

## **Communicative competence in English upper secondary school curricula in Indonesia**

Gloria Silvana TUMANSERY<sup>1</sup>, Akademi Keperawatan Ibnu Sina Kota Sabang, Indonesia

Juliet MUNDEN, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Norway

This study investigates the Indonesian National Curricula documents that stipulate the competencies to be achieved in English in upper secondary school in Indonesia. Both curricula claim to promulgate communicative competence. Using document analysis as its method, the study examines how the notion of communicative competence is represented in the two current curricula. It identifies, interprets and thematically organizes the representations of linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences, as well as of general competence. It finds that while both curricula do not specify the linguistic competence to be achieved, they do specify a limited range of contexts in which learners are to develop sociolinguistic competence, and a limited range of pragmatic functions. While the curriculum of 2006 is organized around the four language skills, the 2013 English curriculum is organized around the development of attitudes and personality, and the paradigm of scientific enquiry. We argue that this paradigm is at odds with a coherent notion of communicative competence.

**Keywords:** Communicative Competence; Competencies; English Subject Curriculum; Indonesian National Curricula

### **1. Introduction**

In Indonesia, there are two curricula for English in upper secondary school, both of which are authorized by the government for the period of 2014 to 2020 (Nuraeni, 2018). The first of these is from 2006, while the second is from 2013. In this article, we refer to them as 'C06' and 'C13' respectively. Both curricula go by a number of names. C06 is also called 'KTSP', (the acronym for its name in Indonesian), and the 'School Based Curriculum', abbreviated to SBC. In much of the literature, also that written in English, C13 is referred to as 'K13', a shortening of the Indonesian of 'Kurikulum 13'.

C13 was meant to remedy the "numerous incorrect interpretations" in

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author (Email: [gloriatumansery@gmail.com](mailto:gloriatumansery@gmail.com))

methodology for which C06 was blamed (Widodo, 2016, p. 138). However, in its pilot period, C13 introduced many frustrations of its own. This resulted in the present situation, where schools are allowed to use either C06 or C13.

C06 was intended to accommodate the economic, social and cultural diversity of Indonesia, by giving each school freedom to design, implement and assess its own English curriculum (Widodo, 2016, p. 134). Although this gave increased autonomy at the local level, most English teachers, according to Widodo (2016, p. 135), saw themselves as implementers of the textbook, and “skewed their English language instruction to the national examination in which competency standards were set by policy makers”. C13, as earlier mentioned, was intended to remedy the methodological shortcomings for which C06 was blamed. C13 puts much more emphasis on national standards. It designs all subject curricula on a five-stage learning process based on “a scientific approach”. The stages are (1) observing, (2) questioning, (3) exploring/experimenting, (4) associating and (5) communicating (Widodo, 2016, p. 138). Widodo (2016, p.139) maintains that this was a highly prescriptive curriculum which was not informed by relevant theories of language learning, but rather by “delineated ideologically and institutionally envisioned goals”.

English language education in Indonesian has, on the whole, failed to produce communicatively competent students (Lie, 2007). According to Lie (2007), there are very few upper secondary school graduates who are able to communicate intelligibly in English, despite many years of English instruction in formal schooling. A more recent study came to a similar conclusion, reporting that a considerable number of upper secondary students in Indonesia are unable to express their ideas, thoughts, and feelings clearly in English (Gani et al., 2015).

Despite these findings, the claim has been made that the curricula under discussion promote communicative competence (Ilyas, 2016). According to Masduqi (2012):

Curriculum development in Indonesia is always up to date in catching up the development of English teaching theories in the world [...]. Since 2004, the curriculum has been indicating the understanding of what communicative competence is. (Masduqi, 2012, p. 5)

In this article, we set out to investigate this claim. More specifically, we ask:

- To what extent does a coherent notion of communicative competence underpin the Indonesian curricula for English in upper secondary school?
- What types of communicative competence are represented in these curricula?

Let us now briefly present the context for which the curricula are designed. Graddol (2006, p. 94) writes that, “English is becoming an ever more valuable lingua franca in the region [Asia]”. This evolving status has a number of important consequences for the teaching of English (Simensen, 2007), not least the need for skills that contribute to successful communication between non-native users of English, both in Asia and elsewhere. As part of the government’s endeavours to develop this competence on a national scale, policy documents play an important role. In Thailand, for example, the Education Core Curriculum for ELT emphasizes communicative competence (Waedaoh & Sinwongsuwat, 2019).

In Indonesian education, students typically study English for six years, three years in lower secondary school, followed by three more years in upper secondary school. Depending on which curriculum is used, English is also taught in primary school, as well as in some private kindergartens in big cities. According to Lie (2007), learning English serves two main purposes in Indonesian education. Firstly, it equips students to read the many texts in English that they will encounter at university (see also Tumansery, 2016). Secondly, “competence in the English language is still used as a determining factor in securing a favourable position and remuneration in the job market” (Lie, 2007, p. 3). Both these purposes require that students achieve a high level of communicative competence in English.

Studies of the English curriculum in Indonesia have tended to focus on textbooks (Aziz, 2014; Ilyas, 2016; Hanifa, 2018) and on curriculum implementation. A systematic analysis of the English curriculum policy documents themselves has not been previously undertaken, as far as we are aware. The present study seeks to fill this gap. As Yin (2013) argues, organizational documents serve as windows onto reality. In this study, the two curricula serve as windows onto the government’s vision for education, and for subject English in particular.

