Language Teaching (2020), 1–33
doi:10.1017/S0261444820000208

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

A COUNTRY IN FOCUS

English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011–2019)

Subhan Zein[1]*, Didi Sukyadi[2], Fuad Abdul Hamied[2] and Nenden Sri Lengkanawati[2]

[1]The University of Queensland, Australia and [2]Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia
*Corresponding author. E-mail: m.zein@uq.edu.au

Abstract
This article reviews the significant and diverse range of research on English language education in Indonesia in the eight-year period 2011–2019. It brings together a body of research consisting of 108 sources, ranging from journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings and doctorate dissertations, to inform the international research and practice community. The contributions cover primary education, secondary education and tertiary education in highly diverse Indonesia where 707 living languages co-exist and struggle to find space in its linguistic ecology. The discussion will provide insights into how factors such as educational policies, ideologies as well as sociocultural and religious values are in contestation in shaping research into and the practice of English language education in the complex, dynamic and polycentric sociolinguistic situation of Indonesia, which has been recently conceptualized as superglossia (Zein, 2020). It is hoped our insights will help inform other multilingual contexts facing the unprecedented need for transforming English language education in this increasingly globalized world.

1. Introduction

In this article, we review the significant and diverse range of research on English language education in Indonesia in the eight-year period 2011–2019, responding to *Language Teaching*'s continuing commitment to becoming an outlet for research on foreign language teaching and learning in peripheral contexts.

First, we provide coverage of research into English language education in Indonesia, the world's fourth most populous nation as well as a nation predicted to rise as the world's fifth largest economy by 2030 (PWC, 2015). Indonesia, being a populous country in the non-English-speaking world, continues to become an important market for English language education. It also holds a prominent position within the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) community where English has become the driving force for globalization with influences extending beyond the linguistic sphere to also reach the economic, political, cultural, and ideological ones (Hamied, 2013; Zein, 2019).

Second, we aim to invigorate the recent tradition of research in English language education in the country. Indonesia has a 50-year tradition of English language education but a comparatively shorter fruitful history of research. In recent years, interest in English language teaching and learning in the country has demonstrated an upward trajectory at three levels of education: primary (e.g. Damayanti, 2014; Hawanti, 2012; Prastiwi, 2015; Zein, 2016a, 2017a), secondary (e.g. Sukyadi, 2015; Sundayana, 2015; Putra & Lukmana, 2017; Widodo, 2016) and tertiary (e.g. Dewi, 2017a, 2017b; Riyanti, 2017; Zacharias, 2014a, 2014b, 2016). This article will elucidate the current trends of English language teaching and learning in the country at the three levels of education as captured by rigorously selected recent studies. Previous work in this series has focused on familiar clusters such as second language acquisition (SLA)-related issues (e.g. Medgyes & Nikolov, 2014; Oliver, Chen, & Moore, 2016), language pedagogy and teaching methodology (e.g. Gao, Liao, & Li, 2014; Moodie & Nam, 2016; Porto, Montemayor-Borsinger, & López-Barrios, 2016), language policy (e.g. Medgyes & Nikolov, 2014; Vieira, Moreira, & Peralta, 2014) and language teacher education (e.g. Moodie & Nam, 2016;

© The Author(s) 2020. Published by Cambridge University Press

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208
CrossMark

Porto et al., 2016). Since we are examining research based on the institutional levels of primary, secondary and tertiary education, we offer an a priori approach to investigating common themes in English language education and scrutinize the specific and contextualized problems arising at each level.

Finally, the article is motivated by the linguistic contestation resulting from the need for English instruction in one of the most linguistically and culturally diverse contexts in the world. With 707 individual living languages, Indonesia is second in the world in terms of linguistic diversity after Papua New Guinea (Simons & Fennig, 2017a, 2017b). But indigenous and heritage languages struggle to co-exist alongside a national language (Indonesian). Concerns over language endangerment are mounting (see Anderbeck, 2015), and there are repeated calls for the development of multilingual and multicultural education (Hamied, 2012; Raihani, 2017; Zein, 2019). Meanwhile, amid the transition from English as a foreign language (EFL) to English as a lingua franca (ELF) (Zein, 2018a), opinions are divided as to whether English is detrimental to indigenous languages (Coleman, 2016a, 2016b; Hadisantosa, 2010; Sugiharto, 2015a) or beneficial for upward mobility and participation in international communities such as the ASEAN (Hamied, 2013; Zein, 2019).

Thus, it is hoped our discussion will provide deeper insights into how factors such as educational policies, ideologies, sociocultural and religious values play complementary, if not contesting, roles in shaping research into and the practice of English language education in the linguistically diverse nation. Our discussion may also help inform other multilingual contexts facing the unprecedented need for transforming English language education in this increasingly globalized world.

1.1 Structure

The structure of this article is as follows. First, we discuss the methodological approaches to selecting and reviewing sources in this article. This is followed by an overview of the historical background of English language education. In Section 2, we review studies on the impact of the surge of interest in English teaching in Indonesia on linguistic ecology. Section 3 continues with coverage of the teaching and learning of English in primary education, focusing on the interrelated elements of pedagogy, teacher education and policy. The fourth section is a review of studies on secondary education, covering curriculum changes, materials development, English as a medium of instruction (EMI), classroom pedagogy, teachers and learners' characteristics, and assessment. We then review studies on tertiary education, focusing on pluricentric English, EMI programmes and pedagogical issues. Finally, we discuss the recurring themes in this article and develop our conclusion accordingly.

1.2 Selection and review procedures

Notable scholars such as Canagarajah (2006) and Kumaravadivelu (2006) have stressed the importance of placing more emphasis on how local practitioners in peripheral countries experience literacy in English. Indonesia as a highly diverse multilingual context offers what Sugiharto (2015b) called 'a perspective of the periphery' where

> linguistic practices are embedded in a highly semiotic complexity and cultural ecologies (including local wisdom) of the communities in diverse regions, thus testifying to the dynamics of language, culture, and identity, and at the same time blurring the demarcation among these units (p. 419).

