

# Exploring Materials Development of English Curricula in Indonesia: A Content Analysis Study

Ratna Sari Dewi<sup>1</sup>, Desi Nahartini<sup>1</sup>, Dede Puji Setiono<sup>1</sup> and Imam Subchi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia

**Keywords:** Curriculum; Material Development; 2013 Curriculum.

**Abstract:** Curriculum implementation is based on the learners' potential, development, and condition to master useful competency. Learners must have quality educational services and opportunity to freely, dynamically, and comfortably express themselves. With these basic principles of curriculum implementation, teachers are demanded to have the know-how to teach. Unfortunately, when Indonesian English teachers teach their students, they mostly rely on using available textbooks. However, such learning materials which are ideally suitable for the needs of the students are not always available. This situation should not discourage teachers as far as they have the objectives of the teaching. To know what English teachers should teach, teachers have to explore the materials development intended in curriculum. This study aims to know: 1) how English materials development is constructed within the latest curriculum in Indonesia, how materials of English subject in senior high school are developed in K13 in senior high school are in the two recent curriculums. This research employed a qualitative approach by using content analysis method. The data obtained through questionnaire, document analysis, and observation. This research's findings showed that the development of ELT Material Development in Indonesia from 2013 Curriculum is not followed by the changing of approaches used by teacher in classroom. Teachers tend to teach more grammar and structure separately and explicitly out of their communicative competence. Teachers' habitual and their previous experiences influence the way of their teaching. Therefore, the government's policy to certify teacher is very crucial in developing ELT syllabus and further for providing 'effective teaching' as part of curriculum development.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Curriculum serves as the substance that gives the soul to learning process. Curriculum should be primarily based on the consideration of promoting learners' interest in identifying and developing their full potential. The term curriculum is used here to refer to the overall plan or design for a subject and how the content for a Subject is transformed into a blueprint for teaching and learning which enables the desired learning outcomes to be achieved (Richard, 2013; Sugiharto, 2013).

Since the planning of the curriculum should be set based on the students' need, the changing of the curriculum as periodically is a must from era to era. A number of principles in curriculum design cannot be neglected (Johnson, 1989; Brown, 1995). Then, materials of the instruction should follow the curriculum as it is the most easily noticed as the mark of the changing (Anderson et al, 2010)

In the history of Indonesia's education, national education curriculum has experienced many changes, namely in the years 1947, 1952, 1964, 1968, 1975, 1984, 1994, 2004, 2006 and the latest is 2013. In ten years ago in Indonesia there were several factors which led to the movement for a competency-based and decentralized curriculum.

The first factor is that it has something to do with the implementation of regional autonomy around the end of 1990. The curriculum which has been formally made by the government is still considered to have many weaknesses caused by the treatment of students who are considered the same throughout Indonesia although religion, culture, language and potential of individuals are different (Sanjaya, 2005; Suderajat, 2004; Us & Harmi, 2011; Utomo, 2005).

The second factor is that in the curriculum field most of the national and international results are considered bad. For example, Quoted from (Sanjaya, 2010) about the World Bank it was explained that

based on the survey, for four years student reading skills were the lowest compared to all Asian countries. The unsettled integrated curriculum in Indonesia also became the issues.

Considering the needs and the demands on the English material in every changing of the curriculum, English material instruction logically also should be developed (Brown 1995). Unfortunately, the changing of curriculum in Indonesia let say the two latest curriculums; school based curriculum 2006/ KTSP and

curriculum 2013/ K13 didn't clearly tell about the material development of English Subject.

### 1.1 Curriculum 2013

Curriculum 2013 was officially launched on July 15, 2013 in ministry of Education and Culture. While, in Ministry of Religion it was begun in July 2014. Basically the curriculum in 2013 is similar to the former curriculum, curriculum 2006 or Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP), with some differences. There is a new definition of curriculum content applied for the 2013 Curriculum such as Kompetensi Dasar (basic competencies) and Kompetensi Inti (core competencies). In addition, the knowledge utilization of KI is from the new taxonomy of educational objective developed by Marzano and (Kendall, 2007).

In terms of the process dimension (the design of learning process in a curriculum), Curriculum 2013 advocates student active learning with the scientific approach model. The model has five activities which should be developed in the learning-teaching process; observing, questioning, exploring/experimenting, analyzing, and communicating.