## **2. Background**

In this section we consider first the key term ‘curriculum’. Secondly, we discuss the concept of communicative competence. Thirdly, we review recent studies that shed light on communicative competence in English in the Indonesian educational system.

### **2.1. Curriculum theory**

We make much use of the term ‘curriculum’ in this article. We use it primarily to refer to the national subject curriculum document, “an all-important document [...] that has legal status in education” (Speitz, 2018, p. 38). In a broader sense, the discipline of curriculum studies is concerned not just with

formal documents, but with all aspects of the educational endeavour (Kelly, 2004). In the first part of this literature review, we therefore draw on the work of John Goodlad and his research team. They present a framework for understanding curriculum design and implementation. Goodlad's framework has retained its explanatory force (see for example Remillard & Heck, 2014).

Goodlad's framework has five perspectives. The first of these is the *ideal* curriculum, "the beliefs, opinions and values of the scholars in the disciplines" (Klein, Tye & Wright, 1979, p. 244). The *formal* curriculum consists of the documents written by key stakeholders, most usually the government at national or regional level, and includes national exams and textbooks. The *instructional* curriculum is the values, experience and competences of English teachers, and their ability to adapt the formal curriculum, including the textbook, to their learners. The *operational* curriculum is what actually goes on in the classroom, and the *experiential* curriculum is what learners experience in the classroom, together with what they actually and demonstrably learn (Klein, Tye & Wright, 1979, p. 245).

In this paper, we are primarily concerned with the formal curriculum, but in the following section, we review the ideal curriculum, in the form of scholarship about the notion of communicative competence.

## **2.2. Communicative competence**

In the field of linguistics, the term "competence" was initially proposed by Chomsky (1965). Chomsky (1965) distinguishes between competence and performance, between a person's linguistic or grammatical knowledge, and their performance of observable language utterances. This distinction has been pivotal in later discussions of how communicative competence is conceived (Canale & Swain, 1980, p. 3). The concept of competence by Chomsky (1965) has, however been criticized, not least by Hymes (1972), who claims that Chomsky's focus on grammar is inadequate to account for the complexities of language use (cf., Salmani Nodoushan, 1995, 2002, 2006a, 2006b, 2012, 2014, 2017, 2020a, 2020b). Hymes (1972) argues for the importance of sociolinguistic competence, a concept of communicative competence that includes not only language knowledge, but also the ability to use language appropriately (cited in Byram, 1997).

Canale and Swain (1980) further developed a theory of communicative competence in the context of second language teaching. They reviewed experimental studies that seemed to demonstrate that knowledge of grammar was a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for performative success (Canale & Swain, 1980). Furthermore, they identified a lack of theoretical focus on the communicative strategies that enable speakers to maintain a conversation and to compensate for linguistic inadequacies in authentic

communication (Canale & Swain, 1980, p. 25). In summarizing their review of the field, Canale and Swain (1980) tentatively suggested that communicative competence can be described in terms of three main areas: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence.

The notions of sociolinguistic competence developed by Hymes (1972) and by Canale and Swain (1980) have been criticized for being modelled on native speakers, and on the assumption that foreign language speakers learn English in order to speak with native speakers. Byram (1997) makes the point that first language competence cannot be appropriated as the aim of foreign language teaching. Such an appropriation, he says, can lead to an ignorance of and a devaluation of one's own social identity and cultural competence, because of the attempt to model the native speaker. Kasper (1995, cited in Byram, 1997, p. 32) argues that, "it is more appropriate to develop an intercultural style, and tact, to overcome divergence rather than accept the norm of the monolingual". Therefore, it is important to develop the concept of the "intercultural speaker", given that communication and interaction in English most often occurs between people with different social and linguistic identities (Byram, 1997). In a similar vein, Ur (2012) argues that the goal of teaching English as a lingua franca or international language is the fully competent user of English rather than the native imitator.

An influential contemporary document in the development of foreign language curricula is *The Common European Framework of Language: Learning, Teaching, Assessment* (Council of Europe, 2001), hereafter abbreviated as CEFR. It builds on the scholarship presented above. CEFR distinguishes between general competence and communicative language competences "which empower a person to act using specifically linguistic means" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 9). This broad conceptualization of communicative competence, developed through several decades of collaboration, remains an important point of reference for curriculum development and curriculum analysis (Speitz, 2018). In what follows, we sketch how CEFR conceptualizes communicative competence.

**General competence** of language learners encompasses their knowledge, their skills and the ability and motivation to learn. CEFR recognizes that this is a vast and comprehensive category: "All human competences contribute in one way or another to the language user's ability to communicate and may be regarded as aspects of communicative competence" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 101). General competence includes articulated knowledge of the world, as well as sociocultural awareness, and the learner's values, beliefs and attitudes. The competences that are more particularly related to the learning of language, CEFR organizes under three headings: linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence.

**Linguistic competence** is “knowledge of, and ability to use, the formal resources from which well-formed, meaningful messages may be assembled and formulated” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 109). There are many ways of organizing and representing such knowledge, and many terms that can systematically describe the formal resources available to a language user. CEFR uses the following headings: lexical competence, grammatical competence, semantic competence, phonological competence, orthographic competence, and the less familiar orthoepic competence – the correct pronunciation of written forms.

**Sociolinguistic competence** is the linguistic component of the sociocultural knowledge and skills that are a part of a learner’s general competence. For the purposes of curriculum design, analysis and assessment, the concept of sociolinguistic competence allows a focus on such aspects of language as linguistic markers of social relations, politeness conventions, register differences and dialect and accent (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 118).