But most studies that offer local and culturally contextual nuances of English teaching and learning in Indonesia are not accessible to a wider international readership because these studies are published in local journals, and many are written in Indonesian. Those that are written in English are often published in non-indexed journals. Therefore, it is a useful exercise to highlight the contributions of local scholars who have endeavoured to disseminate their research despite working in extremely diverse and often unfavourable conditions; here we bring the great wealth of research on English language education in Indonesia published in local journals and volumes to the attention of a wider audience.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

In this article we adopt a non-puristic perspective in that we do not exclude international publications that tackle local issues in the Indonesian context. Although in recent years there has been a steady increase in research focusing on the Indonesian context, the bulk of this research is relatively new and deserves wider dissemination. Furthermore, such nationally focused research deals with local data and issues and therefore deserves inclusion.

The specific aim of this article is to examine conceptual or empirical studies on English language teaching and learning in Indonesia. It is true that conceptual arguments must be verified and established through some kind of empirical procedure before they can meaningfully guide major language policy and curriculum developments. However, in the case of Indonesia, more often than not, conceptual studies actually have a wide outreach and significant impact on language policy (e.g. Dardjowidjojo, 1998, 2000) and curriculum development (e.g. Madya, 2003, 2007). Moreover, Section 2 concerns linguistic ecology in Indonesia, and studies touching upon this topic are conceptual rather than empirical (e.g. Hamied, 2013; Kohler, 2019; Zein, 2019).

In order to minimize both subjectivity and arbitrariness, we undertook various measures in our selection of sources for review. First, we narrowed down the list of publications to those published, or doctoral theses accepted, between 2011 to 2019. We then read the titles and abstracts. Third we carefully examined the methodological and discussion descriptions in each study. Out of the nearly five hundred sources consulted, we were able to identify 108 studies for analysis. These studies we grouped into four categories: linguistic ecology, primary education, secondary education, and tertiary education.

We adopted a matrix of criteria that enabled us to decide whether a study merited inclusion and whether it was significant in terms of implications. The criteria included topical relevance, database inclusion, peer-reviewed studies, methodological rigour and strength of discussion. As a result:

1. We only considered articles published in accredited journals indexed by Scopus, DOAJ, EBSCOHOST and Google Scholar.
2. We only included book chapters appearing in peer-reviewed volumes published by international publishers (e.g. Routledge, Springer and Multilingual Matters).
3. We included conference proceedings from international conferences, whether held in Indonesia or elsewhere, where opportunities for rigorous paper selection, paper editing and feedback are available.
4. We did not include doctoral dissertations from local universities in Indonesia but included those from universities abroad instead, especially from English-speaking countries such as the USA, the UK and Australia. This is mainly due to our assessment that a higher level of academic rigour is associated with dissertations accepted by American, British and Australian universities.
5. Only empirical studies with at least two of the following criteria were included in the review: (a) up-to-date literature review; (b) clear statement of research aim(s) and or question(s); (c) reasonable recommendations and directions for future research.
6. We did not include pseudo-empirical studies, that is, those studies written in the expected genre but in fact lacking either a clear methodology or empirical findings. We also excluded articles where the discussion of findings was either only partially supported by empirical evidence offered in the study or lacked systematicity.
7. We excluded quantitative studies with statistically insignificant results or design issues such as lack of control groups. We also excluded qualitative studies with vague methodologies and those with limited credibility.

Despite our aim to identify and include high-quality studies in the review process, we are aware of the fact that publication is a highly contextualized process. In local Indonesian journals, publications inevitably bear the imprint of circumstances and dominant cultural practices within the local academic communities. For example, articles published in local Indonesian journals are usually relatively short (about 3,000 to 5,000 words), with limited space devoted to the methodological tenets. This is a

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

limitation that we realize may prevent proper evaluation of the methodological rigour of the empirical studies reviewed in this article.

1.2 English in Indonesia: Brief historical background

Indonesia was once occupied by the Dutch (sixteenth century – 1945) and was called the Dutch East Indies accordingly. While they were still under the occupation of the Dutch, natives to the Dutch East Indies had already been familiar with the colonial tradition of learning foreign languages. According to Nababan (1991), the Dutch required the teaching of European languages – Dutch, English, French and German – to the natives who studied in Dutch-medium secondary schools. After independence in 1945, the Indonesian government removed the teaching of Dutch as a compulsory subject. This decision was grounded in the pervasive aversion that the public held against Dutch. Naturally, Dutch was associated with the language of the Dutch colonials, and the language was considered to be of no international stature (Dardjowidjojo, 2000). On the other hand, English was considered to be a language of international importance, as represented by the USA and the UK, which were the dominant global political powers then. Many people thought English would be the language of the future. This made a special case for including English in the national education curriculum, paving the way for its reputation as what Nababan (1991) called 'the first foreign language' (p. 120). English was designated a foreign language, and the first foreign language to be taught in schools, ahead of Arabic, French and German.

Many years later, the New Order regime (1967–1998) cemented the official role of English through Presidential Decree No. 28/1990. With this policy, English was made compulsory in secondary schools under the administration of the Ministry of Education and Culture. This means English was taught as a compulsory subject in *Sekolah Menengah Pertama* (junior high school) (SMP), *Sekolah Menengah Atas* (senior high school) (SMA) and *Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan* (vocational high school) (SMK). English was also made a compulsory subject in secondary schools under the administration of Ministry of Religious Affairs: *Madrasah Tsanawiyah* and *Madrasah Aliyah*. Thus, English automatically became either the second language for people who only spoke Indonesian or the third language for the majority of Indonesians who already spoke both Indonesian and an indigenous language.

