest that the pedagogical performance of teachers graduating from ESPs and ELEPs vary from one case to another. Asriyanti, et al. (2013) reported that teachers in South Sulawesi needed to improve their pedagogical competencies. The test-performance scores verified the researchers' observations to demonstrate that the teachers lacked competencies mainly in teaching areas such as developing teaching materials, classroom management as well as giving instruction, explanations and oral feedback in English. In Bandung, West Java, Gunawan & Suharno (2008) found that while the majority of the teachers in their study were pedagogically challenged in areas such as classroom management, there were cases of teachers with superior pedagogical performance. Husein's (2014) study of seven exemplary teachers in Medan, North Sumatera, showed that teachers were able to design systematic lesson planning and to speak English fluently.

### *Standards of teacher professionalism*

The decree of the Minister of National Education No. 16/2007 on Standards of Teachers' Academic Qualifications and Competence requires teachers to possess an undergraduate degree from a pre-service teacher education institution. However, the policy does not specify whether the undergraduate qualifications need to come from ESP or ELEP. It

does not address the fact that ELEP is not aimed for primary EFL teaching either (Zein, 2016b). After understanding the overview of primary EFL education in Indonesia, it is now necessary to turn to the following section that describes language-in-education policy goals framework.

## **LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION POLICY GOALS**

Language-in-education policy, also known as acquisition planning, is one of the three activity types within language planning and policy, the others being corpus planning and status planning (Cooper, 1989). Baldauf & Kaplan (2005) proposed a comprehensive framework for language-in-education policy goals, namely: access policy, resourcing policy, community policy, curriculum policy, methods and material policy, personnel policy and evaluation policy.

### **Access policy**

According to Baldauf & Kaplan (2005), access policy designates who learns what languages at what age/level and when. Access policy is important because it indicates when learners are given exposure to English through instruction and provides schools with guidelines to the design and development of their language program.

### **Community policy**

It is important to decide who are consulted in the decision-making process for language-in-education policy. The attitudes of the community towards language teaching have significant effects on policy success (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005).

### **Resourcing policy**

Resourcing policy specifies the allocation of funding and resources (e.g. classroom, facilities) targeted for language-in-education programs. Adequate resources are necessary to sustain and promote linguistics development in language-in-education policy (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005).

### **Curriculum policy**

According to Baldauf & Kaplan (2005), once decision is made on the language to be taught, there are curricular issues that need to be taken into account. These include the objectives of teaching and learning of the relevant language, the space in the curriculum allocated to language instruction and the duration of teaching and learning.

### **Methodology and material policy**

Baldauf & Kaplan (2005) stated that methodology and material policy is concerned with: 1) What methodology will be used for language instruction? and 2) What contents will be used for language teaching?

### **Personnel policy**

Personnel policy is related to teachers; its important issues are recruitment of teachers, rewards and teacher education. The abilities of teachers to carry out a language-in-education policy determine its success (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005).

### **Evaluation policy**

Evaluation policy is concerned with the answer to the question “What is the connection between assessment on the one hand and methods and materials that define the educational objectives on the other?” (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005, p. 1014). The framework above provides the basis for understanding language-in-education policy and issues associated with its

implementation. The following section will use the framework for making recommendations on language-in-education policy on primary EFL in Indonesia.

## **LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION POLICY ON PRIMARY EFL IN INDONESIA: RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Access policy**

The current access policy on primary EFL education is based on the Decree No. 22/2006. The decree provides guidelines to teachers in the form of the KTSP curriculum, which is an important aspect of access policy (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005). However, English needs serious repositioning in the curriculum (Hawanti, 2014), as the decree is not in alignment with the increasing demand for compulsory primary English (Lestari, 2003; Supriyanti, 2014), nor does it capture the diversity within the country's linguistic ecology (Zein, 2016a).

The situation also needs to be analysed in alignment with the previous MoEC Minister's exhortation on teaching Indonesian language, indigenous languages and English in schools. Clearly the political stance reflects the perspectives of global interdependence and transnational engagement that are inherent within the mindset of the Indonesian people who view English as having significant values for upward socio-economic trajectories. This may reflect the exertion of economical ideology in language policy. But on the other hand, there was also nationalist and socio-cultural rationale for the exhortation. This was evident in the aspiration of the previous MoEC Minister to implement the Act No. 24/2009 on the teaching of the national language, the local languages and foreign languages. Thus, it appears that the exhortation was made to serve language policy ideologies rather than pure linguistic reasons (Pennycook, 2010).