**Pragmatic competence** comprises discourse competence and functional competence. Discourse competence has to do with the creation of coherent texts, both short and long, oral and written, and the use of appropriate textual conventions (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 123). Functional competence refers to the ability to understand and use spoken discourse and written texts for different purposes (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 125). Common to both aspects of pragmatic competence is fluency, described as the ability to articulate, “to keep going”, and to compensate and recover communication that might otherwise break down (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 128).

### 2.3. The instructional curriculum

In this final section, we consider empirical studies about the instructional curriculum in Indonesia. A characteristic concern of these studies is teachers’ perceptions, practices and what the researchers see as their shortcomings. Yulia (2014) reported on teachers’ limited capacity in the teaching of English in junior high schools in Yogyakarta, where the C06 curriculum was in use. Yulia (2014) found that most teachers lacked the necessary skills, especially with regard to the pedagogical and professional aspects of teaching English. Further, due to the pressure to prepare students for the national exam, most teachers neglected the notion of communicative competence, and focused on developing linguistic competence, ignoring the interactional, sociocultural or strategic competences necessary to achieve the target of communicative competence. Lastly, Yulia (2014) found a lack of motivation amongst both teachers and students to communicate in English, despite the linguistic demands of a global world.

Sahiruddin (2013) reviewed the implementation of English language teaching

and learning in schools using the C13 curriculum. Sahiruddin (2013) identified some common English language teaching problems in Indonesia, such as students' lack of motivation, poor attitude toward language learning and large class size. Like Yulia (2014), Sahiruddin (2013) identified, unqualified teachers as a problem, as well as cultural barriers that make it challenging for teachers to adopt the new role of facilitator. Gani and Mahjaty (2017) also reported that teachers lacked the competence to deliver parts of the curriculum.

Tumansery (2016) found that university-trained teachers of English believed in the importance of communication, but perceived the achievement of sociolinguistic competence as an unrealistic expectation for most Indonesian upper secondary school students. In reality, said Tumansery (2016), students in Indonesia were taught to use English in correct simple sentences which were polite enough to use in various contexts.

### **3. Method**

#### **3.1. Primary data**

We selected the formal curriculum for two different school years in upper secondary school. For C06, the analysis focuses on the English curriculum for Grade 12, the year preceding university entrance (see Appendix 1). For C13 the analysis focuses on Grade 10 (see Appendix 2).

#### **3.2. Instruments**

The document analysis draws on the notion of communicative competence provided by the CEFR framework.

#### **3.3. Procedure**

Both curricula were accessed online, as they are openly available for a general readership on a number of websites. They are written in Indonesian and have not, been officially translated into English. We therefore translated them ourselves, in a dialogic process between the two authors one of whom is a native speaker of Indonesian, and one of whom is a native speaker of British English.

The structural analysis describes the organizing principles of the two curricula. It identifies the key competencies, and the way these are specified in performative competencies. Thereafter, a document analysis is carried out to identify the manifest, latent and context-dependent meaning of the text (Schreier, 2014). Document analysis entails finding, selecting, making sense of and synthesizing data, before organizing it in major themes, and presenting the data in excerpt (Bowen, 2009). It is a process of evaluating documents so

that empirical knowledge is produced and understanding developed (Bowen, 2009). In investigating the two curricula documents, we looked specifically for how the notion of communicative competence was represented. This focused approach is frequently employed in the study of government and other public documents.

Both authors independently found and categorized all occurrences of communicative competence, using the thematic categories provided by the CEFR framework. Furthermore, both authors wrote independently about how general competence is represented in the two curricula. Discrepancies between the analyses were resolved through a process of discussion and re-examination. This has, we believe, contributed to the increased reliability of the results, to which we now turn.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **4.1. An overview of the two curricula**

Both curricula consist of main areas and their specifications. The main areas are numbered, and called “competence standards” in C06, and “core competences” in C13. We argue that the ordering of the parts in both curricula may indicate, at least to some extent, in what order the main areas are to be taught. The right-hand column in both curricula has bullet points, so called “basic competences”, which specify the main areas. In C06, there are usually two basic competences for each main area, while there are usually many more in C13. However, the basic competences are not so specific that teachers can understand exactly what the students are supposed to learn. To understand this, teachers need to look at the syllabus and the textbook. Textbooks that can contribute to the achievement of the curriculum are published by The Ministry of Education and Culture (Yonata, Farida, & Nugraheni, 2017). It is strongly recommended by the Ministry that these textbooks be used by teachers of English, but they are also encouraged to supplement them with other materials (Aziz, 2014). In the context of teaching in Indonesia, in 2006, the Education National Standard Agency (Rusmawan, 2016) defines syllabus’ as a learning plan that covers competence standards, basic competences, subject matter, learning activities, indicators of achievement of the competences for assessment, time allocation, and learning resources. Such a syllabus must try to bridge the gap between the almost visionary quality of the core competences and the skills identified in the basic competences.

### **4.2. A structural comparison of the two curricula**

The four standard competences in C06 are listening, speaking, reading, and what is referred to as “the expression of meaning in writing”, listed in this order. In other words, the competence standards start with a receptive skill,

followed by its related productive skill. This same sequence is adhered to in the syllabus and the textbooks (Hanifa, 2018).

In both curricula, the basic competences are formulated with a verb in the infinitive. These verbs identify both the activity and the goal, and underline that the achievement of a basic competence is to be demonstrated and assessed by performance, rather than by declaratory knowledge. There are systematic differences in the verbs used to express the basic competences in the two curricula. In C06, both the competence standards and the basic competences are formulated using one of just three verbs: “understand”, “respond” and “express”. In C13 the main verbs are “analyse” and “compose”. Learners are typically required to analyse many different functional texts, both oral and written, before they themselves compose texts with the same functions.