Foreign institutions have played a significant role in the growth of English teaching and learning in Indonesia, although the role outlined here is brief and far from representative. For example, in 1953 Ford Foundation contributed to the professional development of 1,025 English teachers through the In-Service Teacher Training Project, while developing programmes such as Kursus B-1 (B-One Course) and Kursus B-1 Rencana Baru (B-One Course New Plan) (Dardjowidjojo, 2000). Other foreign institutions such as AusAID, NZAID, the British Council and AMINEF (American Indonesian Exchange Foundation) have also been supportive. AusAID and NZAID developed the Colombo Plan in the 1950s, offering scholarships for local scholars and teachers to study in Australia and New Zealand; and recent schemes – including Australian Awards – continue to assist local English teachers and scholars to further their qualifications. The British Council has developed various training schemes including Primary Innovation to help teachers in primary schools, while AMINEF has facilitated the deployment of teachers (primarily from the USA) to teach at Indonesian universities and developed professional development activities through seminars and workshops. In their involvement in English language education in any country, these foreign institutions have their own agendas and motivations (see Coleman, 2017a). Some suspect that their involvement in Indonesia constitutes linguistic imperialism (e.g. Sugiharto, 2015a, p. 228), but we will not elaborate on the issue here.

English teaching and learning in Indonesia has undergone complicated curricular developments. The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) was the first methodology to be implemented in the country. Its goal was for students to be able to understand passages in English and translate them into Indonesian. Though heavily criticized, the implementation of GTM in the early years was appropriate. GTM was suitable to the Indonesian context where classes were typically large and teachers were not required to have advanced second language (L2) proficiency (Jazadi, 2000). But GTM waned in popularity when the Ford Foundation developed Standard Training Centres in Yogyakarta and Bukit

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Tinggi. This highlighted a move away to the Oral Approach that placed emphasis on the development of oral skills (listening and speaking) (Dardjowidjojo, 2000). In 1975, the Structural Approach was introduced, focusing on language learning as a set of learned behaviours where repetition of sounds, words and expressions plays a prominent role in the development of language proficiency. As such, the primacy of language and language learning was still on the oral language, with teaching focusing on the introduction of English phonetics (Madya, 2007). The Structural Approach lasted until 1984 when a new curriculum was introduced by the Ministry of Education and Culture. This curriculum was influenced by Dell Hymes' Communicative Approach, which views language beyond structure, that is, as a means of communication. This became the chief principle of English language teaching encapsulated in the 1984 English Curriculum, which emphasizes meaning and function in language teaching. The communicative goal notwithstanding, the structural orientation of the 1984 Curriculum means that it was never fully communicative. Scholars such as Purwo (1990), for example, believed that the 1984 Curriculum did not provide guidelines as to how the core of language use (i.e. pragmatics) should be implemented in language teaching. The 1984 Curriculum was then replaced by the 1994 Curriculum that placed emphasis on the communicative notion of *kebermaknaan*, or meaningfulness. Madya (2007) noted that 'meaning' in the 1994 Curriculum was greatly emphasized, enabling themes to play a more prominent role than linguistic elements.

Following the coming of the new millennium, the Indonesian Ministry of National Education developed two curricula. First, in 2004, MoNE initiated *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi* (Competence-Based Curriculum) (KBK) based on the Act of National Education System No. 20/2003. The goals of English learning in the KBK were: (1) to develop communicative competence, which emphasizes macro skills such as listening, speaking, reading and writing; (2) to build and raise self-awareness of acquiring English as a foreign language and a means of learning and communication; (3) to build and develop a solid understanding of the close relationship between language and culture and raise intercultural understanding. The curriculum caused pros and cons among teachers, teacher educators, researchers and policymakers because there was a sudden movement from communicative language teaching to systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and a genre-based approach (GBA). This movement occurred despite the goal to achieve communicative competence. In 2006, the Ministry of National Education revised the KBK and created *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* (Local Education Unit Curriculum) (KTSP). Paradigmatically speaking, KTSP accentuated KBK's goal as it retained the focus on the development of students' competencies. The major difference is that at the operational level, the school or educational unit was expected to develop its own curriculum. The KTSP was still framed under SFL and GBA. With this curriculum, the central government only stipulated the standard competence and basic competence, while the syllabus, lesson plan, learning materials and assessment were developed by schools and individual teachers. This is parallel to the premise of KTSP to meet different social, economic, cultural and educational backgrounds and to recognize the fact that each school needed to cater to its student and institutional needs and make use of its local resources.

The KTSP lasted for about seven years. In 2013 the educational ministry developed the 2013 Curriculum. The ministry did not conduct a study to support and rationalize the curriculum. Similar to the KBK and the KTSP, the 2013 Curriculum also adopted Core Competencies and Basic Competencies as its guiding principles. In the 2013 Curriculum, SFL and GBA were maintained to develop students' communicative competence. However, the curriculum objectives put the emphasis on the development of students' characters and the skills and knowledge needed for the twenty-first century, especially creativity (Coleman, 2014). This resulted in the decision to reduce hours for English instruction in junior high school (i.e. SMP, *Madrasah Tsanawiyah*) and senior high school (i.e. SMA, SMK, *Madrasah Aliyah*) to between two and three hours per week. Furthermore, the decision to endorse the piloting of the curriculum in 2,598 model elementary schools, resulted in major provinces such as DKI Jakarta banning public elementary schools from teaching English. This was a decision that generated protests among teachers and parents alike who requested the government to be more supportive of primary English education (Zein, 2017a).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

In 2018, the government implemented the Revised 2013 Curriculum. This current curriculum places an emphasis on character building, requiring all subjects, including English, to contribute to the development of learners' character: their religiosity, nationalism, independence, cooperation and integrity. This is the ideological tenet being imposed upon the minds of Indonesian students through schooling.