These diverse variables and complex ideologies competing for influence in language policy in Indonesia are significant considerations for officialising primary EFL in relation to other languages. The current MoEC Minister needs to advance from the previous minister's stance by considering the proposal to authorize a ministerial decree that stipulates the teaching of Indonesian, community heritage and indigenous languages and explicitly officializes the compulsory status of English in primary schools.

The officialisation of primary EFL in particular is an articulation of language-in-education policy formulation that requires a clear, coherent and systematic pedagogy by which pedagogical foci are explicitly addressed (Diallo & Liddicoat, 2014; Liddicoat, 2014). The officialisation of compulsory English in primary schools is **vital** before decisions on, for example, how much funding should be allocated or how to train the teachers, can be taken.

Since language education in multilingual contexts in our currently globalized world is complex, those involved in English as a foreign language education needs to "engage in assumption-dissolving conversations with heritage, community and indigenous" languages (Lo Bianco, 2014). The relationships between English, its use and functions in the society, and how it interrelates with the national, community heritage and indigenous languages at the local level become inseparable. Pennycook (2010, p. 8-9) argued that "it is important, then, when we invoke the local not to see it as inevitably juxtaposed with something global, international or cosmopolitan, nor to suggest some, static, fixed or limited context, but rather to understand the particularities of locality." This requires a more critical approach to endorsing English as a global language. The need for localising English arises; its functions are not merely to serve the global economic powers but also to enrich the lives of the individuals at the local level, and this needs to be done in relation to the existing linguistics tools in the society: community heritage languages, Indonesian as the national language and

the indigenous languages. The work of the Indonesian government in this context is not limited to officialising primary EFL, but also to encourage its stakeholders of these languages to forge a principled depiction of the distinctive as well as the shared perspectives shaped by globalisation and the local needs. This inevitably requires the adoption of a holistic view of multilingualism that caters for the linguistic and cultural diversity that already typifies Indonesian society.

### **Community policy**

It is evident that the societal support runs parallel with the recent policy change in the policy discourse of primary EFL education in Indonesia. It would now be necessary to involve stakeholders that are concerned with primary EFL including parents, teachers, teachers' groups, book publishers, educational administrators, and teacher educators. Relevant organisations need to be involved too. TEFLIN (Teachers of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia) as the largest teaching professionals organization in the country needs to facilitate more cooperation between teachers and researchers. Private institutions such as British Council and IALF (Indonesian Australian Language Foundation), teachers' groups and government-based training institutions such as The Center of Training and Development of Language Teachers (Pusat Pelatihan dan Pendidikan Guru Bahasa – henceforth PPPG) need to be involved to conduct more programs to train EFL teachers across the country.

Those stakeholders may need to work together with the MPSEC to establish a consortium that would become an umbrella organisation for all parties involved in primary EFL education. The presence of such consortium would allow teams of local and global stakeholders to make advocacy for primary EFL education and bring together expertise in languages and cultures to address political, social and pedagogical issues concerning primary EFL education.

This community consultation is not only preventive to the tendency of top-down policymaking (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005) but also constitutes an important theme in language-in-education policy where there is a need to “establish effective communication between the macro-level – the level of government or decision makers where decisions on and about language teaching are made – and the micro-level – where language policy decisions are implemented in classroom” (Diallo & Liddicoat, 2014, p. 112). Effective communication between them is vital in order to ensure that language-in-education policy on pedagogies is clearly communicated and understood by all relevant stakeholders. When such consortium initiative also takes into account the roles of English as a language of global importance in relation to its use in the local contexts and the various community heritage, national and indigenous languages occurring at the society level, it could form a comprehensive professional dialogue that stimulates new understanding of the roles and places of languages in the lives of individuals, the society and the national needs (Lo Bianco, 2014).

