

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY INTO EFL TEACHERS AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE 2013 CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

DEWI RATIH¹, BASIKIN²

^{1,2} Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta State University
dewiratih.2020@student.uny.ac.id basikin@uny.ac.id

DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.29300/ling.v11i1.6228>

Received: 29 November 2024

Accepted: 27 Maret 2025

Published: 3 June 2025

Abstract

Since the beginning, the 2013 EFL curriculum has become a center for research in the field of language learning. This can be seen from pro and cons that surround during the implementation. At certain level, the 2013 EFL curriculum has reported facing various issues. These issues, especially, related to the use of predetermined syllabus and textbooks as the main models of learning, reduction in teaching hours, teaching approach, and the authentic assessment. Reflecting from these issues, this study tries to map the implementation of the curriculum in the classroom by appointing to Snyder et al. (1992) approach models. It is conducted by noticing Fullan's (2007) curriculum implementation factors. The study employs a sequential exploratory method involving twenty-one EFL teachers from five different senior high schools and two hundred-thirteen students. The study reveals that there are two models of approach that are most often applied by EFL teachers. These are mutual-adaptive and fidelity approach model. Eventually, the factors that emerge need to be taken into consideration by policy makers as evaluation material for further language curriculum development.

Keywords: Curriculum implementation, fidelity, mutual-adaptive, The 2013 EFL curriculum,

INTRODUCTION

Implemented in stages since July 15th, 2014, the 2013 EFL curriculum is expected to be able to answer students' needs in improving their English language skills. By adopting reasoning-communicative competencies and offering various learning approaches, students are expected to be able to produce written and spoken language (Madya, 2018; Nuraini, 2019). The learning is designed to resemble daily activities with the aim of making it easier for students to practice using the target language. Then, the government has provided syllabus and learning materials books or guidance to ease EFL teachers in delivering learning (Masduqi & Prihananto, 2021). Students also receive prescribed textbook that have been compiled based on guidelines from policy makers to align learning (A. Wahyudi et al., 2018). Meanwhile, at the high school level, the English teaching and learning process is held for two hours a week. All forms of implementation of the C13 itself have been enacted in regulation no. 32 of 2013 which consists of eight educational standards (The MoEC, 2014).

Unfortunately, since its appearance, the 2013 EFL curriculum has triggered new issues, especially at the local level. The non-involvement of EFL teachers' voices being in developing and constructing the curriculum is considered to be beginning of the problem (Juliantari, 2014). It has impact on the readiness and competence of EFL teachers and schools

for implementation. Despite participating in training program there are still many teachers who have difficulty in preparing lesson plans (Malaikosa & Sahayu, 2019; Setiawan, 2021). Due to the imbalance of theoretical and practical knowledge, many teachers do not apply learning properly. Not a few schools are less than optimal in implementing the curriculum caused by facilities that do not support learning (Warman et al., 2021). Despite adopting reasoning-communicative competencies, the material contained in the textbooks still focuses on written discourse rather than spoken discourse (Elmiana, 2018; Margana & Widyantoro, 2017). Previously, Widodo (2016a) argues that both core and basic competencies in learning materials do not reflect communicative competencies. This far, Masduqi and Prihantoro (2021) reveal that the prescribed textbooks are not comprehensive enough to meet the goal of EFL learning. Meanwhile, students' capacity and number quite influence on teachers' performance in implementing the C13 learning model (Gunawan & Daud, 2018; Madina & Kardena, 2021). From a policy perspective, the 2013 EFL curriculum seems to be discriminated. It can be seen from the established of syllabi and teaching materials by policy makers. Teachers seem to be expected to obey and be dictated rather than involving them in decision making (Iskandar, 2020; Widodo, 2016). Then, Putra (2014) and Sukirno (2014) discover that the policy on the duration of teaching hours also influences the learning process. The most frequent impact of this policy is the less-than-optimal delivery of learning materials. Setiawan (2021) states that it is a government step to prevent gaps in students' attention to Bahasa Indonesia and English lesson. But, in practice this policy actually makes it difficult for EFL teachers to maximize the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in the classroom. Regarding the authentic assessment, in practice, many EFL teachers still face difficulties. There are several obstacles experienced by these EFL teachers in implementing assessments. Jasmi (2014) notes too many aspects and documents that must be evaluated and completed by teachers. Other findings such as class size and complex and time-consuming authentic assessment procedures are among these difficulties (Ashar & Irmawati, 2016; Rukmini & Saputri, 2017).

Beside the findings of issues surrounding the 2013 EFL curriculum, these experts provide feedback on several aspects. They suggest to improve EFL teachers comprehension through ongoing training programs (Darsih, 2014; Setiawan, 2021), evaluate students and teachers' prescribed textbooks (Elmiana, 2018; GoridusSukur et al., 2018), and evaluate of the 2013 EFL curriculum itself (Widodo, 2016). Unfortunately, these feedbacks seem to have received little attention from policy makers. As consequence, there are many issues that have not yet been resolved until the end of the 2013 EFL curriculum implementation.

Beforehand, several studies have been done regarding the implementation of the 2013 EFL curriculum. Anggraeni (2019), through Stufflebeam evaluation principles, reveals that teachers and students have different perceptions on the *product* aspect. Although teachers have prepared and delivered the learning materials as determined on the lesson plan, they still doubt the improvement of students' English skills. This fact can be seen from the lack of students' participation in communicating in English classroom. Mitra and Purnawarman (2019) find that the implementation of core competencies, learning processes, and assessment show quite positive result. Nevertheless, the researchers note that teachers need more training program. Long before that, the policy of reducing teaching hours had quite an impact on the

English learning process. Rosyida(2016) and Darsih (2014) studies found that this policy hampers the process of selecting, compiling, and using the learning materials. Then, it has an impact on the achievement of core and basic competencies that are less than optimal.

Although studies above have the same investigation on teachers and students' perceptions, they have different focus research. Their focus studied included evaluation of three curriculum aspects, teachers' readiness, and the challenge the curriculum implementation. None of these empirical studies has analyzed on the approach used by teachers in implementing the C13. Yet, all of these studies employed qualitative design as research method. Furthermore, the study related to curriculum implementation approach models has not been much conducted in Indonesia. Therefore, this research aims to explore secondary EFL teachers and students' perceptions about the implementation of the 2013 EFL, identify what model approaches that employed by EFL teachers based on Snyder et al. (1992)—*Fidelity*, *Mutual adaptive*, and *Enactment*, and investigate what factors that effected EFL teachers in implementing the curriculum. Factors here refer to Fullan (2007) who divided them into three types—*characteristic of changes*, *local factor*, and *external factors*.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Curriculum Implementation

The curriculum is a map in education. This is where all learning directions are arranged to suit with the community needs. It consists of learning instructions, learning objectives, and learning outcomes (Willes, 2009). All aspects of the curriculum are then transformed into the classroom by the teachers to create students' learning experiences (Kelly, 2004; Marsh & Willis, 2007). By applying the predetermined learning instructions, the curriculum meets its function. Therefore, it is crucial for educators to understand the factors in implementing the curriculum.