2. English within Indonesia's linguistic ecology

A proper examination of English language education in Indonesia cannot be separated from the country's highly diverse linguistic ecology. Indonesia is a superdiverse context (Goebel, 2015; Zein, 2020) in which English is situated, along with 707 languages by one count (Simons & Fennig, 2017a, p. 6), 731 different languages and more than 1,100 dialects in another estimate (Frederick & Worden, 2011, p. 97), or 733 indigenous languages with 652 of them being identified as reported by Indonesia's language planning agency, the *Badan Bahasa* (Badan Bahasa, 2017). These figures place Indonesia second in the world after Papua New Guinea (841) in terms of linguistic diversity (Simons & Fennig, 2017b) and establish its reputation as a country that accounts for one-tenth of the world's languages (Florey & Himmelmann, 2010; Steinhauer, 1994). Across the 17,504 islands of the Indonesian archipelago, there are five major islands: Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan, Sulawesi and Papua. The densely inhabited western Indonesia, mainly the islands of Sumatra, Java and Bali are home to 36 major indigenous languages. These include Acehnese, Balinese, Batak, Javanese, Malay, Minangkabau and Sundanese. Of all indigenous languages, Javanese is the largest, spoken by an estimated number of 95.2 million people or 40.22% of the nation's population, making it the largest linguistic community in the country (BPS, 2011).

This sociolinguistic situation has developed from being conceptualized as a diglossia (Grimes, 1996; Moeliono & Grimes, 1995), a complex diglossia (Arka, 2013; Moeliono, 1986), and a polyglossia (Musgrave, 2014; Steinhauer, 1994) to a superglossia (Zein, 2020). Zein refers to superglossia as "a polycentric sociolinguistic situation in which linguistic varieties and practices of language mixing perform relationships that are complex and dynamic, often inter-glossic and sometimes intra-glossic, reflecting their varying degrees of status, influence and order of importance" (p. 60). In Indonesia's superglossia, a superposed H (High) linguistic variety (i.e. Indonesian) is found. It is officialized as the national language, and it is found in education, mass media, business and other domains. Alongside the official H, there are 14 Malayic regional lingua francas (RLFs) (e.g. Ambon Malay, Manado Malay, Papua Malay) and 29 non-Malayic RLFs (e.g. Bakumpai, Banjar, Musi, Ngaju); major indigenous languages (i.e. Javanese, Sundanese); minor, locally used indigenous languages (e.g. Belu, Lamatuka, Towei); heritage languages spoken by descendants of the Arabs, Chinese, Eurasians, Indians, Japanese and Mardijkers; sign languages; languages used in a particularly dominant domain (i.e. religion) (e.g. Arabic, Sanskrit); 'imported' languages (e.g. English, German, Korean); practices of language mixing; and new linguistic varieties (e.g. Riau Indonesian, Osing, Cirebon). Given the polycentricity of this superglossia and the complex and dynamic relationships between linguistic varieties and practices of language mixing, the official H is in competition with these other elements. RLFs, major indigenous languages, languages in the domain of religion or 'imported' languages could emerge as new centres of normativity (new Hs), competing with Indonesian. Indeed, linguistic varieties in Indonesia have had varied statuses, being recognized, prohibited, promoted or mandated at various times, levels and localities, reflecting the high complexity, dynamism and polycentricity of Indonesia's linguistic ecology (cf. Anwar, 1976; Goebel, 2016; Kohler, 2019).

Within such a superdiverse context, English has been catapulted to new heights. It is currently playing a role as a new H, a new centre of normativity within Indonesia's superglossia (Zein, 2020). The emergence of English as a new centre of normativity is evident in light of the increasing prestige of the language within society and the prevalent social discourse that deems English important for social mobility, upward economic mobility and participation in the global economy (cf. Coleman, 2016a; Dewi, 2014; Hamied, 2012; Manara, 2013; Zein, 2019; Zentz, 2017). This is apparent with the proliferation of labelling and promotion where new products from soaps to shampoos, from snacks to

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

instant noodles, from clothes to young adult novels are all in English. When used on T-shirts or billboards, English is not entirely meant to convey meaning, but it is meant to index ideological values. This has led to the creation of what Zentz (2017) calls *semiotic Englishing*, referring to 'forms of English that are not at all grammatical but that simply index 'English', the language or the concept of it, as well as attributes that travel along with English's symbolism, such as prestige and value.' (p. 177). Further, English has been considered so important that it replaces other languages in the curriculum. From 2009 to 2013, a policy called *Rintisan Sekolah Berstandar Internasional* (International Pilot Project State-run Schools) (RSBI) was implemented, prescribing certified RSBIs to teach maths and Science in English, rather than in Indonesian (see Sugiharto, 2015a). Cases of schools dropping instruction in indigenous languages and replacing them with English were widespread (see Coleman, 2016b; Hadisantosa, 2010). Nowadays, even after the abolishment of the RSBI policy, the continuing prestige of schools that deliver instruction in English or those that employ so-called English 'native speakers' is evident. This prestige becomes the chief reason for such schools to charge higher educational fees. By the same token, the use of English and incorporation of English words into advertisements and social media is prevalent, while many local companies now require job applicants to demonstrate English proficiency.

Recent studies reviewed in this section are categorized into subsections that examine the relationship between English and Indonesian and indigenous languages as well as the utilization of linguistic repertoire. Two other issues on character building and native-speakerism and English varieties are also of relevance to this section.

2.1 English, Indonesian and indigenous languages

The main body of research on the linguistic ecology of English language education in Indonesia constitutes an examination of the relationship between English, Indonesian as the national language, and indigenous languages.

