
Curriculum Approach used in Teaching English: A Case Study

Elda Selja Putri ^{1*}
Abhsarini Kardena ²

^{1,2} Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Bukittinggi, Indonesia

Abstract

The development and implementation of language teaching programs can be approached in several different ways, each of which has different implications for curriculum design. Indonesian schools have started modernizing their curricula by adopting a backward design that places an emphasis on students' learning outcomes in order to replace the outdated forward paradigm. They must, however, overcome a difficulty in order to achieve a beneficial alignment. This problem spurred a case study examination of the primary curriculum's objectives, syllabus, methodology, and evaluation. The results of the research indicate that the curriculum was created forward, despite claims that it was designed backward, with learning outcomes acting as program goals. In truth, the one that follows it promotes the exchange of knowledge above the development of skills. Since they still relied on information transmission, the program's learning goals were not linked with the three important components of syllabus, methodology, and assessment. The university's innovation of technique including a transfer in emphasis from the lecturer to the students was nonetheless rigidly and mechanically interpreted, and the assessment of student learning was said to be criterion-referenced without more explanation for each syllabus.

Keywords: Curriculum, Approach, Teaching English

^{1*}Corresponding author, email: eldaseljaputri@gmail.com

Citation in APA style: Putri, E.S. Kardena, A. (2022). Curriculum Approach Used in Teaching English: A Case Study. *JADEs Journal of Academia in English Educations*, Vol. 3 (2), 236-251

Received August 03rd, 2022; Revised November 26th, 2022; Accepted November 29th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32505/jades.v3i2/4642>

©IAIN Langsa. All rights reserved.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the 2013-2014 academic year, Indonesia's official schools, including elementary, junior high, and high schools, have used Curriculum 2013. (K-13). Indonesia's educational system was built on school-level curricula that had been in use since July 2006 until July 2013. Each school developed it while taking into account its particular conditions, geographical peculiarities, and social and cultural qualities. The school has complete power and responsibility for formulating plans and setting educational priorities for the implementation of this curriculum. This curriculum emphasizes local knowledge, self-improvement activities, mastery learning, and life skill (Hadi, Nugraha, and Retnawati, 2016).

Grades 1,2, 4 and 5, 7, 8, and 10 and 11 (junior and senior high school, respectively) are currently using the 2013 curriculum. The principles of "standard-based education" and "competency-based curriculum" were applied in the construction of the K-13 curriculum in Senior High School. Competency-based learning emphasizes the student's ability to demonstrate desired learning outcomes as a key element of the learning process. Change in general has four consequences on the 2013 curriculum. There are four sorts of standards: (1) standards for graduate competency, (2) standards for content, (3) requirements for the learning process, and (4) standards for evaluation (Prihantoro, 2014).

Curriculum 2013 focuses on helping each student improve their attitudes, cognitive abilities, and skills in the areas of religion, art, creativity, values, communication, and different sides of intelligence, in accordance with the demands of the learner, the community, the country, and humankind as a whole. RI Kemendikbud (Kemendikbud RI, 2014). Throughout the history of curriculum creation and reform in the United

States, four primary curricular approaches may be identified: academic rationalism, social efficiency, progressive education, and social reconstructionism (Pfeffer, F. T., Fomby, P., & Insolera, N, 2019). Language teachers are encouraged to develop lesson plans and curricula based on the government's curriculum in partnership with administrators in order to satisfy the requirements of their students. The knowledge of a curriculum by a teacher has a significant impact on their authority to implement a core curriculum (Kardena, 2015). When it comes to implementing self-paced curriculum development, many school principals lack both expertise and ability. Identifying school goals, creating a school-based curriculum, and obtaining a consensus on the plan are just a few of the many difficulties that may arise. While some principals had fewer issues when it came to implementing new curricula, others were stuck in deeply entrenched situations. The elements that are causing these problems are Objective, Syllabus, Methodology and evaluation must be thoroughly investigated.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Approaches to Curriculum Development in Language Teaching

When building a curriculum, coherence should be accomplished since all of the elements that contribute to the teaching and learning environment are connected (Johnson, 1989). Common descriptors include objectives, curriculum, technique, and assessment (White, 1988, p. 5). The Taba and Tyler paradigm differentiates between curriculum design goals, aims, and objectives. The short- and medium-term goals and objectives are the long-term ones. Targets are more specific than goals, which are very generic and imprecise (Taba, 1962, as cited in White, 1988).