Each of these activities is considered as a competency and, therefore,

it should be planned and assessed. Regarding to the assessment, the 2013 Curriculum advocates the use of 1 - 4 to score the students works and transform these scores to A, B, C, and D replacing the very long tradition 1-10 scale.

### 1.2 Material Development

Materials development is both a field of study and a practical undertaking. As a field it studies the principles and procedures of the design, implementation and evaluation of language teaching materials' (Tomlinson 2001: 66).

In the notion of curriculum design and material development Nunan (2001), proposed six principles of material design; first, English language material

should be contextualized clearly to the curriculum they serve, second, English language materials should be authentic in terms of text and task, third, English language material should stimulate interaction, fourth, English language material should allow learners to focus on formal aspect of language. Fifth, English language material should encourage learners to develop learning skill and skills in learning, and sixth, English language material should encourage learners to apply their developing language skills to the world beyond the classroom.

As a practical undertaking it refers to anything which is done by writers, teachers or learners to provide sources of language input, to exploit those sources in ways which maximize the likelihood of intake and to stimulate purposeful output: in other words the supplying of information about and/or experience of the language in ways designed to promote language learning.

Ideally the 'two aspects of materials development are interactive in that the theoretical studies inform and are informed by the development and use of classroom materials'. In developing materials for any aspect of language learning, whether it be a skill-based course in listening, speaking, reading or writing or an integrated-skills basic series, the writer's understanding of language and language use will have a major impact on material's design, since it will play a role in determining the goals the writer sets for the materials, the focus of the materials themselves and the activities within them (Richard, 2005).

### 1.3 Material Development based on Curriculum 2013

In Curriculum 2013, the government then sets the Graduate Competency Standards (SKL) through Permendiknas Number 54 Year 2013. The Graduate Competency Standards (SKL) is a criteria of graduate qualification that includes attitude, knowledge, and skills. Then SKL is translated into the form of Core Competence (KI), then translated again into the form of Basic Competence (KD). The required KIs and KDs are described in the following paragraphs (Permendikbud No.60 / 2014).

Grounded on the background above, a set of research questions guides the current study:

1. How the teachers of senior high school within Curriculum 2013 construct materials development?
2. How is the class performance in using the material development in both curricula?

KTSP (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan) or School-Based Curriculum (SBC) is an operational educational program that is planned and actualized at each instructive organization (school). In light of the Minister of National Education Regulation (Permendiknas) number multi year 2006, there are various parts canvassed in School-Based Curriculum (KTSP), for example, first, the goals of instruction organization; second, the structure and substance of School-Based Curriculum (KTSP); and (3) scholastic logbook. (Hartoyo, 2011) refers to that essentially the 2006 educational programs (KTSP) is produced from standard of substance by schools dependent on their specific situation and possibility. Consequently, each school has an alternate route in performing KTSP. The KTSP of one school ought not be equivalent to different schools regardless of whether it has a similar report program in light of the fact that each school has distinctive qualities. In spite of the fact that KTSP shifts among one and different schools, government gives a few controls expressed in Governmental Regulation (PP) No.19, 2005 concerning National Standard of Education (SNP) on May 16, 2005 for example, standard of substance and standard of ability of alumni (Hartoyo, 2011). In KTSP, when building up their schedule, instructors should initially recognize the normal abilities gave in the Curriculum Policies archive. Educators at that point decide the substance of each branch of knowledge, instructional strategies, sort of appraisal, learning markers and materials that will offer understudies the chance to meet the normal capabilities (BSNP, 2006). Instructional techniques picked by educators are prescribed to be understudy focus and include different dynamic learning strategies (BSNP, 2006).

Competency-based educational programs (KTSP) in the Indonesian setting seems, by all accounts, to be characterized extensively, as the Curriculum Policies and Curriculum Guidelines propose, by expected skills grasping three learning spaces (BSNP, 2006). These three domains, *cognitive*, *affective* and *psychomotor*, are drawn from Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956). The *cognitive* domain is concerned with intellectual skills, being divided into six levels of complexity, moving from the lowest order of thinking to the highest. These are knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Knowledge concerns remembering of previously learned material and is described by using operational verbs which are measurable such as memorise, recall or name. Comprehension deals with the ability to demonstrate understanding of

facts and ideas. Application refers to the ability to use information and materials to solve problems and to respond to concrete situations. Analysis involves identifying and analysing patterns, organising ideas and recognising trends, while synthesis requires the learner to use existing concepts to create new ideas, designs and inventions. Finally, evaluation is characterised by comparison and evaluation of ideas.