Some studies are concerned with attitudes towards English. Murtisari and Mali's (2017) study is a case in point: they conducted research involving 333 students attending schools in Salatiga, Central Java. The findings of the study show polarizing views towards English. While believing in the positive value of English for international outreach, the participants also raised concerns about the negative impact of English on Indonesian language and culture. More elaboration on the impact of English on Indonesian language and culture is available in Manara (2013). Manara reported on a study where 18 participants offered their opinions on the issue through in-depth interviews. The participants acknowledged the significant role of English in the globalized world, while highlighting socio-economic, cultural and pedagogical tensions that required them to continuously struggle. The data suggested a linguistic hierarchy in which English is considered to be a more prestigious and attractive language than Indonesian. Participants demonstrated the need for a critical evaluation of the current institutionalization of English in order to consider the local and global relations dimension of globalization that underpins English teaching in Indonesia. This requires the incorporation of language awareness, sociolinguistic understanding, pragmatics and intercultural competence.

Dewi (2012) conducted a study involving university staff and students from nine universities in Jogjakarta. The participants did not see English as a manifestation of imperialism; neither did they perceive the language to be carrying values that threaten national identity. Despite feeling the imposition of English upon them, the participants in Dewi (2011) expressed their desire to learn and use the language for social mobility and upward economic trajectory. This is done while they continuously negotiate their identities as both Indonesians and English users, a phenomenon which Dewi called a 'distinctive Indonesian identity'. Such a positive attitude towards English is also captured in Zein (2019). He stated that Indonesia's multilingual context dictates a move towards multilingual education. Multilingual education acknowledges English as a global language that opens the door to upward social and economic mobility. By the same token, it places equal importance on the promotion of Indonesian as the national language as well as the maintenance of heritage and indigenous languages

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

and cultures. This is a balancing act of language policymaking that considers the local interests pertaining to the promotion of Indonesian and the maintenance of heritage and indigenous languages as well as the exogenous factors which mean that English plays an important role in the global world.

Sani et al. (2017) is an excellent endeavour, exemplifying how English stands in the domain of language preservation. Motivated by the fact that Indonesia's multilingualism is currently in 'a state of catastrophe', Sani et al. (2017) are currently developing a speech-to-speech translation system, which is a collection and analysis of Indonesian indigenous speech corpora to enable communication between speakers of two different languages. In Sani et al. (2017), the focus of the research was on the two largest ethnic groups: Javanese and Sundanese. They were aiming for the establishment of an infrastructure of speech-to-speech translation from indigenous languages (e.g. Javanese, Batak, Makassarese) to English/Indonesian (see Figure 1). Further research is needed.

Figure 1. Speech translation mechanism (after Sani et al., 2017) .

2.2 Utilization of linguistic repertoire

Consideration of the multilingual context of Indonesia is also evident in studies that utilize teachers' and students' linguistic repertoire. This is evidenced by the presence of studies such as Cahyani, de Courcy, and Barnett (2018), Hidayati (2012), Ningsih (2016), Sugiharto (2015c), Zein (2018b) and Zentz (2015).

A study by Hidayati (2012) examined the use of Indonesian in teaching English at a polytechnic in Bandung, West Java. Hidayati showed that teachers still overused Indonesian, which might not promote the L2. However, when judicious use of Indonesian was at play, it promoted classroom interaction in English. The teachers acknowledged the benefits drawn from using Indonesian, including for grammar and vocabulary explanation, comprehension checks, advice on language learning strategies, provision of complex classroom instruction and creation of classroom humour. Another study by Ningsih (2016) investigated the implementation of *Reading to learn* that uses students' first language (L1) over a sequence of lessons to allow for L2 (English) to slowly phase in when students demonstrate increasing confidence and familiarity with the L2. The focus was on control of genre development, register with respect to subject/field, jargon, grammar identification of clauses and nominal group structure and presentation (e.g. spelling, images). The findings of the study suggest that the students showed progress in their use of jargon, indicating their improved knowledge of their field, while their use of grammar demonstrated decreasing L1 interference. Grammatical complexity was also evident in the use of identifying clauses and nominalization, while control of spelling and punctuation also increased considerably. Zentz (2015) conducted an ethnographic study involving an undergraduate student at a private Christian university in Central Java. Data from the study shows that when learning English, the student not only learned a new language but also new modes of thinking not found in his immediate environment. Moreover, the student learned about

> …the locally situated social and political nature of multiple registers of English, Indonesian and Javanese, and he explores how and when to deploy a complex and growing set of communicative resources in measure to achieve communicative ends and a comfortable self-image (p. 68).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

This, according to Zentz, was a linguistic manoeuvre appearing through highly dynamic, nuanced and complex communicative repertoire.

The complex interplay of English, Indonesian and indigenous languages within one's linguistic repertoire is the subject of studies by Cahyani et al. (2018), Sugiharto (2015c) and Zein (2018b). These studies show evidence of how Indonesian teachers and scholars employ translanguaging as an act of combining two languages as a unity or one linguistic repertoire, allowing them to select features strategically for effective communication.

Cahyani et al. (2018) employed classroom observations with video and audio recording, interviews with stimulated recall and a focus group discussion to collect data from three teachers in tertiary bilingual classrooms over one semester. The findings described teachers' active translanguaging such as when they switched to Javanese when making jokes, switched to English when praising or reproaching students and shifted into Indonesian when reinforcing students' understanding. Their use of Indonesian words such as 'rekan-rekan' was a deliberate communication strategy to show a collectivist spirit, while one of the lecturers' use of Javanese words 'ditarik tanganku' was meant 'to position himself alongside the students as insiders' (p. 474). Both demonstrate appropriate sociocultural values. Through translanguaging, teachers could '… invite a fully multilingual construction of meaning, drawing on students' diverse cultural and linguistic resources for the sake of learning and engagement' (p. 475). Sugiharto (2015c) analysed the writing practices of two prominent Indonesian scholars: Soenjono Dardjowidjojo and Chaedar Alwasilah through a translingual perspective. Sugiharto's study found that translanguaging was an effective means that allowed the two scholars to incorporate their agency, ideological positioning and rhetorical traditions into their linguistic practices. Alwasilah, for example, framed his texts within the mainstream academic discourse; but in doing so, he was able to infuse his Sundanese and Muslim identities. Sugiharto (2015c) then argued for the necessity of a paradigm shift in teaching writing, accentuating the need to allow learners to uncover their diverse linguistic repertoire while shaping language to appropriate their interest, culture and identity. Zein (2018b) employed multivocal ethnography to investigate the translanguaging practice of English for young learners (EYL) teachers. His study demonstrated that a teacher's multimodal approach to meta-discursive translanguaging could allow for the integration of all discursive resources (e.g. pictures, drawing on the board, videos, labels) while encouraging learners' bilingual practices to make meaning through English, Indonesian and Javanese. When the teacher could design assignments that encouraged learners to consult texts and media across languages and modalities, scaffolding was found. Scaffolding through translanguaging occurred because the teacher could leverage learner's prior knowledge and familiar languaging practices by accessing their linguistic repertoire in a gradual, systematic manner.