An even more substantive difference is that the newer curriculum, C13, is not organized around the four basic language skills. This has significance not only for the notion of communicative competence that underpins each of the curricula, but for the broader conceptualization of the purposes of education, what Kelly (2004, p. 4) has called “the total curriculum”. In C13, the core competences are structured around spiritual attitudes (1<sup>st</sup> competence), social attitudes (2<sup>nd</sup> competence), knowledge (3<sup>rd</sup> competence), and the implementation of knowledge (4<sup>th</sup> competence). These core competences are not specific to the English subject, but apply to all subjects. This makes them an awkward organizing principle for English language learning. According to Gani and Mahjaty (2017), the lack of clarity in both structure and content has contributed to the reappraisal of C13, and the continuation of the 2006 curriculum.

One criticism that may be raised is that the relationship between each core competence and the related basic competences is unclear. Here, for example, is the third core competence in C13:

**C13:** 3. *To understand, apply, and analyse factual, conceptual, and procedural knowledge based on their curiosity about science, technology, art, culture, and humanity with an understanding of humanity, nationality, state, and civilization regarding the causes of phenomena and events, as well as applying procedural knowledge in the specific field of study based on their talents and interests in order to solve problems*

The language here is complex and rambling, and refers to a very wide range of contexts and domains. The eleven related basic competences do not fulfil all the intentions of this core competence, and indeed, it is difficult to conceive how they could do so.

### 4.3. Communicative competence in the two curricula

We now turn to the document analysis, using the CEFR framework to identify and explore the notion of communicative competence in the two curricula. As with most analytical frameworks, it is not always obvious under which category the various features of the curriculum belong. This is in part due to the inherent arbitrariness at the fringes of theoretical categories, but also because the communicative competence in the two curricula is not always clearly articulated, as discussed in section 4.2. Moreover, language competence is a part of general competence in the CEFR, making it sometimes difficult to differentiate categories. In the following discussion we therefore review, under the heading ‘general competence’, only the knowledge, skills and attitudes that do not deal explicitly with language competence.

#### 4.3.1 General competence

The many attitudes that the CEFR lists as part of a learner’s general competence are regarded as contributing to the competent language user. One such is “openness towards, and interest in new experiences, other persons, ideas, people, societies and cultures” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 105). Attitudes are central to successful communication, a widely held perception according to the CEFR:

The development of an “intercultural personality” involving both attitudes and awareness is seen by many as an important education goal in its own right. (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 106)

In the two Indonesian curricula, however, the target is a learner who is committed to the positive values of religion and society, rather than an intercultural personality. The types of texts mentioned in C06, such as interpersonal (socializing) text, and the speech acts of persuading, encouraging and criticizing, contribute to the learner’s general competence. What most significantly distinguishes the two curricula is that while C06 is concerned primarily with the development of language competence, C13 puts the learner’s attitudes at the centre of the English curriculum. Attitudes and values constitute the first and second core competences, and this strongly suggests that C13 is designed primarily for character building. According to the Ministry of Education and Culture in 2012, however, C13 is not a break with C06, but an extension of it.

*The main purpose of this curriculum is to shape individuals who are faithful in God, good in character, confident, successful in learning, responsible citizens and positive contributors to the civilization.*

Such character building is also known as ‘character education’, defined by Character Education Partnership as “a national movement creating schools that foster ethical, responsible and caring young people by modelling and teaching good character through emphasis on universal values that we all share” (Ginanto, Mulyadin, & Putra, 2013). Similarly, the Ministry of Education and Culture defines character education as “a conscious effort to make students understand, care about, and internalize the values and norms of the social life, in order to create a better personality” (Ginanto, Mulyadin, & Putra, 2013).

Nova (2017) explains that character education involves both explicit and implicit teaching. Explicit teaching involves setting certain values to be taught and discussed in class, while implicit teaching requires the teacher to be a role model: attitudes and values practiced in the classroom also build the students’ character. The realization of this ambition will thus depend heavily on the teachers’ initiative and ability to motivate and support students’ learning.

An example of the centrality of character building is the first core competence, which has just one related basic competence:

**C13: 1.1** *To be grateful for the opportunity to learn English as a language of international communication by manifesting it in the spirit of learning.*

In core competence two, character-building values are linked to communication in various social settings. Here is an example (emphasis added):

**C13: 2.1** *To show politeness and caring **in communicating** with teachers and friends.*

This competence aim is an example of the interrelatedness of social attitudes and communicative competence. Learners should develop the communicative competence necessary to perform specific social functions, and in doing so, they demonstrate an awareness of social functions and roles. We shall return to this issue later, under the heading “sociolinguistic competence”, but turn now to a consideration of how the curricula represent linguistic competence.