The *affective* domain deals with attitudes, motivation, willingness to participate, and valuing of what is being learned. There are five levels in the affective domain moving through the lowest order processes to the highest. They are receiving, responding, valuing, organising and characterising. Receiving relates to the students' willingness to listen or to pay attention. Responding refers to students' active participation in the learning process. Valuing is concerned with the values students attach to objects, ideas or experiences and their acceptance or rejection of particular attitudes or actions. Organising refers to students' willingness to synthesise values, information, and ideas and accommodate them within their own schema, and characterising deals with students' willingness to change their behaviour to reflect their values and themselves.

The keep going area, psychomotor, centers around learning through aptitudes advancement and execution identifying with manual assignments and physical development. Under the KTSP, the psychomotor area demonstrate given to educators in PD was the one presented by (Dave,1975). This space incorporates impersonation, control, accuracy, enunciation, and naturalization. Impersonation is worried about watching or replicating conduct. Control identifies with performing specific activities by adhering to guidelines and rehearsing every one. Exactness centers around understudies playing out an undertaking or action with aptitude and to elevated requirements without help. Explanation is worried about performing exercises that relate and consolidate important aptitudes to accomplish amicable and reliable outcomes. Naturalization alludes to very gifted execution which is performed normally and frequently consequently. These learning areas outline the expert advancement gave to instructors about the idea of capabilities and how to consolidate these abilities into the prospectus (Depdiknas, 2007).

## 2 METHODS

The approach used in this study is a qualitative approach with the use of content analysis as the method. The content is analyzed by using six principles of materials design specified by Nunan and his theory about curriculum, the study intend to investigate each curriculum (KTSP and K13) towards English Subject material. To support the theory of Nunan, the theory proposed by Tomlinson also will be used. In addition, the data used in the study are the documents in curriculums and some textbooks used for senior high school published by the Ministry of National Education (MONE) of the Republic of Indonesia.

The instruments used in this study are documents analysis, interview sheets and classroom observation sheet. The document analysis sheet is made from Nunan and Richard's theory about Material Development with some adaptations and modifications. The interview sheet is constructed by considering Tomlinson's research findings about material development. The interview was done to some English teachers of senior high schools in South Tangerang and Jakarta. The instruments are validated to check the construct validity and the reliability of the instruments.

## 3 FINDING

### 3.1 Questionnaire Result

According to the results of the open questionnaire, the teachers generally point out same idea that the main characteristic of School-based curriculum (KTSP) is the authority of the school to develop, design and implement this curriculum based on the school's contexts and potentials. Also, the aspects of cognitive, psychomotoric and affective become the main focus in this curriculum. Nevertheless, only is cognitive aspect clearly defined to be assessed in the curriculum.

Unlike KTSP, for teachers, K13 states straightforwardly to use scientific approach in teaching by operating 5M (*Mengamati* (observe), *Mengumpulkan data* (collecting data),

*Menanya* (questioning), *Mengkomunikasikan* (communicating), and *Mengasosiasi* (associating)). Furthermore, three teaching models are offered to be implemented by the teachers at their school despite of any diversity in students' level competence and background, namely discovery learning, problem based learning and project based learning.

In the given the situation of some changes from KTSP to K13 above, six teachers find the materials in reference textbooks to be generally same or have no significant difference. However, one teacher considers the material in K13 reference textbook as a perfection of the textbook in the previous curriculum. Nevertheless, with generally same materials, five teachers note some differences such as reduction in certain materials, teaching method to be implemented, the use of High Order of Thinking Skills (HOTS), an emphasis on character education, and the structure or order of the materials.

Most of the teachers, thirty one teachers to be precise, use the textbook published by the government as their main source of reference. In other words, the government textbook still has a prominent role for teachers in material development as well as textbooks published by public publishers. There are twelve out of those thirty one teachers use textbooks from other public publishers as their additional references such as Erlangga (entitled *Lokahead*, *Pathway*, *Bupena*), *Grafindo*, *Yudhistira*, and *Windows on the World*.

The reference used by teachers is not only limited on textbook but also other sources in order to enrich students' knowledge as mentioned by one teacher. Some other sources are video, film, social media (newspaper) and internet. A lot of advantages can be benefited from internet such as web search engine (Google), Youtube, and other websites (e.g. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary). A number of materials are available therein the form of text, audio or video.