2.3 English and character building

Pertinent to discussion on English within Indonesia's linguistic ecology is the analysis of English vis-à-vis character building, which comes as a response to the recent major educational reform in Indonesia. The policy, initiated by the administration of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (2004–2014) is currently expanded under the incumbent President Joko Widodo's (2014–present) *Nawa Cita,* or nine-point development programme. As a consequence, English teachers are required to carry out character education reform in their classrooms through the incorporation of national, social, cultural and religious values. Qoyyimah (2016) examined teachers' implementation of the 2013 Curriculum that stipulates character building. Data from the study show the emergence of secular morality as a result of teachers' attempts to align character building and teaching materials. Religious morality, on the other hand, emerged as a result of teachers' own priorities and practice. Qoyyimah suggested that 'teachers' implementation of moral education in their classes was dominated by their school communities' and the teachers' own preferred value of religiosity' (p. 109).

Given the importance of religious values in character building, it is of no surprise that studies touching upon the relationship between English language and religions are in the ascendancy. One

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

excellent example is Mambu (2016). In research involving Christian and non-Christian students at a teacher education programme, Mambu attempted to resist dichotomization of religious faiths. Collecting data from six students through interviews and an audio-recorded class session, Mambu (2016) showed participants' willingness to engage in interfaith dialogues that promote love and humility. This is feasible, for example, through intellectual discussions on religious texts where open-mindedness and respect for others are key. Such a practice, according to Mambu, would help challenge the predominant reluctance to incorporate religion into English language education, an important point given the rising religious intolerance in Indonesia.

Murtisari and Mali (2017) also found religion to be one of the determining factors that create the tensions between English and the national language and culture. While participants coming from Christian backgrounds tended to show more inclusive perceptions towards English, those with Islamic beliefs demonstrated negative attitudes towards western loan words coming from English. This latest finding contradicts Dewi (2012), whose research suggested that the majority of the participants who were Muslims had positive attitudes towards English. They held no consensus on associating English with any particular religion, while agreeing that their religion supports language learning. Another assertion that Islam is non-oppositional to English is found in Setiyadi and Sukirlan (2016). Focusing on the role of English in *madrasas,* or Islamic schools, Setiyadi and Sukirlan analysed the language attitude of 329 students towards English. Findings from their study indicate the positive perceptions of the students towards English. Students were found to have developed positive sensitivity towards the Western culture associated with English while learning the language without necessarily fearing that the attempt would threaten their religious beliefs and cultural identities.

2.4 Native-speakerism and English varieties

Recent studies have also investigated the ecology of the linguistic landscape in Indonesia through examination of English in relation to issues such as native-speakerism and its varieties. The English as a native language (ENL) ideology has long become the ideological norm in the country where teachers are supposed to teach according to the 'standard' or 'native' English varieties such as American English (AE) and British English (BE) (Dardjowidjojo, 2000). However, this appears to be changing on the evidence of recent research.

Zein's (2018a) synthesis of studies on English language education in Indonesia shows there is currently a shift in language attitude. It seems that students, teachers and teacher educators have changed their perceptions regarding English and the theoretical perspectives underlying its teaching and learning. The ENL ideology encapsulated in the EFL perspective that has been long and widely implemented in Indonesia is under question. In his study, Zein argued that the sociolinguistic situation of English language in Indonesia appears to be transitioning from EFL to English as a lingua franca (ELF). Zein's view receives support from scholars such as Kirkpatrick (2018), who states that 'the labels EFL and ESL are no longer appropriate, as English is the lingua franca of the [ASEAN] group' and that the officialization of English as the working language of the ASEAN 'provides a timely moment to radically alter the way English has traditionally been taught in Indonesia, and to move from an ENL approach to the lingua franca approach.' (p. 198).

Scholars working within the pluricentric English perspective generally challenge the native-speakerism which highlights the belief that the only norm worth teaching is the 'native' English and that the 'native speakers' of English are the only language models. For example, Kramadibrata (2016) conducted a quasi-experimental study to investigate the perceptions of native-speakerism, using video analysis, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Although they held an implicit preference for 'native' English-speaking teachers, the participants of the study also believed in a more fluid understanding of 'nativeness'. They argued that English now belongs to the majority 'non-native speakers' or everyone that uses it, and no longer the minority so-called 'native speakers'. More importantly, they believed that 'native-speaking' status in language teaching was no longer important, as one of them stated, 'It's not about native or non-native. It's just about the way he/she [the teacher] teaches.' (p. 293).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

The issue of English varieties has generated a lot of debate. In a study involving 32 lecturers, teachers and students in Jogjakarta, Dewi (2014) showed mixed perceptions among participants regarding new Englishes (e.g. Indian English, Singaporean English) in comparison to BE and AE. The participants in general perceived New Englishes to be inferior to AE and BE. However, the participants did not consider New Englishes to be problematic – they are 'just different'. One of them stated, 'We should embrace and learn other dialects of English since English is now becoming an international language' (p. 10). Another study by Dewi (2017a) investigated the perception of English language educators pursuing postgraduate studies in Australia regarding the varieties to teach upon returning to Indonesia. Data obtained from individual interviews of 14 participants suggests that most participants would generally teach either AE or BE due to external factors such as textbook availability and curricular imposition. However, other participants would broaden their scope of teaching beyond the ENL ideology imposition, with one of them stating, '…if I'm given the authority to design syllabus, I wouldn't limit myself with those Inner Circle choices. At least I hope to make some positive changes to my students in their belief about the English language' (p. 142).