### **Resourcing policy**

Decision making on resourcing policy is necessary not only when pedagogy issues are seen as problematic (Liddicoat, 2014) but also when it is used as a means of providing opportunities and incentives to support its implementation (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005). This requires a costing exercise that is embedded into the pedagogical realm of EFL as well as into its place and roles in the larger context of Indonesian's linguistic ecology.

First, up to now there has been no sign for a policy to meet the ideals of language classroom size (14-18 students) in the 177,985 Indonesian primary schools. Attempts to do so in the vast and diverse geographical area of the country would not only imply doubling (or even tripling?) the number of the primary schools but would also create avalanche of effects

to other aspects of education such as the teaching of other subjects and the provision of facilities and teaching materials. This is a revolution not only in primary EFL education but education in general, in all subjects, at all levels. If this option is taken, an extremely enormous funding is required, and it may take decades to implement. Since these are consequences that the incumbent government may not be able to afford, this suggests allocation of funding and resources for primary EFL education needs to be concentrated on other elements of language-in-education policy (see the following section).

Second, English as a foreign language can certainly play a pivotal role in Indonesia's economic development, meeting the expectations of the people of what can be accomplished through mastery of a language of global significance. Yet even so, if languages are ever to hold significant roles in the nation's socio-economic development, a narrow conception of development that attaches progress only to English must be avoided (Bamgbose, 2014; Walsh, 2006). Development is not only outward through globalisation but also inward through local socio-economic initiatives. Thus, English representing a language of global, as viewed by the people, plays as much important roles in the community as the national, community heritage and indigenous languages. As Walsh (2006, p. 127) argued, "all languages and cultures, regardless of their status or numerical size, can be integrated into processes of socio-economic development, and that none is inherently anti-development." The costing exercise in this regard needs to consider the inter-relationships between the majority speech community speaking Indonesian as the national language, the minority one speaking English, and those in between speaking community heritage and indigenous languages in relation to their use of language of preferences in the market, state and civil society and the developmental outcomes derived from such preferences (Walsh, 2006).

## **Curriculum policy**

### *Curricular objectives*

The fact that the KTSP curriculum emphasizes the mastery of competencies in the four macro-skills suggests it might have been designed with little attention being paid to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories. Studies in SLA show that due to the differences between formal school setting and naturalistic one, lowering expectations in primary EFL education is vital. It is unreasonable to expect children to be able to master certain level of linguistic competencies when they only have limited exposure to the language (Nikolov & Djigunovic, 2006). Furthermore, the development of affective factors such as motivation and interests is crucial (Nikolov & Djigunovic, 2006; Nunan, 2011). An SLA-informed primary EFL education curriculum needs to be designed in ways that would promote both affective and cognitive development with more emphasis on the former than the latter (Nikolov & Djigunovic, 2006). This is necessary in order to sustain intrinsic motivation over the six years of learning in primary schools (Nakata, 2009).

In terms of affective domain, the curricular objectives may be geared towards raising children's awareness of English as a foreign language, promoting positive attitudes towards the language, and sustaining children motivation and interests while learning the language (Chen, 2012). Given the multilingual context where primary EFL education in Indonesia is implemented, there is also a need for accommodating linguistic and cultural diversity in order to build recognition of other cultures and languages. First, curricular objectives in a multilingual context should be geared towards the maintenance of home language (i.e. local languages & the national language) while reaching literacy in a language that would bring social and economic mobility, even in the long run (i.e. English) (Ohlstein & Nissim-Amitai, 2004). Second, there is a need for recognition of cultural discourse within the national context and the worlds that would expose children to the richness of cultures through English. This is how primary EFL curriculum makes "provisions for building a meta-plurilingual [and

pluricultural perceptions] which can enrich all students in the school” (Ohlstein & Nissim-Amitai, 2004, p. 63).

In terms of cognitive domain, primary EFL education during early years should focus on the development of auditory skills, mainly because the provision of basic literacies in children’s first language (L1) is made in these years. As children progress with their literacy, more emphasis on the development of English literacy skills and the recognition of their learning styles and strategies can take place in higher grades (Chen, 2012). Aspects relevant to primary EFL pedagogy such as basic vocabulary pertinent to the primary curricular themes (e.g. family, fruit and vegetables, etc.), formulaic language, phonological development and spelling also need to be covered.