#### **4.3.2 Linguistic competence**

None of the components of linguistic competence listed in the literature review – lexical, grammatical, semantic, phonological, orthographic and orthoepic competence (Council of Europe, 2001) – are explicitly mentioned in either of the curricula, but they are implicated in all of the competence aims. In C06, we find linguistic competence implicit in the phrase “using the

oral/written language accurately”, a phrase that occurs in every one of the eleven basic competences. In C13, linguistic competence is represented by the phrase “correct linguistic elements”, which occurs in all eleven points under the third core competence, and in eight of the fifteen points under the fourth core competence. Here is one example from each of the curricula (emphasis added):

**C06:** 4.1 *To respond to meaning in formal and informal short functional texts using written language **accurately**, fluently, and appropriately in the contexts of everyday life*

**C13:** 4.11 *To compose oral and written announcements, very short and simple, with regard to social functions, text structures, and **correct linguistic elements** appropriate to the contexts*

The concepts of accuracy and correctness are not straightforward. In the literature review in section 2, we discuss the view that the target language for learners of English should not be the emulation of native speakers, but a mastery of English that allows learners to communicate successfully. C06 and C13 are not clear as to whether they share this perspective, or whether the phrases “using oral/written language accurately” and “correct linguistic elements” reflect an aspiration towards native-like proficiency. English in Asia is in a process of devolution, and questions related to indigenized varieties of English and the choice of standards in Asian English are controversial and largely unresolved (Jenkins, 2015).

Before moving on to the other categories of communicative competence, it is worth noting that in none of the basic competences does linguistic competence stand alone. It is always part of a phrase that includes sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence. In C13, linguistic competence is consistently the third of the three, despite being the competence on which the other language competences must build. However, we find it unlikely that this positioning is meant to diminish the attention that should be accorded in the classroom. In Indonesia, while linguistic competence in English is crucial for success in tertiary education and access to professional mobility (see Lie, 2007), it also plays a key instrumental role. More specifically, it functions as a gatekeeper, because it is primarily linguistic competence that is tested in the multiple-choice format of the secondary school national exams in English, as well as in the university entrance exam.

#### **4.3.3 Sociolinguistic competence**

Sociolinguistic competence relates to the mastery of language forms and meaning that are appropriate in different contexts (Simensen, 2007). Using

appropriate language is mentioned in every one of the basic competences in C06. Here is one example (emphasis added):

**C06: 1.1** *To respond to meaning in formal and continuous (sustained), transactional (getting things done) and interpersonal (socializing) conversations accurately, fluently, and **appropriately** [...].*

The context for which this response is to be appropriate is defined in all the competence standards as “everyday life”. This can be understood as an attempt to engage students in texts that are both familiar and linguistically manageable. However, the phrase is somewhat indiscriminately used when students are required to work with formal continuous texts, also these “in the contexts of everyday life”.

Similarly, C13 emphasizes that language must be adapted to the setting and speaker, as we can see in this example (emphasis added):

**C13: 3.1** *To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in texts of self-introduction, **appropriate to the contexts**.*

This exact formulation – “appropriate to the contexts” – is found in ten of the eleven basic competences related to the third core competence, and eleven of the sixteen related to the fourth core competence. We see that C13 places the linguistic elements first and then requires that they be appropriate for the context. Here as elsewhere, C13 follows the pattern of scientific enquiry, requiring the learner to first analyse and then apply the language. Another point of interest is that the first and second core competences in C13, those that have to do primarily with character education (cited earlier), may be seen as contributing to the learner’s sociolinguistic competence.

#### **4.3.4 Pragmatic competence**

According to CEFR, pragmatic competence has to do with fluency with understanding and creating coherent texts, with using text conventions, and with understanding and producing texts that serve different functions.

We find the concept of fluency in C06 in the recurrent phrase “accurately, fluently and appropriately”. Another recurrent formulation states that the learner is to understand or express meaning in continuous text, indicating a focus on coherence in thought and cohesion in formulation. In C13, the notions of fluency and cohesion are less explicit. This is not to say that fluency is not taught, and indeed it may well be part of the formal curriculum, if we include in the formal curriculum, as does Goodlad, the syllabus, the exams and the textbook.

Discourse competence is concerned with the textual conventions. In C06, three types of text are mentioned under listening and speaking: formal and continuous texts – terms that we can recognize from CEFR; transactional texts, which are about “getting things done”; and interpersonal conversations, which are about “socializing”. In reading and writing, C06 is partly structured by a distinction between texts involving more than one speaker, and those it calls “monologue” texts. It also specifies text types: short formal and informal functional texts, essay and narrative.

Like C06, C13 is concerned with discourse competence, which it identifies with the phrase “text structures”. This phrase is part of each of the basic competences under the third and fourth core competences. Here is one example (emphasis added):

*C13: 3.1 To analyse social functions, **text structures**, and linguistic elements in texts of self-introduction, appropriate to the contexts.*

We argue that the ordering of the competences may reflect an assumption about how language should be taught. The implication of the formal curriculum is therefore that explicit analysis is the necessary condition for the production of linguistically cohesive and coherent texts. Indeed, we find that the first activities in each unit of the textbooks delivering the C13 curriculum call for the learners to analyse texts (see e.g., Buku Bahasa Inggris SMA/SMK Kelas 10 Kurikulum 2013 in Widiati, Rohmah & Furaidah, 2017).

With respect to functional competence, C06 views the primary purpose of learning to listen, speak, read and write English to be that of developing the ability to function in everyday situations and interactions. A total of nine interactional functions are mentioned, including “to persuade”, “to regret” and “to speculate”. Additionally, one non-interactional function is mentioned under reading, namely gaining access to scientific texts and reviews.

In C13, students are expected to analyse and consider the social functions of texts, as exemplified in point 3.1 above. Worth noting is that in C13 functional competence is the organizing factor of core areas 3 and 4. Each of the basic competences is concerned with the analysis or composition of oral or written texts, and the only phrase that changes from one such basic competence to the next is the specification of the text’s function. The functions include giving compliments, expressing caring, expressing intention, congratulating, and talking or writing about the past. The only other texts mentioned in either curriculum is found in C13: folk tales and simple songs. While it is noteworthy that literature is on the curriculum at all, given its potential to develop critical thinking and tolerance (Ilyas, 2016) it is not clear what role it is here asked to serve.