Manara (2016) conducted in-depth interviews with 13 English language educators to investigate their attitudes towards English varieties. Her study suggested polarizing views of English. On the one hand, participants believed in the importance of preserving the 'standard' or 'native' English varieties as normative linguistic knowledge was considered important for language teaching. They thought that introducing more than one variety to learners was imprudent as it would only create confusion. On the other hand, participants argued for a more flexible mode of communication that accepts English varieties, especially when it comes to (verbal) intercultural communication. Given the vast and diverse global communication, participants suggested that privileging the 'standard' or 'native' English varieties was 'restrictive' and 'unrealistic'. This led Manara (2016) to argue that 'Englishes are felt to be more acceptable in communicative settings (other than formal educational setting of a classroom)' where 'variations are welcomed, tolerated, and accommodated' (p. 14). A study based on a microteaching course was conducted by Zacharias (2016). Data from interviews involving 12 prospective teachers in the study suggests that the participants held the belief that their identities were projected through having a native-like pronunciation. Nevertheless, the participants agreed that learning ELF had no direct relationship with their integration with the 'native' English-speaking community. The majority of the participants also appropriated their ELF pedagogy understanding with maintenance of cultural identity and promotion of local cultures. They further reported an increased sense of professional confidence after being exposed to ELF pedagogy.

Overall, the studies reviewed in the current section demonstrate the linguistic contestation resulting from the introduction of English. First, they present one major challenge for teachers in utilizing English for the benefit of learners' linguistic repertoire. This is important in consideration of the emergence of what Coleman (2017b) calls *Indonesian English* as a newly recognized linguistic variety, although this view warrants further research in light of Hamied's (2012) suggestion that varieties of English spoken by Indonesians would be as varied as varieties of Indonesian given the nation's rich linguistic diversity. Investigation as to how English varieties occur in the process of Indonesians acquiring English on top of Indonesian and indigenous languages is very much needed. Further, it is worth noting that these studies come mainly from familiar contexts in Java, including DKI Jakarta, Central Java and West Java. They generally examined English in relation to major indigenous languages: Javanese and Sundanese. Similar research undertaken in other multilingual contexts of Indonesia and involving other indigenous languages have yet to be found. Another challenge captured by studies in this section is how English fits within the grand scheme of policy on character building, an issue that seems to perplex many. The third challenge relates to the shifting paradigm from the ENL ideology to the pluricentric ideology which questions the present status and role of English within Indonesia's linguistic ecology. Clearly the studies capturing the last two challenges demonstrate the responses to the endogenous factor of changing educational policy as well as the exogenous factor of the shift towards pluricentric English.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

3. Primary education

Unlike in secondary school, English is not compulsory in primary school. The Ministry of Education and Culture Decree No. 060/U/1993 stipulated English as *Muatan Lokal* (Local Content Subject) (Mulok), allowing a primary school to teach English from Grade 4 onwards if: (1) the society in which the school is located requires it; and (2) the school has qualified teachers and can guarantee facilities to accommodate proper teaching–learning activities. Zein (2017a) noted that primary English education gained prominence in the early 2000s when there was a tendency for parents to enrol their children in a school that offers English. School principals feared that numbers would decrease if they failed to respond to it, so they offered English instruction. Many lowered the level at which English was introduced into the curriculum to as early as Grade 1 and replaced the teaching of indigenous languages with English. In 2006, the Ministry of National Education released Decree No. 22/2006 on The Structure of National Curriculum to give freedom to schools to start teaching English earlier than Grade 4 for up to 2 × 35 minutes per session. This situation changed in 2013 when the Ministry of Education and Culture replaced the KTSP Curriculum with Curriculum 2013. The curriculum emphasized the development of character building, hence abolishing the teaching of English in primary schools. It was suggested that primary English education be seconded in order to give curricular space for indigenous languages and that children would need to develop linguistic competence in their mother tongue prior to learning a foreign language (i.e. English). The Revised 2013 Curriculum, established in 2017, retains this policy. This means that English is no longer part of the educational curriculum at primary level, although many schools still teach it as an extracurricular activity.

Research on English education at primary level can be divided into three major categories: (1) pedagogy; (2) teacher education; and (3) policy.

3.1 Pedagogy

Studies on the pedagogical domain of primary education revolve around the issue of developing best practice for English teaching, that is, how teachers can best shape their pedagogy to cater to the needs of young learners.

A few studies focus on teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and teaching techniques. These include Hawanti (2014), who conducted interviews and observations of teachers in Banjarnegara, Central Java to investigate their pedagogical knowledge and its effects on their pedagogy. Findings from the study demonstrate that 'in the absence of official curriculum teachers are required to draw on their existing knowledge and beliefs but the existing knowledge and beliefs of teachers in Indonesia are often not well developed.' (p. 162). As a result, the teachers used the textbooks for curricular guidance. They argued that this was justified because the textbooks had relevant themes, teaching materials and exercises. In terms of teaching practice, Ratminingsih (2014) was interested in developing song-based instruction as a pedagogical model in primary schools in Bali. Focusing on learners' abilities to respond to instructions through songs, the model allowed for active participation of the learners. Although the model was found to be engaging and effective in improving learners' learning achievement, Ratminingsih argued that the teachers still needed professional development to carry it out appropriately. For Zein (2017b), teachers' pedagogical content knowledge is related to a focus on young learners. His study focuses on the appropriate pedagogy for teaching EYL. The study collected data from 26 teachers through semi-structured interviews. The findings of the study suggest the importance of young learner pedagogy, arguing that any attempt to create a practically oriented teacher education must be done by re-shifting the focus on young learners. This becomes a point of departure for Zein to argue that TESOL (teaching English to speakers of other languages) teacher education needs to make stronger emphasis on child individual differences in order to equip teachers with appropriate working knowledge in SLA that is pertinent to EYL teaching expertise.