### *Space allocation and length of instruction*

The inclusion of English should not create disruption to the primary school timetable. Schools also need to allocate time for the national and local languages as well as other subjects. For this reason, the current time allocated for English instruction cannot be extended; the 2 x 45 minute English lesson per week needs to remain. However, its delivery may need to be spread out in two blocks. Thus, English can be taught as a 45-minute lesson in two days, instead of one, over the week. It may also be necessary to combine the class-hour lessons with English as an extra-curricular activity. This could be implemented in higher grades (4-6). The implementation of such distributed exposure in foreign language learning will allow children to develop some proficiency and basic language-learning styles and strategies that will assist them throughout their study at secondary level (Nikolov & Djigunovic, 2006).

## **Methodology and material policy**

### *Methodology policy*

Given the challenges faced by Indonesian teachers, it may be necessary to reconsider the use of CLT in primary classrooms. Studies have demonstrated the ineffectual use of CLT in primary EFL education in other contexts too (e.g. Copland, et al. 2014).

It is necessary for teachers to be methodologically eclectic. They need to adapt pedagogical decisions to suit children’s needs as well as the local context where pedagogical challenges occurring from large classes are predominant (Copland, et al. 2014). In designing tasks and activities for children, it is necessary to emphasize meaning-focused instruction as it is proven indispensable in the sustenance of children’s motivation in language learning (Huang, 2011). Since children benefit much from rich input-based condition in formal school-setting, teachers also need to create tasks and activities that provide children with opportunities for negotiating meanings and encouraging simple dialogical verbal interaction (see Huang, 2011 for samples). Stories, games and songs are useful for the development of enjoyable lessons that would promote interests and motivation among children (Nunan, 2011).

Although there has been growing aspiration for the increasing use of English in primary EFL classrooms (e.g. Asriyanti, et al. 2013; Gunawan & Suharno, 2008), the multilingual context of Indonesia requires teachers to utilize children’s L1 without necessarily curbing the potential of communicative activities (Zein, 2016c). This is particularly relevant to the proposed curriculum that promotes linguistic and cultural diversity and encourages children to use English in a thematic way through their acquisition of knowledge and culture in L1. Furthermore, teachers also need to be versatile in designing tasks and activities that could introduce children to the cultures of the world and cultivate students’ existing knowledge as a basis for exploration into global understanding (Shin, Eslami, & Chen, 2011).

### **Material policy**

Teaching materials should cover vocabulary pertinent to the primary curricular themes that would promote positive attitudes towards English. A balance needs to be made in the presentation of listening and reading-based activities with auditory development being the focus of instruction in early grades and literacy development in higher grades. Furthermore, tasks and activities in the teaching materials need to promote children's learning styles and strategies while allowing the inclusion of formulaic language, phonological development and spelling in an incremental manner. Since there is a need for the recognition of linguistic and cultural diversity in the proposed curriculum, teaching materials also need to cater for this objective. The contents of materials need to be local in a sense that it exposes children to the diversity occurring within the linguistic and cultural domains of the country. They also need to be global in a sense that they build recognition of cultures of the world to children (Shin, et. al. 2011).

### **Personnel policy**

#### ***Recruitment and rewards***

The lucrative recruitment of English native speaking teachers like what Taiwan (Chen, 2012) does may not be a feasible and affordable solution in the Indonesian context. It is worth noting that the country is steadily closing the gap of the shortage of approximately 115,000 specialist primary EFL teachers. On the other hand, the need for specialist, instead of generalist teachers, has increased (e.g. Hawanti, 2014; Asriyanti, et al. 2014). This suggests that it is more beneficial in the long term to accelerate the growth of specialist teachers than following author's earlier (Zein, 2015, 2016b) advocacy to train PGSD prospective teachers to become generalist teachers. The strategy would be to train the currently practicing generalist teachers through in-service training programs while accelerating the growth of prospective primary EFL teachers in ELEPs. It is necessary to calculate how long it takes to meet the teacher shortage by considering the annual growths of school, student, and teacher populations as well as graduates of ELEPs. The result indicates how much ELEPs need to expand student enrolment in order to recruit prospective primary EFL teachers.