The next part is an investigation of using authentic materials for teaching and learning in class such as song, film, poems, newspaper, magazine or internet. According to teachers' responses, all teachers have ever used any kind of those materials in class. The teachers use this kind of materials by firstly planning the lesson in line with the syllabus and then look for further materials in the internet after textbook.

In the classroom teaching, there are several techniques that the teacher uses in using the materials such as analysing the song, film watching, reading newspaper or magazine and discuss the moral value within. Second, teachers assign students to work in group and do a research on particular topic being discussed.

In spite of several different characteristics between KTSP and Curriculum 2013, twenty one teachers view that the material is not different or generally the same even though clear distinctions exist in terms of the teaching approach, method and



techniques in teaching, and an emphasis on students' character building and 21st century learning skills (4C). In fact, regardless of the similarity of the materials, two teachers find the material of K13 more developed and completed by providing more examples than KTSP.

Unlike those teachers, the other eight teachers are aware of the focus on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Skills and Scientific Approach in K13 as a clear difference in the material of both curriculums. Thus, this is necessary for teachers to look for the material which is able to facilitate students to be more creative and productive by providing factual material, practical examples, unlike KTSP which provides more theories.

Also, the material needs to be relevant with the teaching procedures to be implemented with required certain quality of questions (HOTS). During the teaching, teacher needs to make sure that the material makes possible to strengthen students' character of nationality, religiosity, mutual help (gotong-royong), caring, cooperation, confidence. Eventually, the material should enable teachers to assess students' behaviour and social skill, not only the knowledge aspect.

After investigating the teachers of view on the materials used in KTSP and K13, the next question aims to hear about any suggestions would be made by the teachers. Unfortunately, eighteen teachers give no response to this question. Nonetheless, seven teachers say that adding more portion to the current material is unnecessary since it is already enough for some teachers and many for the others. Teachers have different opinion in which or what materials to be added in learning. The addition of material is necessary especially in that requires bigger points of graduate competence standard. Besides, the material for high school students are too easy so more materials are essential to build better understanding among the students, especially in language structure. Meanwhile, one teacher views that the idea of adding materials might be different from one teacher to the teachers according to their teaching ideology and the difficulty level of particular materials for students, such as text genres.

As previously mentioned that lesson planning is an initial step for teachers to develop their teaching materials. In this part, sixteen teachers leave the answer sheet blank. However, according to the response of seven teachers, it shows that relatively the lesson planning in both curriculums is the same. The fundamental difference of both is the teaching in class with the scientific approach, character

building, literacy and 4C as main characteristics of K13 curriculum as mentioned by three teachers.

Even though those teachers claim the lesson planning generally the same, the other teachers are aware of several aspects they need to think of in lesson planning according to terms and conditions applied in the curriculum as mentioned by one of the teachers. The lesson plan shows that K13 has already determined the standard to be achieved by the students unlike KTSP in which the competence match with students' need and potentials. In more detail, several teachers stated that graduate competency standard (SKL) in K13 requires teachers to describe the competence according to the 8 process

Once the lesson plan is well planned consistent with the terms and conditions of the curriculum with specific learning objectives, eleven teachers search for more relevant materials from other sources such as internet, book, discussion of professional development program with subject teachers (Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran – MGMP), or discuss with other English teachers. One teacher mentioned the use of evaluation of previous learning is also useful in order to develop materials for more effective learning.

### 3.2 Document Analysis Result

The discussion of documents analyses on the material development of both curricula was referred to the six principles of material design by Nunan (2001). According to the data of the document analyses gained by analyzing the lesson plans and the materials from both curricula (KTSP and K13) given by the 20 selected teachers to their students, the results proved in the following:

- a) The materials were contextualized to the served curriculum.
- b) 80% of the materials given were not authentic (taken from English textbooks or internet)
- c) The material provided most likely stimulated interaction in spite of its inauthenticity.
- d) 70% teachers led the students to focus on formal aspect of language, while the rests just focused on the topic and examples.
- e) 70% teachers encouraged students to develop their learning skills and strategies in learning by providing them with the confidence to persist in their attempts to find solutions when they have initial difficulties in communicating.

- f) The materials given by the teachers were considered to be encouraging students to apply their developing language skills in their daily activities and situations, and their future.