Depending on whether the designer places more emphasis on the input (curriculum), the process (methodology), or the product (evaluation/learning outcomes), there are three approaches to building language programs, according to Richards (2013). The language curriculum may be created in one of three different ways: forward, center, or backward, depending on whether the emphasis should be on intake, process, or output. In the forward design, decisions about methodology and output come before decisions about the content of instruction; in the central design, the development of educational programs starts with decisions about teaching activities, techniques, and methods rather than with the development of specific language contents or the specification of learning outcomes. As a last point, the backward design starts with a precise specification of the desired outcomes or objectives, from which relevant content and educational activities are produced stated by Richards (2013).

2.2 Objectives

Variations in practice that reflect distinct concepts of the nature of second or foreign language ability are frequently referred to as "variations in practice reflecting various conceptions of the nature of second or foreign language proficiency" in the context of language instruction (Richards, 1985, p. 15). This researcher proposes four distinct categories of objectives: behavioral, process-related, content-related, and proficiency-related goals. These approaches may be reorganized to match this order: content-related, process-related, and behavioral objectives, as well as the three separate curriculum-building designs, which are forward, center, and backward, as was indicated before. The ultimate prize that Taba and Tyler are vying for is a pedagogical paradigm that places an emphasis on educational goals (as cited in White, 1988, p. 26).

2.3 Syllabus

The course outline that you use might be one of many different sorts, since there are many different formats to choose from. Because the linguistic and language syllabus is crucial to the development of language teaching methods, certain curriculum models are predominantly content-oriented. This is because of the importance of the linguistic and language syllabus. A process-based syllabus is another option, in which the methodology is developed directly from an appropriate instructional theory. This type of syllabus typically includes an explanation of the underlying processes in the acquisition of a foreign language, in addition to a specification of relevant teaching and learning activities. In conclusion, another alternative for a curriculum model is one that is mostly based on an educational methodology (Richards, 1985, pp. 20-26). Later in the year 2013, this researcher differentiated between two categories of activities depending on whether or not they were meaningful or communicative, and he underlined that both categories of tasks are used in both central and backward design (Richards, 2013). In light of the fact that Nunan did not distinguish between product-oriented and process-oriented curriculum until 1988, extreme care is suggested. In the first curriculum, he integrated both grammatical and functional-notional training. According to this investigator's findings, the instructional product therefore references Richards' forward design (2013).

The shift in the focus of curriculum development had to be tailored in one of three ways: the content and language of the curriculum, the activities and tasks of the curriculum, or the learning objectives of the curriculum. However, before we get started with that, we need to first go through a brief history of teaching techniques, which should include an analysis of

significant developments in language teaching practices over the twentieth century. There are six primary trends that may be recognized: GTM in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries; Direct Method (DM) at the turn of the century; ALM in the 1950s and 1960s; CLT in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s; and the two tendencies known as TBLT1 and TBLT2 (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). It is possible to classify approaches to the instruction of foreign languages into one of three groups, depending on whether they emphasize the student, the language, or both. Under this classification, they might be categorized as language-centered approaches, learning-centered techniques, or learner-centered methods (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). The first four trends that were stated above fall under group 1, whereas trend 5 falls under group 2, and trend 6 falls under group 3.

Similarly, certain curriculum development strategies are more suited to one design than another. The structural situational method, the audiovisual method, the audiolingual method (ALM), and even more contemporary examples of communicative language teaching (CLT) and content-based teaching/instruction (CoBI)/content and language integrated learning (CLIL) are all examples of forward design with an emphasis on content/language/curriculum, according to Richards. Other examples of forward design with an emphasis on content/language/curriculum include the following: (2013). Methods such as the natural approach, the silent way, counseling learning, task-based language teaching (Version 1), and Dogme fall under the category of forward-looking design methods, whereas methods such as TBLT (Version 2), competency-based instruction (CpBI), the use of standards, and the Common European Framework of Reference fall under the category of backward-looking design methods (CEFR).