To attract prospective teachers, rewards are necessary. Given the fact that specialist primary EFL teachers are casually contracted with salary far less than those of permanent classroom teachers, a policy to address this issue is of vital importance (Zein, 2016a). One solution would be to appoint them civil servants. As civil servants, teachers hold permanent employment and are entitled to full salary, remuneration and health insurance that could not have been afforded otherwise. The security and prestige attached to a civil servant status would likely attract high school graduates to consider primary EFL education as a career option.

### **Teacher education**

Hawanti (2014: 169) argued that "the teacher education policy... does not have the capacity at present to resolve the problems". A recent research by author confirms Hawanti's assertion because ELEM is not specific to address the professional needs of primary EFL teachers; it is argued that a specialized preparatory course in primary EFL teaching is necessary (Zein, 2016b). A Minor in Primary EFL Teaching being set up in ELEPs would provide prospective primary EFL teachers with opportunities to develop relevant knowledge and skills pertaining to their vocation. This requires policy alteration to the Decree No. 16/2007 in order to specify qualifications for both primary and secondary EFL teachers, with the former needing qualifications from the Minor in Primary EFL Teaching.

The main aim of the Minor is to prepare prospective teachers to be methodologically eclectic, that is, to be able to assess different pedagogical options and choose ones that best fit

classroom circumstances and students' needs. Teacher educators need to assist prospective teachers to develop strong methodological competence to the level that they can manage children in large classes through group and pair work (Copland, et. al. 2014) and create enjoyable learning environments while doing so (Nunan, 2011). This requires teachers to have good understanding of children. The inclusion of differential psychology in the Minor's curriculum may offer assistance in this regard. Differential psychology would help teachers gain working knowledge of SLA conceptions such as knowledge about learners' personality, aptitude, motivation, learning styles and strategies and learning development to inform their pedagogical decisions (Dörnyei, 2006). Since teachers should play the role of language models in primary EFL education, the language preparation of prospective teachers needs to place more emphasis on oral skills where they can improve their pronunciation, classroom language and code-switching skills to promote comprehension (Zein, 2016c). Finally, pre-service teacher education needs to emphasize activities that would develop teachers' skills in promoting linguistic and cultural diversity. This is vital because culturally appropriate teaching materials and tasks/activities that would enhance children's awareness and sensitivity about different languages and cultures are significant parts of primary EFL pedagogy.

On the other hand, the training at in-service level needs to be separated for the two groups of practicing teachers: 1) generalist teachers; and 2) specialists teachers. It is apparent that considerable time needs to be devoted to the language preparation of generalist teachers. They need to be trained until they become proficient language users who can use English for instructional purposes confidently and with good pronunciation (Chodidjah, 2007). Specific focus needs to be made on classroom language in order to train teachers to be able to give instruction, explanations and oral feedback in English. Furthermore, they would also need further training in pedagogical areas they are not familiar with such as integrating language skills and promoting student-centred learning (Asriyanti, et. al. 2013; Zein, 2016c).

It has been demonstrated earlier that the pedagogical practices of specialist primary EFL teachers vary from one case to another. It is important to conduct a thorough needs analysis in the design of in-service teacher training program in order to identify the specific needs of primary EFL teachers. This is relevant especially because there are specialist primary EFL teachers who come from English departments and those who do not. Specialist primary EFL teachers coming from English departments are presumably more proficient than specialist teachers coming from general majors; therefore, the language training for the latter needs to be given more emphasis. These two groups of teachers may also need specific training in various pedagogical areas such as materials development, classroom management and assisting individual students. There is a need for in-service teacher education to also include a focus on knowledge of children. Thorough provision of differential psychology may be needed because teachers have not been prepared with it (Zein, 2016c).

In developing in-service teacher education, it must be borne in mind that teacher learning is not only a matter of deliberate enrichment of professional skills, knowledge and attitudes but also an issue of giving meaningful attention to active exploration between teachers, administrators and other stakeholders. This exploration needs to occur within the evolving process of the changing needs of teachers. This includes considerations of teachers' pedagogical, linguistic and professional needs that are all assessed against the backdrop of their profile and sociocultural contexts to form the underpinning principles that determine the design of in-service teacher education (Zein, 2016d). In this regard, teacher educators must play greater roles in the creation of teacher-centred and context-specific models of PD that allows for the emergence of communities of enquiry (Zein, 2016e).