Fullan (2007) coins three factors related the implementation of the curriculum. First, the factors that arise from the characteristics of the curriculum change itself. It covers needs, clarity, complexity, quality, and practically. Curriculum change should be based on urgent and measurable needs. It must have the *clarity* of directions and meaning for the future. Then, changes must consider the level of *complexity* that may be experienced by implementer with different conditions as anticipation. The *quality* factor is measured by how the curriculum is delivered. Thus, preparations such as evaluations, teacher training program, completeness of learning devices, and learning resources must be carefully prepared. Furthermore, the curriculum *practically* meets implementers needs (i.e., teachers, principals, staff) in the school environment. The second is local factors which include social conditions, school committee, local region, and stakeholders. This is because these parties have a role either actively, passively, or apathetically in the successful of the curriculum implementation (Fullan, 2007). Unfortunately, the involvement of local parties is still rare in Indonesia. From the researchers' observation, most local parties are involved when discussing the construction of school buildings. The third is the external factor which is influenced by government in running education in a country. Generally, this factor is often found in countries with centralized government system (Iskandar, 2020; Wang, 2006). Here, the government has a dominant role

in making decisions on the direction of curriculum policy. Eventually, in many cases, changes by the government emphasize policies and programs without involving local roles (Fullan, 2007). As a result, difficulties in implementing the innovation at the local level are rarely well anticipated. However, curriculum implementation is a complex and dynamic process in education. This process requires the readiness of planning, infrastructure, capacity of the parties involved in achieving the curriculum objectives.

Curriculum Approaches by Snyder et al. (1992)

Snyder et al. (1992) map out three types of approaches after studying Fullan and Pomfre's model (Hongboontri & Darling, 2020). The mapping is based on the teacher's role in implementation of the curriculum in the classroom. These approaches are known as fidelity, mutual-adaptive, and enactment. Fidelity depicts the teacher's obedience in implementing the learning instructions in the curriculum. The teacher's role in this approach is simply as a user of instructions as standardized by policy makers (Hongboontri & Darling, 2020; Shawer, 2017). The source material used is a predetermined syllabus, lesson plans adapted from the curriculum, and assigned textbooks by policy makers (Snyder et al., 1992). Fidelity approach is commonly found in countries that adopt a centralized government system such as Indonesia. Ultimately, the success of the curriculum is assessed by how far the learning instructions are implemented by the teachers (Graves, 2014). Thus, teacher training and provision programs are an urgency in such an education system. Mutual-adaptive is an approach in which teachers make adjustment to their needs (Hongboontri & Darling, 2020; Shawer, 2010). Adjustment is made based on a joint decision of the students and do not change the content of the curriculum. In other words, the changes are still within the standardization specified in the curriculum or have not been linearly implemented by the EFL teachers. The characteristics of the teachers in this approach are being active and creative (Snyder et al., 1992). They are active in discovering students' needs and interest. They are creative in utilizing and delivering additional material sources. Enactment approach describes the independence of EFL teachers and students in creating their own learning experiences. Here, teachers invite students to determine the direction of learning and sources of learning materials according to their needs and interests (Hongboontri & Darling, 2020; Shawer, 2017). Teachers are no longer as implementer, adopter, or supplementer but as curriculum creator and developer with their students (Graves, 2014; Snyder et al., 1992). Hence, teachers' commitment as educator is the substantial demand in this approach. Teachers must be sensitive and professional in dealing with changing needs in society which of course affect the students' needs (Fullan, 2007; Wells, 1999 in Shawer et al., 2008).

METHOD

A mixed method with exploratory design was applied on this study. It combines both qualitative and quantitative methods in collecting, analyzing, integrating findings, and drawing a conclusion (Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The researcher's purpose in employing an exploratory study was to deepen the implementation of the 2013 EFL curriculum. Since this research is in exploratory design, qualitative data is priority in data analysis (Creswell et al., 2003; Lodico et al., 2006). Meanwhile, quantitative is

intended to strengthen and expand the primary data (Mertens, 2010). Therefore, the data was obtained by applying interview and questionnaire sequentially. For qualitative data, two EFL teachers and eighteen eleventh graders were interviewed separately. After that, the quantitative data were obtained by distributing questionnaire that had been developed from interview questions. The questionnaires were shared to twenty-one EFL teachers from five different schools in East Java, Aceh, and West Kalimantan and two hundred and thirteen eleventh science graders from East Java.

Research Respondent

Twenty-one EFL teachers and two hundred and thirteen 11th science graders are participated in this research. Since this study focus on qualitative data, the researcher applied purposive sampling in selecting participants (Creswell, 2012; Saldana et al., 2018). Furthermore, in accordance with ethic codes, all participants identities in the study were anonymous, especially for interview participants both teachers and students. For teachers, the researcher used the pseudonyms Mr. Hendi and Mrs. Heni. While students were given the codes SP 1A – 6A and SP 1B - 6B. For interview session, teacher participants were selected based on their teaching experience with the 2013 EFL curriculum for at least five years. While student participants were chosen based on three criteria. They were students with high, medium, and low achievement from each class. Then, the questionnaires were administrated to all participants but by adjusting the questions based on target participants. Finally, all participants have stated their willingness to participate in this study by filling out the consents form provided.

Data Collecting Techniques

This study applied interview and questionnaires as data collecting techniques. The interview conducted in a state senior high school in Blitar with involving two EFL teachers and eighteen students. While the questionnaires are distributed to twenty-one EFL teachers in five different school spread across East Java, Aceh, and West Kalimantan and two hundred and thirteen students from Blitar. Interview questions adapted from Nuraini (2019), Shawer et al. (2009), and Shawer (2010). These interview questions are, then, developed for questionnaire. The questions of interview and questionnaire are arranged according to the target participants.

Data Analysis

Since this is a sequential exploratory research design, the data were analyzed entirely using descriptive qualitative model. The researcher pointed Saldana's et al. (2018) techniques, which covers data condensation/reduction, data display, conclusion, and verification. The Interview data are analyzed by re-reading the data to select, short, and code the main data. Sequentially, quantitative data analysis used descriptive statistics with frequency and percentile ranking. Then, the whole data re-selected to suit the formulation of the problems.