2.4 Evaluation

Green (2014) investigates the development of testing and evaluation over the course of history and suggests six different phrases or patterns for the evaluation of languages. This research has somewhat altered the following sequence so that it aligns more closely with the stages of development in educational approach that have been outlined earlier. (4) communicative assessment, (5) learning evaluation, and (6) formative evaluation are all part of the third psychometric-structuralist approach. The following are the four major obstacles that this author identifies for the most recent crucial stages of development: dependability, content validity, learning process, and learning products (ibid. p. 174). After that, he differentiates between assessment for learning and formative assessment, which is going to cover the next two stages of the process. According to Poehner (2008), the labels "interactionist" and "interventionist" are employed to refer to these two different varieties. [Citation needed] (Green, 2014, p. 207). Criteria-based examinations are required to place a significant focus on attainment of learning goals (White, 1988, p. 29).

2.5 Research Methodology

The use of a case study as the research method appears more appropriate given that the purpose of this study is to examine the curriculum approach at SMP N 5 Kec. Kapur IX. The development of this idea necessitates the complexity of several various elements, including viewpoints, objectives, curricula, methodologies, and evaluation. Yin asserts that the necessity for case studies arises from the need to understand intricate societal developments (2003). (p. 2). Nunan (1992) makes additional arguments in favor of the use of case studies for program evaluation since "the main aim of the evaluation was to convey

information to the education authority" (p. 201). In order to help students in this "less privileged" region of the country learn more effectively, we were seeking for fresh, innovative lesson plans. As a result, it is believed that this design is able to solve the complexity and challenges associated with the process of developing a curriculum for a certain educational institution.

In West Sumatra's SMP N 5 Kec. Kapur IX Kabupaten Lima Puluh Kota, an evaluation of the English language curriculum was conducted in April 2022. There are 85 pages in all, divided into two main portions as follows: A. more basic information, and B. the program's goals and anticipated objectives. The major body of B is divided into the following 12 pieces: 1. The program's objectives; 2. Its learning objectives; and 3. The total quantity of content provided. Students that are considering participating in the program 5. Graduation requirements and the training procedure 6. Assessments of the pupils' intellectual development The program's scope includes program objectives and learning outcomes, program objectives and learning outcomes, course objectives and learning outcomes, and syllabi.

According to Nunan, there are several important considerations that need to be considered while examining a program (1992). In the domains of requirements analysis (i.e., objectives), content (i.e., the course design), methodology, assessment, and evaluation, this author offers a number of crucial issues for program evaluation (ibid., p. 191). In actuality, the elements of curriculum building that these techniques reflect are the essential ones, as was discussed in the theoretical portion of this book. The theoretical framework that was covered in the theory portion is consequently directly implemented in the program evaluation. Its aims, syllabus, methodology, and evaluation were all clearly evaluated in order

to ascertain if it adhered to the claimed backward design and what proof its constituent parts provided for this assertion. To ascertain whether it adhered to the backward design, this was done.

3. METHODS

A qualitative research methodology is used in this study. One junior high school in Kapur IX is where this study is being done. Interviews, observations, and documentation were used to collect the data. Teachers of English served as informants in this study. Data was collected through interviews and observations, and documents such as the annual curriculum, academic session schedule, syllabus, lesson plans, and assessment tools were examined. Regression analysis, data presentation, and conclusion were the three steps that were used in the study of the data, according to Miles & Huberman (2014). Since data collecting began, the qualitative data analysis has been done concurrently with the data collection procedure. To guarantee uniformity, observations, written material, and interviews were all combined. Before dividing the data into three categories based on specific study goals, the researcher reads the complete data set.

4. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Finding

4.1.1 Objectives

The program objectives of the present curriculum may be divided into general and specific categories, respectively, for easier analysis and comprehension. The precise objectives may be split down into the following five categories: knowledge, skills (both hard and soft), attitudes (including a feeling of responsibility and professional ethics), post-graduation employment alternatives, and the opportunity to continue

one's education. The objectives of the program are described in further detail in the first three parts of this publication (POs). In addition to this, there are three distinct categories of learning objectives (LOs) that are included in the curriculum. These include knowledge, hard and soft skills, as well as autonomy and responsibility. These three subsections have written their work such that it complies with the LOs.

4.1.2 Syllabus

The teaching and learning components of the great majority of syllabi in this curriculum are based on the accessible chapters of the books used as course materials, as opposed to the stated program learning goals. Subsequently, these chapters are incorporated into the course syllabi, claiming to reflect the content chosen to fulfill the program's learning objectives.

In virtually all syllabi, Part 4 Course Contents and Section 8 Teaching Plan's section defining course material are essentially similar and too detailed. A Speaking 3 curriculum of up to 13 pages is an example.

The material is based on Course Expected Learning Outcomes (CELOs), which are tied to program Learning Objectives (LOs).

4.1.3 Methodology

Teacher will include critical thinking, cooperation, communication, and creativity into the instructional plan. Included are the teacher action of "presenting in the form of active contact (by asking questions to elicit replies)" and the student activity of "listening, receiving, and understanding the transferred information." Teacher activities such as "explanation and knowledge presentation," "explanation of specialized terms," "a supply of vocabulary and sentence patterns commonly used in class," and "lesson reinforcement through pertinent questions," as well as student activities such as "group discussion and speaking practice," are included (listening, speaking practice, and exercise doing). After a few

sessions, the student engagement in Basic Informatics consists of "presenting a subject, conducting the dialogue, and establishing criteria for evaluating the quality of the argument" with prescribed steps.

4.1.4 Evaluation

In practically, there are three areas for evaluating student learning: Attitudes, Knowledge and Students' Skills.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Approach to Curriculum Development

The learning outcomes of the program are stated as the starting point of the curriculum, which leads some people to believe that the curriculum was designed in the wrong order (LOs). These outcomes are dependent, not only on the competencies of autonomy and responsibility, but also on one's level of knowledge and ability. In addition to this, certain goals pertaining to one's knowledge, abilities, and attitudes are laid down. It is sometimes referred to as a backward design, despite the fact that it is really a forward design. This is because of the fact that there is a lot of misunderstanding between a backward design and a forward design as a result of this. This idea will be explored in more depth in the following four parts, which are as follows: objectives, methodology, curriculum, and evaluation.

5.2 Objectives

The data analysis shows that this curriculum encompasses both the defined goals (SOs) and the program learning outcomes (LOs). Detailed goals are developed after taking into account the relevant information, abilities, and attitudes. Given that the latter are dependent on knowledge and abilities for the first two, but competence for the third, it begs the issue as to why curriculum designers incorporated both program (specific) objectives (POs) and program learning outcomes. In other

words, given that the later two are written based on knowledge and skills for the first two, but competence for the third, it may be concluded that the third is written based on competence (LOs). This result was likely reached because a content-based approach and a competency-based approach were likely confused for one another throughout the curriculum development process. The second technique emphasizes the development of (general and professional) learners' skills, while the first method emphasizes the development of (general and professional) learners' competences and traits (MOET, 2018). Due to this, the component of the learning outcomes that depends on a person's prior knowledge and skills is not constructed in reverse order. According to what was discussed in the preceding section on theory, goals, aims, and objectives are three distinct phrases that have a similar meaning but cannot be used interchangeably. When the structure is flipped, learning outcomes are prioritized above conventional goals. As a result, the course learning outcomes are included in the course syllabi at the University of Bedfordshire in the United Kingdom after the course objectives (University of Bedfordshire, n.d.).

5.3 Syllabus

Due to the following reasons: “(1) the program learning outcomes (LOs) are not written satisfactorily (with a focus on knowledge and skills, but not competencies), (2) there are many course objectives (COs), and (3) there are too many courses expected learning outcomes”, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate the contents, or to put it another way, syllabi, that are selected to serve the program learning outcomes (CELOs).