## Evaluation policy

Instead of paper-based tests, the use of a combination of assessment formats consisting of teachers' assessment, children's self-assessment, and pair-based assessment may be useful to bring positive effects on children's language learning, boost their confidence and allow the use of a wide range of interactional strategies (Butler, 2015). Conceptualisations of assessment criteria need to reflect the emphasis on the development of both affective and cognitive domains. Aspects such as students' motivation, interest, and attitudes towards language learning need to be included. Children's recognition and development of linguistic and cultural diversity need to be appreciated along with their awareness of learning styles and strategies. Assessment on the cognitive domain needs to cover students' use of basic vocabulary pertinent to primary curriculum themes and formulaic language in communicative activities.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Current trends in language-in-education policymaking have suggested the need for articulating a clear, systematic and coherent pedagogy (Diallo & Liddicoat, 2014; Liddicoat, 2014; Zein, 2016a). The recently appointed MoEC Minister needs to realize that the centrality of pedagogy in language-in-education policymaking in Indonesia means the officialisation of English in primary schools is vital, if the country aspires to cultivate languages pertaining to the nation's socio-economic development goals. The official status of English in the schooling context will help strengthen its roles as a language of global importance in relation to its functions in the local context and how it relates to the various community heritage, national and indigenous languages existing at the society level.

But initial investment in access policy is only the beginning. If language-in-education policy on primary EFL is to succeed, organized and considerable efforts to address the challenges occurring in other language-in-education policy goals are indispensable. Community policy needs to ensure the establishment of a consortium that would become an umbrella organisation to connect stakeholders involved in primary EFL education with the government. Furthermore, resourcing policy needs to ensure that funding and resources are geared towards the improvement of more pressing and immediate needs in curriculum policy, methodology and material policy, personnel policy and evaluation policy.

Dr. Subhan Zein can be contacted at the School of Education, The University of Queensland, [mzein@uq.edu.au](mailto:mzein@uq.edu.au)/ORCID: 0000-0003-3787-3211.

## REFERENCES

- Asriyanti E., Sikki A., Rahman A., Hamra A., & Noni, N. (2013). The competence of primary school English teachers in Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Practice* 4(11), 139-146.
- Aydawati, E. N. (2005). *Several considerations in teaching English to children in Indonesian society*. Paper presented at the TEFLIN International Conference, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, 6-8 December.
- Baldauf Jr. R. B., & Kaplan, R. B. (2005). Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1013-1034). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bamgbose, A. (2014) The language factor in development goals. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(7), 646-657. doi:10.1080/01434632.2014.908888