FINDINGS

For further depiction, findings related to the implementation of the 2013 EFL curriculum are discussed based on theoretical framework with the following research questions: 1.) How do EFL teachers use the syllabus and lesson plan? 2.) How do EFL

teachers apply English learning in the classroom? 3.) How do EFL teachers manage the learning material sources? 4.) What media do EFL teachers use to support learning in the classroom?

The findings disclosed that there are differences among EFL teachers in responding the 2013 curriculum documents. The responds, then, affect them in implementing English learning in the classroom. In learning process, most of the teacher participants carry out every predetermined instruction in the 2013 EFL curriculum documents. In other side, a small of the teacher participants decide to involve students in determining English learning needs.

EFL Teachers' Perceptions

a.) The use of the 2013 EFL curriculum documents

Specifically, the documents here refer to two main documents in English learning, namely the syllabus and the lesson plan. Both in interview and questionnaire data, there are two tendencies of teachers in the use of these documents. Some participants admitted that they sometimes implemented learning that was not in accordance with the syllabus and lesson plan.

“Clearly, I often face obstacles in conveying the learning material. Thus, the syllabus contents are inevitably adjusted to the needs of different classes. It is because every class has different circumstance and needs. So, sometimes the order of the lesson is changed” (Mr. Hendi, August 16th, 2022).

Meanwhile others carry out learning as stated in the two documents.

“I just follow what are there (syllabus and lesson plan). The problems if I change, it will be confused about the assessment. So, I just follow it. This is because I compile the lesson plans by myself. It is from textbooks. Thus, I just follow. But, yes, sometimes it needs to add more learning materials” (Mrs. Heni, August 16th, 2022).

The findings above are suitable with the questionnaire data as follow. Where 19% (4) of participants sometimes teach as determined in the documents. In other side, 80,9% (17) of participants always refers to the documents.

Table 1. The use of Syllabus and Lesson plan.

Aspect: The use of 2013 EFL curriculum documents n: 21					
Statements	Scale				
	N	R	S	O	A
I refer syllabus in learning English	0%	4,8%	9,5%	28,6%	57,1%
	4,8%		9,5%	85,7%	
I follow the lesson plan in learning English	0%	0%	19%	33,3%	47,6%
	0%		19%	80,9%	

Therefore, it is known that there are differences in the responding of the 2013 EFL curriculum documents among EFL teacher participants.

b.) The implementation of learning English

In this theme, it was known that some teachers sometimes negotiate what and how students want to learn English. They will involve students to make decision about it. They

will ask students directly about that. By this, learning materials are no longer limited to textbooks or student worksheet. Teachers will use other sources from internet.

“Yes, I have. Outside the context of textbooks is more about additional materials. Because I am so sorry to say, I think the material is often repeated. So, I prefer to expand or replace it. For example, so far, the focus of textbooks is discussing grammar. So, I ask students to make paragraph or dialogues, then I ask students to practice speaking in front of class. They also learn how to pronounce verb 1, 2, and 3...” (Mr. Hendi, August 16th, 2022).

“In my opinion, the pedagogical strategies and instructions in teachers’ book are sometimes not accordance with the way I present the materials. It is not suitable either. Sometimes it is complicated. If I want to implement it in class, student often cannot be invited toward it. I meant students want to be guided all the time. I think their critical thinking is still less active” (Mr. Hendi, August 16th, 2022).

Otherwise, some teachers choose to implement learning as instructed in the 2013 curriculum learning documents.

“In the class, I do not do that, Miss. I just follow what is in the textbooks. But, indeed, I add the learning materials and exercises outside of the textbooks” (Mrs. Heni, August 16th, 2022).

“Yes, I do (following the pedagogical strategy or instruction in the prescribed textbooks). (Mrs. Heni, August 16th, 2022).

The same findings are also obtained from the questionnaire data. 14% (3) of teachers state they never negotiated learning with students. 57,1% (12) of teachers sometimes negotiated it. There are 28,6% (6) of teachers who always negotiate learning with their students. Thus, 19% (4) of teachers sometimes use textbooks as a learning material source. Meanwhile, 80,9% (17) of teachers always teach English based on prescribed textbooks.

Table 2. Negotiation and the use of prescribed textbooks

Aspect: The implementation of learning English n: 21					
Statements	Scale				
	N	R	S	O	A
I conduct a negotiation regarding what students want to learn.	9,5%	4,8%	57,1%	23,8%	4,8%
	14%		57,1%	28,6%	
I refer to the textbooks as English teaching materials	0%	0%	19%	33,3%	47,6%
	0%		19%	80,9%	

Another innovation of the 2013 curriculum is teaching with a *scientific approach*. Unfortunately, from the interview, it was found that not all EFL teachers are able to apply in language classes.

“Yes, I have done that. But of course, it still needs improvement especially at experiment and communication levels. Students still need the help of the teachers” (Mr. Hendi, August 16th, 2022).

“Honestly not yet, Miss. I admit that I still to learn more from MGMP” (Mrs. Heni, August 16th, 2022).

The same findings are also found in the questionnaire data as follows.

Table 3. Teaching approach

Aspect: The implementation of learning English n: 21					
Statements	Scale				
	N	R	S	O	A
I follow teaching approach instructed in the 2013 curriculum	0%	4,8%	9,5%	57,1%	28,6%
	4,8%		9,5%	85,7%	

As many as 85,7% (18) of teachers have applied teaching approach as instructed in the C13. 9,5% (2) of teachers sometimes employ the *scientific approach* in teaching English. While there is only 4,8% (1) of teachers who still does not implement teaching approach.

Obviously, differences in document usage have impact to the implementation of learning. These data show some EFL teachers choose to adapt learning based on student needs and conditions. While the rest obey learning instruction in the syllabus and lesson plan.

c.) The management of learning materials

This theme is closely related to the previous theme, especially regarding learning negotiations. Through negotiation, some teachers chose to decide what material to study together with students.

“Yes, of course. My students these days prefer to audio-visual combination, I think. Accordingly, to attract students’ interest, I usually display material directly from YouTube or internet through a projector provided in the classroom. Each class is facilitated by speakers to support listening practice. We can use it if by chance the language laboratory is being used by another class. The school regulation also allows students to use cell phone for study needs. Thus, the modification of the material is more diverse. Not only in terms of material but also presentation, Miss” (Mr. Hendi, Auguts16th, 2022)

“Oh, I did not even change the material. As I said earlier. In term of delivery of material, I just follow the textbooks provided. But in presenting the material I combine it with learning support media such as projectors or speaker that have been provided in the classroom” (Mrs. Heni, August 16th, 2022)

The findings of the questionnaire data show the information as the interview data. 19% (4) of participants reveal that sometimes they change the learning material out of the prescribed textbooks. The rest, 80,9% (17) of teachers always deliver the materials based on prescribed textbooks. Related to the additional learning materials, 90,5% (19) of teachers provide it. Meanwhile, 9,5% (2) of teachers sometime add the learning materials from other sources.