The types of texts and the types of speech acts in C06 and C13 signal the curriculum's considerable focus on social functions. The functional texts to be analysed and composed are presumably intended to reinforce the ambitions of personal and social development that are explicit in the core competencies of C13. However, an interesting aspect of both curricula is the small number of communicative functions and sociolinguistic contexts that learners are required to master. This invites the question as to how Indonesian speakers of English are expected to deal with communicative situations and functions that are not addressed in the curriculum.

One might question whether a function-based curriculum is best suited to achieving communicative competence in English in the Indonesian context. While a function-based curriculum arguably provides a more direct pathway to communicative competence than a structure-based curriculum, function-based curricula have been criticized for overloading students in the early stages of language learning, by requiring them to learn several language structures to fulfil the same function. This can be a particular burden when learners have little exposure to English outside the classroom as is often the case in Indonesia.

## **5. Conclusion**

The analytical framework and the terminology used by CEFR have proved well-suited to describing and contrasting the notion of communicative competence that underpins the two English curricula in current use in Indonesia. Although C13 was intended as a revision and extension of C06, the two curricula differ from one another in several significant respects. C06 builds on the teaching of the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. This structural device allows for the presentation of a clearer notion of communicative competence than we find in C13. C13 builds on a scientific paradigm that does not fit well with scholarship on what makes for successful foreign language learning. Furthermore, C13's focus on character education arguably comes at the cost of language competence, and undeniably at the cost of didactic clarity.

When it comes to the various types of language competence – linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic – we find that both curricula are concerned with linguistic competence, though they provide no specifications, and do not address the issue of whether it is international or native-like English that learners are to use accurately and correctly. Both curricula mention sociolinguistic awareness throughout, although within a very limited range of contexts. Finally, the two curricula centre around pragmatic competence. Speech acts and functional texts play a key role in both their structure and their content.

Looking ahead, we identify several fruitful areas for further research. The CEFR framework that we have used does not readily allow for a skill-based analysis of the curricula. It would therefore be of interest to draw on the revised and expanded sets of CEFR descriptors (Council of Europe, 2018), to identify how the various skills are included in the Indonesian curricula. More research is also needed into other dimensions of the formal curriculum. We have touched on textbooks and exams, and one extension of the present study would be to investigate the relationship between the various components of the formal curriculum.

Finally, one should ask how the ambitions of the national curricula accord with the realities of English learning in Indonesia. This merits extensive careful and non-judgmental investigation. For example, we suggest that empirical studies into the realities and challenges of teaching and learning English in Indonesia should inform the assessment of the effectiveness and appropriateness of both the formal curricula in current use. After all, the formal curriculum is only one dimension of the educational endeavour. It is crucial not to lose sight of the other curricular dimensions (Kelly, 2004) and the importance of closing the gaps between them.

### **The Authors**

Gloria Silvana Tumansery (Email: [gloriatumansery@gmail.com](mailto:gloriatumansery@gmail.com)) has seven years of experience in teaching English to children and adults in Indonesia. She is currently a lecturer at Akademi Keperawatan Ibnu Sina Kota Sabang, a nursing academy in Indonesia. Her academic interest and concern for the development of communicative competence arose in response to the inability of many of her students to communicate successfully in English. A collaboration with the nursing academy in Inland University of Applied Sciences in Norway facilitated exchange visits and academic partnerships between the two institutions. This allowed her to receive some training from Professor Juliet Munden, who later became her supervisor in writing her thesis. In her master's thesis, Tumansery investigated perceptions and practices relating to communicative competence in English in an Indonesian context.

Juliet Munden (Email: [juliet.munden@inn.no](mailto:juliet.munden@inn.no)) is a Professor of English at The Inland University of Applied Science in Norway. She holds a PhD from the University of Oslo. In her doctoral thesis, Munden compared the various ways in which Eritrean and Norwegian students make sense of literary texts. She has broad international experience, having taught in secondary schools in Kenya, and trained teachers in Namibia, Papua New Guinea, Eritrea, Zambia and Indonesia. During the past twenty years, she has worked with the initial and in-service education of English teachers in Norway. She is the author of

several school textbooks, as well as three books that are widely used in teacher education, at primary, middle and high school levels respectively. Her research interests include literacy development, the role of reading and literature in English learning, and comparative studies of education.

## References

- Aziz, M. S. A. (2014). Developing listening supplementary materials for the seventh-grade students based on curriculum 2013. Paper presented at *The 61<sup>st</sup> TEFLIN International Conference* (pp. 321-324), Sebelas Maret University, Solo, Indonesia.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approach to second language teaching and setting. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Council of Europe (2018). *CEFR: Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Gani, A. S., Fajrina, D. & Hanifa, R. (2015). Students' learning strategies for developing speaking ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 2(1), pp. 16-28.
- Gani, S. A., & Mahjaty, R. (2017). English teachers' knowledge for implementing the 2013 curriculum. *English Education Journal*, 8(2), 199-212.
- Ginanto, D. E., Mulyadin, T., & Putra, K. A. (2013). *Character education at schools in Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://dioneg.com/education/character-education-at-schools-in-indonesia/>.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. London: British Council.