### 3.3 Class Performance Analysis Result

Before the teaching learning process, the lesson plan made by the English teachers as the scoring criteria based on the observation checklist from MONE. The teachers analyzed whether the lesson plan arranged is in line with curriculum 2013 or not. There are 25 components of the lesson plan grouped in nine aspects: (1) Lesson identity, (2) Formulation of the indicators, (3) Formulation of the learning objectives,

(4) Learning material, (5) Source of learning, (6) Media of the learning process, (7) Model of the learning, (8) Scenario of the learning, and (9) Scoring.

According to the result of the assessment on teachers' lesson plans, the teacher have planned the lesson very well by putting down all 25 components listed in nine aspects above and corresponding to the requirements of the curriculum. This finding is in line with Suparlan (2003) who proposed that lesson plan is to be made as detailed as possible in accordance with the needs and demands in the syllabus.

Basically, the teachers used the book *When the English Rings the Bell* as the main resource in teaching. However, a few discrepancies were found. First, teachers did not include the lesson objectives in the lesson plan documents. Second, there was no clear description of allocated time for each activity during the class.

During the teaching and learning process in the classroom, students actively participated in classroom activities by giving the opinion, questioning, doing the task well, and answering the question. Also, students paid attention to the teacher. It was evidenced by students' attention to the teacher's explanation, students' enthusiasm, students' interest, classroom environment (happiness in the teaching learning process). In team work, students showed satisfactory performance by helping the other friends, appreciating the other friends, having solidarity, and being active in group. Last, in terms of responsibility, students showed positive responsibility among students during the class.

### 3.4 The Result of Teaching and Learning Process Analysis

According to the observation in accordance with the observation checklist by *Depdikbud*, the activity used by the teacher was considered to be a good activity by having a pre-activity which included an explanation of the basic competence, and a discussion connecting the current lesson to the previous one. In main-activity, the teacher with enthusiasm guided the students to do the task. Also, the teacher encouraged students to be active, pay attention and be responsible during the group work.

Last in the post-activity, the teacher guided the students to communicate with friends in the group and invited them to solve the problem together. Nevertheless, the time allocation was not clearly divided for each activity.

## 4 DISCUSSIONS

### 4.1 How the Teachers of Senior High School within the Two Latest Curriculums Construct Materials Development

First of all, the analyses of results pointed out that teachers were fully aware of the distinctions between KTSP and K13. The most basic difference is that KTSP is developed from standard of content by the school based on its context and potentiality (Hartoyo, 2011; Muslich, 2008, p.17, Suparlan, 2011, p.9). The teachers' well understanding on this distinction was interpreted in several different features to consider which then written down in planning the lesson as required by each curriculum.

The other difference is that K13 requires teachers to implement the scientific approach in their teaching by using three suggested learning models, namely: discovery learning, problem based learning and project based learning. As the very first step in developing materials, the teachers have successfully accomplished Nunan's first principle by contextualizing the materials to the curriculum.

In planning the lesson in order to develop the materials, the results highlighted two points. First, the teachers made use of the textbook provided by the government as their main reference. The teachers provided various reasons when further materials after this textbook would be necessary, such as those mentioned by Tomlinson (2001) that the used materials should inform learners about the language,

be experiential by providing exposure to the language in use, be elicitive by stimulating language use, and be exploratory by facilitating discoveries about language use.

This situation provided an evidence that a textbook does not always meet the variety of conditions in a language class (Ur, 1996; Richards, 2003). The type of the materials taken from other sources varied among the teachers depending on their view of language and learning to be comprehended (Crawford in Richards-Renandya, 2002). Second, the teachers' lesson plans were generally well written. Unfortunately, teachers could have planned their lessons in more detail by describing the lesson objectives, estimated time allocation of each activity and other sources used.

As mentioned, teachers primarily used the materials from the government textbook with intermittently looking further materials from other sources. It brought up an idea for future researcher to study more deeply how many percentage the other sources is used in certain period of time. Among a number of reasons provided by teachers in using supporting materials (mostly from internet) after textbook was their necessity as authentic materials to support the learning by encouraging learners to apply their developing language skills to the world beyond the classroom as defined in Principle 6.