Table 4. The management of learning materials

Aspect: The implementation of learning English n: 21					
Statements	Scale				
	N	R	S	O	A
I change learning materials out of the prescribed textbooks	0%	0%	19%	33,3%	47,6%
	0%		19%	80,9%	
I add the learning materials from other sources such as from website, <i>YouTube</i> , or English reference books.	0%	0%	9,5%	52,4%	38,1%
	0%		9,5%	90,5%	

The findings prove that some EFL teachers negotiate learning materials with their students. On the other hand, EFL teachers deliver learning materials based on prescribed

textbooks. However, almost all EFL teachers provide additional materials and test from other sources to increase students' understanding.

d.) The use of learning support media

Both interview and questionnaire data reveal that in learning English they always involve supporting learning media. This is because school regulation allows the use of these media in learning process.

"Yes, of course, Miss. I realized that now students prefer learning that combines audio-visual. So, to motivate them, we usually take material from YouTube, or internet for example brochures, maps. They are also more interested when the materials are shown on a projector. The speakers are also needed to support the audio, especially for listening section, in case by chance the laboratory is being used. Students are also allowed to use smartphone for studying needs" (Mr. Hendi, August 16th, 2022).

"As I conveyed earlier. Of course, we used learning support media. For example, the presentation of learning material is varied as much as possible. So that students do not get bored. After all, the school has facilitated audio-visual learning. So, yes, it is used so that teaching and learning activities can give maximum results" (Mrs. Heni, August 16th, 2022).

The questionnaire data shows the same result. As many 90,5% (19) of teachers involve supporting media as form of adjusting students learning styles. While only 9,5% (2) of teachers sometimes involve supporting learning media.

Table 5. The use of supporting learning media

Aspect: The implementation of learning English n: 21					
Statements	Scale				
	N	R	S	O	A
I use school facilities as learning support media (e.g., projector, speaker, laptop, etc.)	0%	0%	9,5%	47,6%	42,9%
	0%		9,5%	90,5%	
I allow student to use <i>smart phone</i> in learning process	0%	0%	9,5%	52,4%	38,1%
	0%		9,5%	90,5%	

The findings above confirm the use of supporting media in English learning. These media include *smartphone*, laptop, projector, and speakers. This method is intended to maintain current students' motivation who tend to have a combination of *audio-visual* learning styles.

EFL secondary students' perceptions

a.) The implementation of the EFL learning

The first indicator in this theme is related to negotiation. Students' perception here are used to find out the truth of information from EFL teachers' perceptions. Students' interviews show the same findings as teachers' data. Mr. Hendi's students stated that sometimes the learning materials are negotiated with students.

"em... I think only in particular chapter, Miss" (SP 1A)

"e... yeah. In some meetings Mr. Hendi gives us chance to learn something else" (SP 2A)

"... later, Mr. Hendi asks what we want to learn" (SP 3A)

In other classes, students said there is no negotiation. The teacher teaches based on prescribed textbooks.

“No, (Mrs. Heni does not negotiate). It is directly to the textbooks and students’ activities books” (SP 1B)

“Hem... I think no, Miss. We asked to open the textbooks at that time” (SP 2B)

“As I remember we just focus on the textbooks” (SP 3B)

These findings are also supported by the acquisition of questionnaire. It shows that 28,9% (61) of students agree about the negotiation. While 71,3% (152) of students state the opposite.

Table 6. Negotiating with teacher

Aspect: The implementation of the EFL learning				
n: 213				
Statements	Scale			
	TD	D	A	TA
Negotiating learning materials	7%	21,6%	50,2%	21,1%
	28,6%		71,3%	

Here, the data findings justify the differences in the delivery of learning materials among EFL teachers. Some EFL teachers negotiated learning materials with students. While in other classes, students only received learning materials based on prescribed textbooks.

b.) The management of learning materials

As beforehand, students’ responses regarding this theme were quite varied. In Mr. Hendi’s class, the students’ participants confirmed that there are changes and additions to learning materials.

“It could say there are from the textbooks and not. We refer to the textbooks if Mr. Hendi says the materials (in the textbooks) are new for us” (SP 1A)

“... after that, we no longer use the textbooks. Mr. Hendi teachers us directly through Kampung website or YouTube” (SP 4A)

“Usually there is additional explanation materials. Because in the textbooks the explanation is too short. So, it is not clear” (SP 2A)

“Yes, Mr. Hendi does. Almost in every meeting we get extra explanation and exercise” (SP 3A and SP 6A)

Meanwhile, in Mrs. Heni’s class, the discussion of learning materials focuses on prescribed textbooks. However, Mrs. Heni provides additional materials and practice questions at each meeting.

“Yes, it is. The materials delivery is in accordance with the textbooks” (SP 1B, SP 2B, SP 3B, SP 6B, SP 8B, SP 9B, SP 11B, and SP 12B).

“No, Mrs. Heni never changes it. But she always adds the materials from internet or YouTube” (SP 5B and SP 10B)

“Mr. Heni only adds materials. Because in the student’s worksheet and textbooks the explanations are too short. So, it is less understandable” (SP 3B, SP 5B, and SP 6B).

“Yes, it is right, Miss. Mrs. Heni just more gives additional materials and exercises for the same chapter” (SP 7B)

The students’ response of the students above is also proven in the questionnaire data. As many as 81,7% (174) of students agree that learning is in accordance with the contents of the textbook. The remaining 18,3% (39) of students disagreed about that. 53,1% (144) of students stated that the prescribed textbooks are not the only source of learning materials. The remaining 46,9% (69) of students stated otherwise. Regarding the additional learning materials, 82,2% (190) of students confirmed about this. Meanwhile, 10,8% (23) of students felt that there is no additional material.

Table 7. The management of learning materials

Aspect: The management of learning materials				
n: 213				
Statements	Scale			
	TD	D	A	TA
The learning is accordance with the flow of content from the prescribed textbooks	5,2%	13,1%	64,3%	17,4%
	18,3%		81,7%	
The prescribed textbooks are the only source of learning materials	4,7%	48,4%	19,2%	27,7%
	53,1%		46,9%	
In teaching, teacher does not only use the prescribed textbooks, but also combine them with other sources such as from the internet, English references books, or sources such as from the internet, English references books, or <i>YouTube</i> .	2,8%	8%	48,4%	40,8%
	10,8%		82,2%	

Thus, it is confirmed that in some classes EFL teachers change the learning materials out of the prescribed textbooks. While in other classes, teachers only delivery material based on the prescribed textbooks. However, almost all EFL teachers use other sources as additional learning materials.

c.) The use of learning support media

For this theme, almost all students confirmed the involvement of supporting learning media. Beside available media in the classroom, they stated that the school is allowing the rules regarding *smartphone*.