- Hanifa, R. (2018). EFL published materials: An evaluation of English textbooks for junior high school in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9, 166-173.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-285). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ilyas, H. P. (2016). Retaining literature in the Indonesian ELT curriculum. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 3(1), 1-11.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Kasper, G. (1995). Wessen pragmatik? Für eine Neubestimmung sprachlicher Handlungskompetenz [Whose pragmatics? Towards a reconceptualization of linguistic action competence]. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung*, 6, 1-25.
- Kelly, A. V. (2004). *The curriculum: Theory and practice (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. London & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Klein, M. F., Tye, K. A., & Wright, J. E. (1979). A study of schooling: Curriculum. *The Phi Delta Kappa*, 61(4), 244-248.
- Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: between the commitment and competence and the quest for higher test score. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18(1), 1-14.
- Masduqi, H. (2012). The competence-based curriculum of English subject for senior high school in Indonesia: a critical evaluation. *Jurnal Humanitas*, 1(2), 56-68.
- Nova, M. (2017). Pendidikan karakter di kelas EFL Indonesia: Implementasi dan hambatan (Character education in Indonesian EFL classes: Implementation and obstacles). *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*, 7(2), 142-157.
- Nuraeni, S. F. C. (2018). A lesson from Indonesia: Implementing 2006 and 2013 English curriculum. *The Educational Review USA*, 2(7), 386-396.
- Remillard, J. & Heck, D. (2014). Conceptualizing the curriculum enactment process in mathematics education. *ZDM: The International Journal on Mathematics Education*, 46(5), 705-718.

- Rusmawan, P. N. (2016). The formulation of indicator in teacher's syllabus on speaking skill. *Jurnal Dimensi Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 4(2), 43-51.
- Sahiruddin. (2013). The implementation of the 2013 curriculum and the issues of English language teaching and learning in Indonesia. Paper presented at *The Asian Conference on Language Learning* (pp. 567-574). Osaka, Japan.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (1995). *A sociopragmatic comparative study of ostensible invitations in English and Farsi* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2002). *Text-familiarity, reading tasks and ESP test performance: A study on Iranian LEP and Non-LEP university students* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2006a). A sociopragmatic comparative study of ostensible invitations in English and Farsi. *Speech Communication*, 48(8), 903-912.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2006b). Language teaching: State of the art. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 169-193.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2012). Rethinking face and politeness. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 6(4), 119-140.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2014). Speech acts or language micro- and macro-games? *International Journal of Language Studies*, 8(4), 1-28.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2017). Lexemes, practs, and those who have yet to decide. *Linguistik Online*, 81, 77-93.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2020a). English for Specific Purposes: Traditions, trends, directions. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(1), 247-268.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2020b). Language assessment: Lessons learnt from the existing literature. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 14(2), 135-146.
- Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp.170-183). London: Sage.

- Simensen, A. M. (2007). *Teaching a foreign language: Principles and procedures* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Oslo: Fagbokforlaget.
- Speitz, H. (2018). National curricula and international perspectives. In H. Bøhn, M. Dypedahl & G.-A. Myklevold (Eds.), *Teaching and learning English* (pp. 38-50) Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Tumansery, G. S. (2016). Students' strategies in acquiring English communicative competence in Indonesia. *Jurnal Serambi Akademica*, 4(1), 100-105.
- Ur, P. (2012, June 10). *English as a lingua franca and some implications for English teachers* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yTidAm0dRR0>
- Waedaoh, A., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2019). Enhancing English language learners' conversation abilities via CA-informed sitcom lessons: A case study of Thai high school students. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 13(1), 41-56.
- Widiati, U., Rohmah, Z., & Furaidah. (2017). *Buku Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK Kelas X (English Book for General, Islamic and Vocational Upper Secondary School)*. Rev. ed. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan (Ministry of Education and Culture). Retrieved from [http://bsd.pendidikan.id/data/2013/kelas\\_10sma/siswa/Kelas\\_10\\_SM\\_A\\_Bahasa\\_Inggris\\_Siswa\\_2017.pdf](http://bsd.pendidikan.id/data/2013/kelas_10sma/siswa/Kelas_10_SM_A_Bahasa_Inggris_Siswa_2017.pdf)
- Widodo, H. P. (2016). 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. 127-152). Basel: Springer International Publishing.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Yonata, F., Farida, R. A., Nugraheni, F. W. (2017). Multicultural content in Indonesian English textbook: What material should be? Proceedings of *The 8th National English Language Teachers and Lecturers Conference (NELTAL)* (pp. 69-73). Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia.
- Yulia, Y. (2014). *An evaluation of English Language Teaching programs in Indonesian junior high schools in the Yogyakarta Province*. (Doctoral dissertation). Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University, Melbourne.

**APPENDIX 1: Competence Standards and Basic Competences of C06****Competence Standards and Basic Competences (2006)**

Subject: English language

**Grade 12**

Competence Standard	Basic Competence
<p>Listening</p> <p>To understand meaning in formal and continuous (sustained) transactional and interpersonal conversational texts in the context of everyday life</p>	<p>To respond to meaning in formal and continuous (sustained) transactional (getting things done) and interpersonal (socializing) conversations accurately, fluently, and appropriately, using oral language, and involving speech acts: to persuade, to encourage, to criticize, to express hope, and to prevent somebody from doing something</p> <p>To respond to meaning in formal and continuous (sustained) transactional (getting things done) and interpersonal (socializing) conversations accurately, fluently, and appropriately, using oral language, and involving speech acts: to regret, to express / ask about plans, objectives, intentions, to predict, to speculate, and to provide judgement</p>
<p>To understand meaning in short and monologue functional texts in the form of narrative and review in the context of everyday life</p>	<p>To respond to meaning in formal and informal short functional texts, using oral language accurately, fluently and appropriately, in the context of everyday life</p> <p>To understand and to respond to meaning in monologue texts, using oral language accurately, fluently and appropriately, in the context of everyday life, in the form of narrative and to review texts</p>
<p>Speaking</p> <p>To express meaning in interactional texts, with an emphasis on formal continual transactional</p>	<p>To express meaning in formal and continuous (sustained) transactional (getting things done) and interpersonal (socializing) conversations, accurately, fluently, and appropriately, using</p>