- Butler, Y. G. (2015). English language education among young learners in East Asia: A review of current research (2004–2014). *Language Teaching*, 48, 303-342.
- Chen, C. (2012). Planning and implementation of primary school English education in Taiwan. In B. Spolsky & Y-I Moon (Eds.), *Primary school English-language education in Asia: From policy to practice* (pp. 129-144). New York: Routledge.
- Chodidjah, I. (2007). Teacher training for low proficiency level primary English languageteachers: How it is working in Indonesia. In British Council (Ed.), *Primary innovations: A collection of papers* (pp. 87-94). Hanoi: British Council.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Copland, F., Garton, S., & Burns, A. (2014). Challenges in teaching English to young learners: Global perspectives and local realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(4), 738-762.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *EA Journal*, 18(1), 22-23.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2006). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No. 22 Tentang Struktur Kurikulum Pendidikan* [The Decree of the Minister of National Education Republic of Indonesia No. 26 on the Structure of the Educational Curriculum].
- Diallo, I., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2014). Planning language teaching: An argument for the place of pedagogy in language policy and planning. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), 110-117.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2006). Individual differences in second language acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19(1), 42-68.
- Gunawan, M. H., & Suharno. (2008). *Indonesia teachers' understanding of EYL principles and their ability to apply the principles in teaching practices*. Paper presented at the 2008 Asia TEFL International Conference, Bali, Indonesia, 1-3 December.
- Hadisantosa, N. (2010). Insights from Indonesia. In R. Johnstone (Ed.), *Learning through English: Policies, challenges and prospects* (pp. 24-46). London: British Council.
- Hawanti, S. (2011). Teaching English in Indonesian primary schools: The missing link. *Leksika*, 5(1), 62-69.
- Hawanti, S. (2014). Implementing Indonesia's English language teaching policy in primary schools: The role of teachers' knowledge and beliefs. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), 162-170.
- Huang, K-M. (2011). Motivating lessons: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of content-based instruction on EFL young learners' motivated behaviours and classroom verbal interaction. *System* 39, 186-201.
- Husein, R. (2014). A profile of exemplary teachers of English for young learners at the primary school. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora* 2(4), 311-321.
- Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional. (2009). *Data Pendidikan Sekolah Dasar Tahun Ajaran 2008/2009*. Jakarta: Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional.
- Lestari, L. A. (2003). Should English be a compulsory subject in the primary schools? *Journal Bahasa dan Seni* 31(2), 197-213.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2014). The interface between macro and micro-level language policy and the place of language pedagogies. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), 118-129.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2014). Domesticating the foreign: Globalization's effects on the place/s of languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 312-325. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12063.x
- Madya, S. (2007). Curriculum innovations in Indonesia and the strategies to implement them. In Y. H. Choi & B. Spolsky (Eds.), *ELT curriculum and implementation in Asia* (pp. 1-38). Busan: Asia TEFL.

- Nakata, Y. (2009). Intrinsic motivation in the EFL school context: A retrospective study of English learning experiences in Japanese elementary schools. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6(4), 263-291.
- Nikolov, M., & Djigunovic, J. M. (2006). Recent research on age, second language acquisition, and early foreign language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 234-260.
- Nunan, D. (2011). *Teaching English to young learners*. Anaheim: Anaheim University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). Language policies, language ideologies and local language. In L. Wee, R. B. H. Goh & L. Lim (Eds.). (2013). *The politics of English. South Asia, Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific* (pp. 1-18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Olshain, E., & Nissim-Amitai, F. (2004). Curriculum decision-making in a multilingual context. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1(1), 53-64.
- Shin, J., Eslami, Z. R., & Chen, W-C. (2011). Presentation of local and international culture in current international English-language teaching textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 24(3), 253-268.
- Supriyanti. (2014). Why do our children need to learn English at primary schools? Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Conference of *Teaching English for Young Learners: From Policy to Classroom*. Kudus, 11-12 July.
- Wahyuni, T. (2014). *Kurikulum 2013 hanya diterapkan pada sekolah contoh* [Curriculum 2013 is only implemented in model schools]. Retrieved from <http://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20141203132342-20-15545/kurikulum-2013-diterapkan-hanya-pada-sekolah-contoh/>
- Walsh, J. (2006). Language and socio-economic development – Towards a theoretical framework. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 30(2), 127-148.
- Zein, M. S. (2015). Preparing elementary English teachers: Innovations at pre-service level. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(6), 104-120. doi:10.14221/ajte.2015v40n6.6
- Zein, M. S. (2016a). Elementary English education in Indonesia: Policy developments, current practices, and future prospects: How has Indonesia coped with the demand for teaching English in schools? *English Today*, 33(1), 53-59. doi:10.1017/S0266078416000407
- Zein, M. S. (2016b). Pre-service education for primary school English teachers in Indonesia: Policy implications. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 36(S1), 119-134. doi:10.1080/02188791.2014.961899
- Zein, M. S. (2016c). Professional development needs of primary EFL teachers: Perspectives of teachers and teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, 43(2). doi:10.1080/19415257.2016.1156013
- Zein, M. S. (2016d). Government-based training agencies and the professional development of Indonesian English for Young Learners teachers: Perspectives from complexity theory. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 42(2), 205-223. doi:10.1080/02607476.2016.1143145
- Zein, M. S. (2016e). Factors affecting the professional development of elementary English teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, 42(3), 423-440. doi:10.1080/19415257.2015.1005243