“Most often, we use whiteboard, projector, and classroom speaker” (SP 1A, and SP 3A)

“Because sometimes we do exercises through google form” (SP 2A)

“When explaining, Mam Heni uses the whiteboard. When showing videos or presentation, she uses projector, laptop, and speaker” (SP 1B)

“em... whiteboard, projector, and sometime we are used smartphone” (SP 2B and SP 3B)

The findings from questionnaire data show the same information about it. As many as 90,7% (193) of students justify the use of supporting media in learning process. Meanwhile, only 9,2% (20) of students feel that teachers do not use supporting media in learning process.

Table 8. Students’ perception about supporting media

Aspect: The implementation of the EFL learning n: 213				
Statements	Scale			
	TD	D	A	TA
Teacher used audiovisual media and technology in teaching (whiteboard, marker, projector, speaker class, laptop, smartphone, etc.)	2,3%	7%	59,2%	31,5%
	9,3%		90,7%	

Based on the findings above, EFL teachers attempt to provide learning that attract students' interest. These efforts are realized by involving learning support devices both provided by the school—such projector, speaker class, or laptop or by students themselves—such as smartphone.

DISCUSSION

Discussion of the findings is presented according to the order of the themes above. It is structured based on the results of clarifying data findings between teacher and student participants. Based on data analysis, four main discussion themes are obtained as follows:

Syllabus and lesson plan

The data findings show that there are differences in use of the two documents. Some EFL teachers sometimes choose not to refer completely to both documents in EFL learning process. Instead of following predetermined instructions, they involve students' in deciding on learning activities. Based on teachers' observation, the class situation is uncertain at each meeting. Thus, the teacher needs to adapt to the circumstance. The teachers mention that they negotiate with each other at certain meetings.

These EFL teachers' decision is reminiscent of the negotiation syllabus echoed by Grave (2008). This type of syllabus is designed to give teachers and students choices in learning. Developed from task-based, the syllabus is identical to language learning. It prioritizes the learning process rather than product (Rahayuningsih, 2016). Accordingly, the negotiation syllabus emphasizes the practice of using the target language in real situation. The C13 itself is claimed to have adopted a task-based syllabus for EFL learning (Panjaitan et al., 2014). This enables teachers to involve students' voices in determining learning. The joint decision-making in language class is believed to leads an effective learning process (Littlejohn and Breen, 2000 in Graves, 2008). In terms of lesson plans, experts prove that the possibility of mismatching in learning activities still exists. Teachers still have to reformulate learning depending on the class needs (Farrel, 2002; Richards & Renandya, 2002). This is certainly in line with one of the learning principles in the C13. It is encouraging students-centered learning to form independent students (The MoEC, 2014). Thus, starting learning from students' needs is the right step instead of following predetermined instructions.

In relation to the syllabus and lesson plans, these EFL teachers' initiative is a form of learning adaptation (Snyder et al., 1992). Based on the interview data findings, class conditions are a factor that influences these teachers' decisions. Specifically, the class condition here refers to students' *needs*. Fullan (2007) categorizes *need* factor into the characteristic of change. As emphasized by Chaudhary (2015) and Richard and Renandya (2002), students are the core figure in the implementation of the curriculum. The position of

students' needs is vividly indisputable. This means students' needs, interests, and conditions should be to be concerned in learning making decisions.

On the other hand, several EFL teachers choose to apply learning as instructed in the syllabus and lesson plan. Findings reveals that complexity in some aspects of the curriculum are the reason behind their compliance. As with previous research findings, this aspect includes testing, assessment, and evaluation (Ashar & Irmawati, 2016; Malaikosa & Sahayu, 2019). These teachers are worried that changing the learning instructions in these two documents will make the three process more difficult. Moreover, the C13 itself is known for its complicated and time-consuming assessment process. In addition, this curriculum is identified as pre-determined curriculum from stakeholder (government) to educators.

Obviously, complexity is a factor that influences these teachers' responses to two curriculum documents. This factor is included in the characteristics of change (Fullan, 2007). With the emergence of these problems in its implementation, the government seems to neglect the difficulties that may occur when initiating change. Then, the implementation of the C13 has been assigned as the national curriculum in Ministry of Education and Culture regulation no. 65 of 2013. It is obviously that there is an emphasis on regulation by policy makers in enforcement of the 2013 EFL curriculum. Fullan (2007) includes policy makers (government) in the category of external factors in implementing the curriculum. Thus, there are two factors that influence these teachers in complying with the predetermined learning instructions. Graves (2008) states that in such a system teachers' compliance is a measure of their success in implementing the curriculum. Eventually, this situation place teachers' role as no more than a curriculum implementer.

Negotiation in learning process

As with the previous theme, EFL teachers apply leaning differently. Personal factors such as educational background and teaching training and experiences surely affect their perceptions toward predetermined instructions. Instead of following learning material in the predetermined textbooks, several EFL teachers tend to negotiate it with students. These teachers realize that currently students have diverse learning styles and interests. Accordingly, following learning instructions completely will complicate the learning process. These teachers convey many materials that still focus on written discourse. This issue proves that there is still a discrepancy between the material and the learning objective in the 2013 EFL curriculum (Putra, 2014; Widodo, 2016b). Besides that, they also state that the learning material seemed to be repeated.

From the information provided, two factor that influence the negotiation are identified. Apart from the students' needs factor, as described in the previous theme, there is clarity factor. Clarity here refers to the purpose and meaning of the initiating of change (Fullan, 2007; Nuraini, 2019). These EFL teachers' perception toward the pre-determined textbook prove this lack of clarity. The goal of EFL learning in the C13 is that students can master oral and written discourse by adopting communicative competence approach. Unfortunately, the pre-determined textbooks still focus on grammar or linguistic knowledge. It can be seen from the explanations and exercises in the textbooks which are still dominated by writing test. Putra (2014) has predicted this issue since the curriculum is first introduced. Margana and Widyantoro (2017) and The Rapid Review Team (2017) prove this prediction where textbooks are more inclined to focus on texts comprehensions. Nuraningtyas (2018) records that the textbooks consist only 14% for communicating activities. Meanwhile for linguistic

competence reaches 30%. Certainly, these findings show an inconsistency between the material content and the EFL learning goal.