<b>Competence Standard</b>	<b>Basic Competence</b>
conversations, in the context of everyday life	<p>oral language, and involving speech acts: to persuade, to encourage, to criticize, to express hope, and to prevent somebody from doing something</p> <p>To respond to meaning in formal and continuous (sustained) transactional (getting things done) and interpersonal (socializing) conversations accurately, fluently, and appropriately, using oral language, and involving speech acts: to regret, to express / ask plans, objectives, intentions, to predict, to speculate, and to provide judgement</p>
To express meaning in short and monologue functional texts in the form of narrative and review accurately, fluently, and appropriately in the context of everyday life	<p>To respond to meaning in formal and informal short functional texts using written language accurately, fluently, and appropriately in the context of everyday life</p> <p>To express meaning in monologue texts using written language accurately, fluently, and appropriately in the context of everyday life, in the forms of narrative and to review texts</p>
<p>Reading</p> <p>To understand meaning in monologue written texts in narrative and review forms accurately, fluently, and appropriately in the context of everyday life, to access science</p>	<p>To respond to meaning in short formal and informal functional texts using written language accurately, fluently, and appropriately in the context of everyday life, and to access science</p> <p>To respond to meaning and rhetorical devices in monologue texts using a variety of written language accurately, fluently, and appropriately in the context of everyday life, and to access science in the form of narrative and to review texts</p>
<p>Writing</p> <p>To express meaning in monologue/essay written texts in the forms of</p>	<p>To express meaning and rhetorical devices in essays using written language accurately, fluently, and appropriately in the context of</p>

Competence Standard	Basic Competence
narrative and review in the context of everyday life	everyday life in the form of narrative and to review texts

## APPENDIX 2: Core and Basic Competences of C13

### Core and Basic Competences (2013)

Subject: English language

#### Grade 10

Core Competence	Basic Competence
To fully appreciate and practice the teachings of own religion	To be grateful for the opportunity to learn English as a language of international communication by manifesting it in the spirit of learning
To fully appreciate and practice honesty, discipline, responsibility, caring (collaboration, cooperation, tolerance, peace), politeness, responsibility and proactivity and act as part of the solution to various problems in interacting with the social and natural environments to present oneself as a reflection of the nation in world society	<p>To show politeness and caring in communicating with teachers and friends</p> <p>To show honesty, discipline, confidence, and responsibility in transactional communication with teachers and friends</p> <p>To show responsibility, caring, cooperation, and peace-loving in functional communication</p>
To understand, apply, and analyse factual, conceptual, and procedural knowledge based on their curiosity	<p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in texts of self-introduction, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in giving compliments and how</p>

Core Competence	Basic Competence
<p>about science, technology, art, culture, and humanity with an understanding of humanity, nationality, state, and civilization regarding the causes of phenomena and events, as well as applying procedural knowledge in the specific field of study based on their talents and interests in order to solve problems</p>	<p>to response to it, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in expressing caring and how to response to it, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in expressing and asking about intention to do something, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in expressing extended congratulations and how to response to it, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in expressing and asking about actions / events carried out / happened in the past referring to their end, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in in simple descriptive texts about people, tourist attractions, and famous historic buildings, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in announcements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in the simple recount text about experiences / events, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To analyse social functions, text structures, and linguistic elements in simple narrative texts in the form of folk tales, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To identify social functions and linguistic elements in songs</p>
<p>To process, reason, and present concretely and abstractly everything</p>	<p>To compose simple oral and written texts in introducing, asking and responding to self-introduction with regards to social functions, text</p>

Core Competence	Basic Competence
<p>studied in school independently and be able to use methods according to scientific principles</p>	<p>structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To compose oral and written texts to express and respond to compliments with regards to social functions, text structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To compose oral and written texts to express caring with regards to social functions, text structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To compose oral and written texts to express and ask about intention to do something about action/activity and its response with regards to social functions, text structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To compose oral and written texts to express and respond to extended congratulation with regards the purpose, text structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To compose oral and written texts to express and ask about actions / events carried out / happened in the past referring to their end, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To understand meaning in simple oral and written descriptive texts</p> <p>To edit simple oral and written descriptive texts about people, tourist attractions, and famous historic buildings by taking into account the social functions, the text structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To compose simple oral and written descriptive texts about people, tourist attractions, and famous historic buildings by taking into account the social functions, the text structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To understand meaning in announcements</p>

<b>Core Competence</b>	<b>Basic Competence</b>
	<p>To compose oral and written announcements, very short and simple with regard to social functions, text structures, and correct linguistic elements, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To understand meaning in simple oral and written recount texts</p> <p>To compose simple oral and written recount texts about experiences / activities / events by taking into account the social functions, the structures of the text, and linguistic elements properly, appropriate to the contexts</p> <p>To understand meaning in oral and written narrative text in the form of simple folk tales</p> <p>To understand meaning in simple songs</p>