Those authentic materials could be in the form of written (newspaper, magazine,) or spoken (video, audio). As pointed out by Nunan (2001) that the text specifically written for the classroom purpose generally distort the language in some way. In fact, the results of document analysis showed that teachers used most of the materials from the internet (but still with the texts specifically designed for teaching in classrooms) and textbooks. This situation suggests that teachers were fully concerned about the essential of using authentic materials but did not put it into practice. Thus, the Principle 2 that the materials should be authentic in terms of text and task requires an improvement.

#### **4.2 How the Class Performance in using the Material Development in Both Curriculum**

In the classroom, teachers followed the lesson plan for the most part. In the same way as the lesson had been planned before, the activity was divided into pre-activity, main-activity and post-activity as proposed by Sadiman (2000). Unfortunately, unspecified time allocation of each activity in the

lesson plan impacted on the indeterminate length of each activity during the class.

This situation could be a serious issue since teachers need to make sure that certain competences should be achieved by students for certain period of time in one academic year. In addition, the classroom did not last 2x40 minutes as expected in the curriculum, but 2x35 minutes, in spite of a suggestion that the effective of time allocation every meeting in teaching learning process at Junior High School is about 2x45 minutes to improve the quality of the teacher in teaching learning process (Rusman, 2012).

During the classroom activities, the teachers played an important role in order to support the learning process among students in the implementation of learning models according to the scientific approach (Permendikbud 81A: 2013). Teachers encouraged students so that students were able to acquire the 5Ms ((*Menanya* (questioning), *Mengumpulkan data* (collecting data), *Mengasosiasi* (associating), *Menyimpulkan* (making conclusion)).

A number of roles that the teachers played, such as motivating, encouraging, interacting, offering suggestions, giving feedbacks etc., led highly positive performance of most students. It was proved by most students successfully met the lesson target with a few of them reached the higher and the lower. In line with Principle 5 that the material should encourage learners to develop learning skill and skills in learning, the material needed also to be supported by teachers' encouragement.

This encouragement is about how the teachers' instruction could trigger the interaction between students to students and between students to the teachers so the interaction in Principle 3 is likely to stimulate and happen. One of the important roles played by the teachers is giving feedback during teaching and learning activities in classroom, especially in every step of 5M activity. Giving feedback was worthwhile to emphasize the focus of formal aspect of language which is comprised in the materials according to Principle 4. Accordingly, the students performed highly positive activeness, attention, team work and responsibility.

## **5 CONCLUSIONS**

The aim of this study is to investigate how the teachers construct materials development within Curriculum 2013 and how the class performance is in using the material. The researcher used interview, questionnaire, document analysis and classroom

observation as the methods to conduct data collection and data analysis.

The results found that the material development in Curriculum 2013 has no significant difference from its development in the previous development in spite of a number of changes in the newest curriculum. The use of materials in this kinds of development facilitates students to perform well during the teaching and learning process in the classroom..

Post-Colonial Perspective of English Language Education in Indonesia.,  
Wiggins G, McTighe J, 2006, *Understanding by Design: A Framework for Effecting Curricular Development and Assessment*. Alexandria: VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

## REFERENCES

- Ball, D. L., & Feiman-Nemser, S. 1988. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 18(4): Using textbooks and teachers' guides: A dilemma for beginning teachers and teacher educators.
- Browns, J. D. (1995): The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development. Massachusets: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Cohen, Louis, Laurence Manion, and Keith Morrison. 2005. *Research Methods in Education (Fifth edition)*. USA: The Taylor Francis E-Library.
- Cooker, L. 2008. Self-access materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Cunningsworth, A. 1984. *Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching material*. London, UK: Heinemann
- Cresswell, J. W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among the Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., Anderson, N. J. 2010. *A principled approach to content-based materials development for reading*. In N. Harwood (ed.). *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold
- Hartoyo. 2011. *The Indonesian Quarterly* 21(1) : Curriculum Inquiry English Language Education in Indonesia
- Johnson, R. K. 1989. *The Second language curriculum*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nastaran Chegeni & Nasrin Chegeni, *ELT Voices – India ( Vol . 3 Issue 4 ) | August 2013* Language Curriculum Development and Importance of Needs Analysis
- Nunan, D. 1997. Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London, UK: Longman
- Richard J C, 2013, *RLEC Journal* 44 (1): Curriculum Approach in Language Teaching-Forward, Central and Backward Design.
- Sugiharto, S. 2013. *The Indonesian Quarterly* 41(3) : Rethinking Globalization, Reclaiming the Local: A