In other class, EFL teachers fully deliver the learning materials available in the pre-determined textbooks. There is no negotiation between teacher and students. Even so, they always provide additional learning materials from other sources. As syllabus, the MoED stipulates the use of pre-determined textbooks in the regulation no. 64 of 2013. It means that pre-determined syllabus and textbooks are a main model to construct learning. But this regulation seems to be interpreted as instructions for use rather than a model. Thus, these EFL teachers places themselves as presenter of the materials. However, Darmawati (2020) and Widodo (2016b) view this step as a neglect of EFL teachers' capacity in compiling learning activities and materials. Their arguments are without a reason. It is because from the beginning of curriculum development, there is no teacher involvement. Teachers just explain the material according to what they learn from the training program. Hence, obviously this policy is a factor that influences EFL teachers respond to the pre-determined textbooks. According to Fullan (2007), government or policy maker is categorized as external factor, where all policy decisions related to education are controlled by the central government. This system leads teachers' commitment to implementing learning in accordance with instructions from policy makers (Iskandar, 2020).

Apart from negotiation and learning instruction, this theme also discusses a teaching approach known as the *scientific approach*. This approach is one of leading innovations in the C13. Through *scientific approach*, the learning is designed to match students' real lives (Hosnan, 2014; Panjaitan et al., 2014). Thus, students can easily apply their skills in daily live. This approach requires five learning stages, namely *observing*, *questioning*, *experimenting*, *associating*, and *communicating*. Regarding this approach, data findings reveal differences in implementation among EFL teachers. Although theoretically they quite understand about the approach, but they need further training in practice.

Based on the data findings, it is obviously EFL teachers face several factors that influence the use of a *scientific approach* in their class. The first is the *complexity* of the approach. Linguists assume this approach to be inappropriate for language class. Abidin (2016) and Suharyadi (2013) state that a *scientific approach* is inclined to learning natural or social sciences. Richard (2014) even argues that there are still no supporting theories regarding this approach to language learning. Previously, the first introduction of this innovation is opposed by the association for teaching English as foreign language (TEFL) in Indonesia. For the initiation of the approach, the policy maker seems to less estimate to possible obstacles faced at the local level (Fullan, 2007). The second relates to the teaching hour policy which becomes a challenge in implementing the approach. As is known, policy maker has reduced the duration of EFL learning hours at the high school level (Malaikosa & Sahayu, 2019; Rukmini & Saputri, 2017). Meanwhile, each stage in a *scientific approach* requires adequate time to be applied optimally. The third factor is students' capacities. Based on these teachers' observation, most students still depend on teacher guidance. They seem doubtful and passive. In other side, the *scientific approach* demands an active interaction between teachers and students (Zaim, 2017). Several studies report that students' abilities and attitude have quite an impact on the application of each stage in *scientific approach* (Gunawan & Daud, 2018; Nugraha & Suherdi, 2017). This means that good cooperation between students and teachers is the primary key to implementing the approach. The next factor is related to the *quality* and

clarity of the learning materials contained in the predetermined textbooks. The EFL teachers' participants state that the materials still focus on writing knowledge.

As stated by Curriculum Rapid Review Team (2017), the quality cannot be separated from the hasty introduction of the curriculum. Then, it also has an impact on the clarity of the materials with scientific learning. Wahyudi and Sukyadi (2015) find the textbooks tend to explain structure instead of observing phenomena or testing a theory. The portion of EFL learning with a scientific approach. At first, Fuyudloturrohmaniyyah (2015) records the questioning activities in the textbooks reached 61%. Then, Nuraningtyas (2018) finds that 65% of the material is dominated by observing activities. Therefore, some EFL teachers only succeed in applying the approach at certain stages in EFL class. Meanwhile in other classes, several EFL teachers admit that they have not implemented the scientific approach. Despite having good understanding in theories, they are still weak practically. They need further training both teacher training program and MGMP (Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran/Subject Teacher Deliberation). Through these programs EFL teachers could exchange ideas, share teaching experiences, and consult about their difficulties (The MoEC, 2014). Eventually, mostly EFL teachers apply the approach concept depending on their understanding, procedural knowledge, and comfort offered by changes (Ahmad, 2014 in Nuraini, 2019).

Changes and additions to learning materials

The discussion on this theme is divided into two indicators which are delivered sequentially. The first relates to changes in learning materials by EFL teachers. Here, data findings from teachers and students' participants support each other. Data findings reveal that among EFL teachers are managed the learning materials in the predetermined textbooks differently. The analysis shows that EFL teachers who deliver materials outside the textbook are influenced by students' needs, clarity, and quality of the materials. As stated previously, the needs of the final recipient are the basis for curriculum implementation (Chaudhary, 2015). Therefore, following these changing needs are the key to successful learning. This initiative places teachers' role as facilitators. In term of clarity and quality, it is closely related to materials contained in the textbook. These factors refer to the suitability between the material and the learning goals. Gunawan and Daud (2018) even find a mismatch between the learning materials and the tests in the national exam. Masduqi and Prihantoro (2021) conclude that the predetermined textbooks are not yet that comprehensive for communicative competence. Moreover, it is still found similarities in the materials which seem to be developed a few percent for higher levels. This can be seen in Aziz's (2015 in Zein et al., 2020) findings where the level of difficulties for junior and senior high school only 0.16% different. The issue leads to difference in meaning between what teachers understand and teaching practice in the classroom. Eventually, with sufficient teaching experiences and understanding of the issues, these EFL teachers initiate to change particular materials.

In other classes, students receive the learning materials according to the available textbooks. Even though the teachers realize that the materials still do not meet EFL learning needs. They do not change at all. Analysis of data findings reveal that these teachers are worried about assessment if they do not present the materials based on the textbooks. The C13 itself is known with authentic assessment which cover the assessment of students' attitude, knowledge, and skills. This model assessment emphasizes on learning process rather than the learning products. Unfortunately, this innovation is one of the difficulties faced by EFL

teachers in implementing the C13 (Setiawan, 2021; Warman et al., 2021). Some records note that this assessment system is quite time-consuming for teachers. Rukmini and Saputri (2017) find that teachers do more assessment than teaching. Besides many aspects that need to be assessed, the number of students in one class has quite an influence on the assessment process. Apart from that, teachers must report on the administrative tasks that are required for them. However, this assessment is instructed to be applied in all subjects. Yet, the use of predetermined textbooks is established in regulation no. 64 of 2013.