Much of the information in the syllabi is not required by the institution. For example, the following is specified in the program

learning outcomes (LOs) for teaching Knowledge: LO2 It is necessary for a teacher to have a broad understanding and a professional qualification. LO10 Putting theoretical and practical knowledge of the topic into practice in a variety of situations.

5.4 Methodology

As mandated by the institution, efforts are undertaken to create teaching and learning methodologies that suit the move from forward to backward curriculum design. However, the emphasis remains on information transmission, and little effort has been made to assist learners in enhancing their competencies in order to satisfy the program's learning objectives. Still, the necessity for innovative teaching methodologies is strictly and mechanically viewed.

5.5 Evaluation

The course objectives, also known as COs, serve as the foundation for the assessment of the learning outcomes. The relationship between course outcomes (abbreviated as COs) and program goals or learning outcomes (abbreviated as LOs) has not been described in the curriculum of this institution. In addition, COs are not suitable for use in any educational curriculum as a statistic that is reliable, trustworthy, and consistent with itself.

When moving away from a content-based approach to curriculum creation and toward a learner- or learning-centered approach, it is necessary to realign assessment in a way that reflects the change in focus that occurs in educational philosophy. It is heartening to see that almost all course syllabi include criterion-referenced evaluation into both the formative and summative portions of the evaluation process. On the other hand, the specific course prerequisites are not disclosed, especially in connection to the learning goals of the program.

6. CONCLUSION

This research can draw some primary conclusions from the findings after reviewing the curriculum of this educational institution, First despite the claims made by the curriculum's designers that it was produced in reverse with a focus on the learning outcomes of the students, the curriculum was essentially constructed in the typical forward manner with an emphasis on the subject content and second The goals of the education program were laid out in terms of abilities in areas such as knowledge, skills, as well as autonomy and responsibility. As a consequence of this, the three basic elements of the curriculum, namely the syllabus, methodology, and assessment, are not in sync with one another, with the first two of knowledge and skills being notably affected.

REFERENCES

- Green, A. (2014). *Exploring language assessment and testing: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Johnson, R. K. (1989). *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge University Press, 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011..
- Kemendikbud RI. Press workshop: Implementasi kurikulum 2013. , Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia (2014).
- Kardena, A. (2015). CHANGE OF CURRICULUM AND ITS IMPLICATION ON TEACHERS'PERFORMANCE IN EFL CLASSROOM. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 3, 46-51.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Postmethod* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410615725>
- Matthew B. Miles, A. Michael Huberman, Johnny Saldaña. (2014). *Qualitative DataAnalysis. A Methods Sourcebook* 3rd Edition, ISBN 9781452257877, SAGE Publications: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC

- Nunan, D., Candlin, C. N., & Widdowson, H. G. (1988). *Syllabus design* (Vol. 55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D., David, N., & Swan, M. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge university press.
- Pfeffer, F. T., Fomby, P., & Insolera, N. (2019). The Longitudinal Revolution. *Sociological Research at the 50-year Milestone of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics*.
- Prihantoro, C. R. (2015). The perspective of curriculum in Indonesia on environmental education. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 4(1), 77-83. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2014.915>
- Retnawati, H., Hadi, S., & Nugraha, A. C. (2016). *Vocational high school teachers' difficulties in implementing the assessment in curriculum 2013 in Yogyakarta Province of Indonesia*. *International Journal of Instruction*, 9(1), 33-48.
- Richards, J. C. (1985). *Language curriculum development*. Retrieved April 6, 2020, from [https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/38633/1/Richards%20\(1985\)_WP4\(1\).pdf](https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/38633/1/Richards%20(1985)_WP4(1).pdf)
- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central and backward design. *RELC Journal*, 44(1), 5-33. <https://doi:10.1177/0033688212473293>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. University of Bedfordshire. (n.d.). Syllabus of English syntax. LNG022-3, University of Bedfordshire, Bedfordshire, U.K.
- White, R. V. (1988). *The ELT curriculum: Design, innovation and management*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.