Previously, EFL teachers are also provided with textbooks as teaching guidance. It is purposed to ease teachers in implementing learning based in the C13 (The MoEC, 2014). In other side, this decision is viewed as limiting teachers' creativity in constructing learning materials. Iskandar (2020) and Sundayana (2015) affirm in this system, the teacher's role finally as implementer or user of curriculum. Teachers' opportunities to provide materials according to students' needs are limited by the materials described in the predetermined textbooks. Referring to Fullan (2007), two factor can be identified that influence this group of teachers in delivering materials. The first is complexity of assessment which has an impact on teachers' perceptions. The second is external factors in the form of regulations that bind the use of textbooks by policy makers. The second indicator concerns to additional material provided by the teachers. From the analysis of data, it is found that these EFL teachers always provide additional material and exercises. Both teacher and student participants in interview agree that the explanation of the materials in the predetermined textbooks are inadequate. The textbooks that have been used do not motivate them in learning English. Specifically, it relates to layout, design, and the print quality. Wahyudi et al. (2018) conduct a study on several printed textbooks for senior high school level. They find out that those books are suitable for use in English learning. But in fact, not all schools use the same books for learning activities. Eventually, students are more interested in additional materials presented in power point, You Tube, or website links. The additional materials and exercises are purposed to enrich students' comprehension regarding the topic materials discussed.

Involvement of supporting media

The final theme discusses the use of media as an alternative learning. Media here refers more to learning support devices. In this case, the use is related to changes and additional material to the previous theme. The data findings data in interview and questionnaire show that these EFL teachers quite often involving devices such projector, speaker, and smartphone in learning activities.

The involvement of these devices is based on teachers' awareness of changes in students' current learning style. Based on their observation, students sometimes get bored with textbook-centered learning. The projector can become a replacement for whiteboard. Therefore, they learn from special English learning websites such as kampuninggris.id or You Tube. The materials are more varied and combinative which is made students more enthusiastic in learning process. Rumanayanti and Nasrullah (2020) prove that the delivery of learning materials accompanied by interactive sounds and image can trigger students' interest in learning. On the contrary, the utilization of these devices is not yet optimal. It is because the teaching duration policy which is considered inadequate. Meanwhile, the C13 instruct to integrate learning with 21st skills which one of them is involving the use of technology. Obviously, it is inversely proportional to the theme itself. The findings of the C13 review team (2017) and Zein et al. (2020) reveal that this policy has quite impact on almost all aspect

of EFL learning. In fact, the 2013 EFL curriculum has the ultimate goal of learning in accordance with language needs in this globalization era. Sulistiyo et al. (2020) confirm the integrated learning surely provide quite beneficial for students. However, because of overlapping policies, the curriculum is less than maximal in its implementation. Accordingly, the use of supporting learning media mostly influences by quality of learning materials and policies that regulate the implementation of the C13. As stated by Fullan (2007), in some cases the policy makers put more concern in the initiation of change rather than process of implementation. Consequently, the latest innovations raise their own challenges at certain levels.

CONCLUSION

Finally, this study revealed differences in perception among teachers regarding the 2013 EFL curriculum. These differences, then, affect teachers in implementing English learning in the classroom. According to Snyder et al. (1992), these teachers are categorized into two approach models. The first is *mutual-adaptive* approach where EFL teachers involve students' role in deciding the learning process. Teachers with this approach are influenced by students' dynamic needs and condition in each meeting. For them, this is a way to maintain the continuity of learning process. Beside that, the characteristic of change such as *quality* and *clarity* of the predetermined textbooks also establish how teachers managing learning materials. The second is teachers with *fidelity* approach model. EFL teachers in this model obediently apply learning based on predetermined instructions. Factors that influence teachers' fidelity include the characteristic of change and external factors. The characteristic of change refers to the *complexity* of authentic assessment that will put more burden on teachers if they make changes to the instructions. Meanwhile external factor points to policy maker (government) who compiled the instructions in the curriculum. Yet, they also require the use of the curriculum as a learning guideline through regulations.

REFERENCES

- Abidin, Y. (2016). *Desain Sistem Pembelajaran dalam konteks Kurikulum 2013*. PT Refika Aditama.
- Anggraeni, N. A. (2019). Teachers and Students Perception on the Implementation of Curriculum 2013. *Journal of Applied Linguistics Indonesia (Aplinesia)*, 3(1), 11–16. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30595/aplinesia.v3i1.12071>
- Ashar, A., & Irmawati, I. (2016). The Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum of English at SMKN 1 Bantaeng: An Evaluative Study. *ELT WORLDWIDE: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v3i2.2255>
- Chaudhary, G. K. (2015). Factors Affecting Curriculum Implementation for Students. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 1(12), 984–986.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (P. A. Smith, Ed.; 4th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L. P., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced Mixed Methods Research Design. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (p. 768). SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Curriculum Rapid Review Team. (2017). *Rapid Review of Curriculum 2013 and Textbooks*. Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP).
- Darmawati, B. (2020). *ELT Curriculum and Material Production "Teachers' Fidelity to Curriculum"*. PREPRINTS. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/udcwp>
- Darsih, E. (2014). Indonesian EFL Teachers' Perception on the Implementation of 2013 English Curriculum. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 2(2), 1–8.
- Elmiana, D. S. (2018). A Critical Analysis of Task in Senior High School EFL Textbooks in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 462–470. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.14.462>
- Farrel, T. S. C. (2002). Lesson Planning and Classroom Management. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (p. 415). Cambridge University Press.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Fuyudloturromaniyyah, N. (2015). A Textbook Analysis: An in-depth analysis of activities in Scientific Approach's perspective in an EFL textbook for Seventh Grade. *Journal of English and Education*, 3(2), 51–64.
- Graves, K. (2008). The Language Curriculum: A Social Contextual Perspective. *Language Teaching*, 41(02), 147–181. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004867>
- Gunawan, H., & Daud, A. (2018). The Implementation of 2013 Curriculum in English Teaching: Stories from Rural Areas. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal (ELTEJ)*, 1(2), 65–75.
- Hongboontri, C., & Darling, W. E. (2020). EFL Curriculum Implementation: An Exploratory Study into Teachers and Students' Perceptions. *Horizon Journal*, 2(1), 69–86. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37534/bp.jhssr.2020.v2.n1.id1015.p69>
- Hosnan, M. (2014). *Pendekatan Saintifik dan Kontekstual dalam Pembelajaran abad 21: Kunci Sukses Implementasi Kurikulum 2013* (R. Sikumbang, Ed.). Penerbit Ghalia Indonesia.
- Iskandar, I. (2020). Teachers' fidelity to curriculum: an insight from teachers' implementation of the Indonesian EFL curriculum policy. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 3(2), 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.33750/ijhi.v3i2.79>
- Juliantari, S. (2014). *Kurikulum 2013, untuk siapa?* Indonesian Corruption Watch. <https://antikorupsi.org/id/article/kurikulum-2013-untuk-siapa>
- Kelly, A. V. (2004). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice* (5 ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtler, K. H. (2006). *Methods in Educational Research* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- Madina, S., & Kardenia, A. (2021). The Difficulties in Implementing Scientific Approach based on 2013 Curriculum: A case Study on one English Teacher. *Journal of English*

- Language Studies*, 3(2), 126–133.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v3i2.5794>
- Madya, S. (2018). *Metodologi Pengajaran Bahasa dari Era Prametode sampai Era Pascametode (Pertama)*. UNY Press.
- Malaikosa, C. A., & Sahayu, W. (2019). Teachers' Challenges on Implementing EFL Curriculum in Indonesian Rural Area. *Journal of Foreign Language Education and Technology*, 1(1), 61–71.
- Margana, M., & Widyantoro, A. (2017). Developing English Textbooks Oriented to Higher Order Thinking Skills for Students of Vocational High Schools in Yogyakarta. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 26–38.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.04>
- Marsh, C. J., & Willis, G. (2007). *Curriculum: Alternative Approaches, Ongiong Issues* (D. A. Stollenwerk, Ed.; 4th ed.). Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Masduqi, H., & Prihananto, N. (2021). Communcative Approach in the Five Curricula of English Subjaect for Secondary Schools: A Paradox in English Language Teaching in Indonesia. *ScienceOpen*, 1, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-PPHBZCF.v1>
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diveristy with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods* (V. Knight, Ed.; 3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Mitra, D., & Purnawarman, P. (2019). Teachers' Perception Related to the Implementation of Curriculum 2013. *Indonesian Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology Studies*, 7(1), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcets.v7i1.27564>
- Nugraha, S. I., & Suherdi, D. (2017). Scientific Approach: An English Learning-Teaching (ELT) Apparoach in the 2013 Curriculum. *Journal of English and Education*, 5(2), 112–119.
- Nuraeni, Y., Zulela, Ms., & Boeriswati, E. (2020). A Case Study of Curriculum Implementation and K-13 Challenges in Indonesia. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 2(1), 14–18.
<https://doi.org/doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v2i1.2263>
- Nuraini, D. (2019). *Curriculum change: Implementation the 2013 English Curriculum in Senior high schools in West Java province, Indonesia*. University of Exeter.
- Nuraningtyas, S. I. W. R. (2018). *An Evaluation of Bahasa Inggris Tetxbook Grade X in Kurikulum 2013 Published by Ministry of Education Based in Scientific Approach and Communicative Competence*. Diponegoro University.
- Panjaitan, M., Wachidah, S., Sumarni, S., Luciana, L., Sukriani, Y., Sumaydia, S., & Gunawan, A. (2014). *Pedoman Guru Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris (Pertama)*. PUSAT KURIKULUM DAN PERBUKUAN BADAN PENELITIAN DAN PENGEMBANGAN KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN DAN KEBUDAYAAN.

- Putra, K. A. (2014). The implication of curriculum renewal on ELT in Indonesia. *Parole: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 4(1), 63–75. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v4i1%20April>
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching* (J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya, Eds.). Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rosyida, E. M. R. (2016). Teachers' Perception Toward The Use of English Textbook. *English Education: Journal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 9(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v9i1.418>
- Rukmini, D., & Saputri, L. A. D. (2017). The Authentic Assessment to measure Students' English Productive skills based on 2013 curriculum. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 263–273. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8128>
- Saldana, J., Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2018). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (H. Salmon, Ed.; 4th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Setiawan, I. (2021). Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris dalam Kurikulum 2013: Suatu Tinjauan dan Perspektif. *Journal Ilmiah Dan Pendidikan Dan Keislaman*, 1(2), 104–112.
- Shawer, S. F. (2010). Classroom-level Curriculum Development: EFL Teachers as Curriculum-developers, Curriculum-makers, and Curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.015>
- Shawer, S. F. (2017). Teacher-driven curriculum development at the classroom level: Implications for curriculum, pedagogy and teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 63, 296–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.12.017>
- Shawer, S. F., Gilmore, D., & Banks-joseph, S. R. (2008). Student cognitive and affective development in the context of classroom-level curriculum development. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(1), 1–28.
- Shawer, S. F., Gimore, D., & Banks-joseph, S. R. (2009). Learner-Driven EFL Curriculum Development at the Classroom. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 125–143.
- Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zumwalt, K. (1992). Curriculum Implementation. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum: A Project of the American Educational Research Association*. MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Suharyadi, S. (2013). Exploring “Scientific Approach” in English Language Teaching. *Prosiding 2 Seminar Nasional Exchange or Experiences: Teachers Quality Improvement Program (TEQIP) 2013*, 1348–1355.
- Sulistiyo, U., Juwita, M., Hadiyanto, Agustina, P. S., Astini, S., Anwar, K., & Wiryotinoyo, M. (2020). What benefits that students can take? Portraying the implementation of EFL curriculum in Indonesia through phenomenological lens. *Elementary Education Online*, 19(3), 1487–1497. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.731167>

- Sundayana, W. (2015). Readiness and Competence of Senior High School English Teachers to Implement Curriculum 2013. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 29–36. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i1.828>
- The MoEC. (2014). *The concept and Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum*.
- Wahyudi, A., Mirizon, S., & Inderawati, R. (2018). English Textbooks Used at Banyuasin Senior High Schools: Based on Curriculum 2013. *English Community Journal*, 2(1), 194–209.
- Wahyudi, A. Y., & Sukyadi, D. (2015). A Closer Look at the Implementation of the Curriculum 2013 in Indonesia: Should the Scientific Approach be used in EFL classroom? *Rangsit Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(2), 56–70.
- Wang, H. (2006). *An Implementation Study of The English as a Foreign Language Curriculum Policies in the Chinese Tertiary Context*. Queen's University.
- Warman, W., Suryaningsih, S., & Mulawarman, W. G. (2021). Overcoming Obstacles in Implementing the 2013 Curriculum Policy. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 16(3), 967–980. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i3.5770>
- Widodo, H. P. (2016a). Language Policy in Practice: Reframing the English Language Curriculum in the Indonesian Secondary Education Sector. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English Language Education Policy in Asia* (pp. 127–151). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319224640>
- Widodo, H. P. (2016b). Language Policy in Practice: Reframing the English Language Curriculum in the Indonesian Secondary Education Sector. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English Language Education Policy in Asia* (pp. 127–151). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319224640>
- Willes, J. W. (2009). *Leading Curriculum Development*. Corwin Press: A SAGE Company.
- Zaim, M. (2017). Implementing Scientific Approach to Teach English at Senior High School in Indonesia. *Asian Social Science*, 13(2), 33–40. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v13n2p33>
- Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English Language Education in Indonesia: A Review of Research (2011-2019). *Language Teaching*, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208>