Other studies are more methodological in their approach (e.g. Diem, 2011; Suryati, Furaidah, & Saukah, 2017). Suryati et al. examined dialogic reading strategy in which students were given

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

opportunities to complete endings of sentences, to respond to teachers' open-ended and wh- questions and to recall what they had just read. The researchers collected data from control and experimental groups involving 40 fourth-grade students. Their study shows that the experimental group that was given eight meetings of dialogic reading instruction outperformed the control group that only received traditional reading instruction. Arguing for the efficacy of the dialogic reading strategy, the researchers recommend it to teachers to help enhance their pedagogy. Diem (2011) was motivated by the low literacy level of primary school children in Indonesia. She conducted a study with a model called the 3-Ls: Libraries, Literature and Literacy, allowing for optimal utilization of diverse learning resources by teachers in cooperation with librarians. Involving 200 Grade 5 students, the research employed regression analysis. The findings suggest that the model made a significant contribution to both students' reading habits (R^2 0.793) and literacy skills (R^2 0.943), although these were still deemed insufficient gains. Diem's study implies that in order for the model to be effective it needs optimal library facilities, often equipped with computers and the internet.

Other studies are interested in examining teachers' ability to develop discourse in the classroom. Aisah and Hidayat (2012) conducted research in a newly established international school to investigate teacher classroom discourse. Using video-recorded data of a Grade 1 teacher, Aisah and Hidayat examined the spontaneous production of teacher talk. The findings of their study suggest that the teacher employed referential questions and extended wait time. While the teacher was vigilant in correcting students' pronunciation, he was more lenient when it came to grammatical error. The teacher also employed a series of teacher-initiated exchanges and student-initiated exchanges. All these strategies, according to the researchers, contributed to the creation of a challenging but supportive learning environment. Setiawati (2012) also worked on classroom discourse. Her research investigated teacher talk through direct observations of three native English native-speaking teachers and interviews with 18 primary school students. The study shows that although 'native' English speakers were good models for the language, 'most students found the class more motivating, interesting, and challenging when the teachers minimized their teacher talk and made use not only more constructive teacher talk but also interesting activities' (p. 33). Setiawati calls for teachers to develop more skills to direct activities, create transitions, give feedback and praise and check students' understanding.

Some researchers are interested in unravelling the sociolinguistic nature of textbooks in supporting pedagogy (e.g. Sari, 2011; Hermawan & Noerkhasanah, 2012; Damayanti, 2014;). For example, Sari (2011) conducted critical discourse analysis to investigate the underlying ideology behind gender representation in a primary school textbook, *Learn English with Tito*. Sari's text analysis focused on participants, processes and circumstances of clauses appearing in the textbook. Findings reveal the perpetual stereotyping of male characters, tending to give more dominant roles to them and less dominant roles to female characters. This male domination underlying ideology was found to be prominent, which the editor admitted to be the case in a follow-up interview that Sari conducted. Taking a similar departing point, Damayanti (2014) employed a textual analysis on four English textbooks: *Go with English, Learning by Doing, Grow with English* and *Fokus*. The findings of her study demonstrate that 'the illustrations accompanying linguistic texts fortified the representations of gender asymmetry' (p. 100) with female characters being depicted as more dependent and passive than males. Damayanti argued for more conscientious effort to ensure gender equality in the multimodal meaning construction represented in textbooks. Furthermore, Hermawan and Noerkhasanah (2012) investigated the representation of cultures in textbooks and how they were presented. Using data from *Grow with English*, the researchers categorized texts according to Adaskou, Britten, and Fahsi's (1990) cultural framework. The results of the study suggest the salience of the target culture (exclusively American) and the marginalization of the local culture. Representations of local cultures include character names, places and locations and rituals. Discussion of cultures was also found to be at the 'surface level' (p. 60). The researchers argue for the inclusion of other cultures that represent a more international view of English and the integration of cultural dimensions other than from the sociological perspective.

A different stance in viewing pedagogy of teaching English in primary schools appears in Adityarini (2014) and Setiasih (2014). The research by Adityarini aimed to investigate the endonormative models

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

of incorporating local varieties of English among 15 primary school English teachers. The researcher employed a sequential exploratory mixed method with interviews and questionnaires. The findings of the study show the support of the teachers for the adoption of a pluricentric model of English language teaching, as it was deemed to be beneficial for the adoption of cultural values and identity. Complex issues, however, were identified. These include teachers' lack of professional qualifications and a conflicting political agenda associated with Curriculum 2013, which planned to abolish English in primary education. Adityarini suggested the inclusion of courses that promote pluricentric models in programmes offering primary English education. Setiasih, on the other hand, was interested in investigating the role of teachers' pedagogy in the classroom and the home environment outside the classroom in the promotion of learners' literacy. In a case study in a primary school in Bandung that offers EMI for maths and Science, Setiasih employed analysis of student assessments, classroom observations, interviews and documentary materials. The findings of the study demonstrate the importance of developing 'educational, meaningful…out of school English literacy activities…beyond school-based tasks' (p. 95). According to Setiasih, this requires strong parental involvement through a family learning programme, an initiative that suits the sociocultural context of education in Indonesia.

3.2 Teacher education

With the extremely high demand for English in primary schools occurring a few years ago, many primary schools were in short supply of qualified English teachers. Often, school principals appointed teachers with no English background to teach English. Studies have attempted to respond to this situation by examining two areas of research. One is the lack of competencies of teachers who were generally unprepared to teach English in primary schools (e.g. Hawanti, 2012; Sikki, Rahman, Hamra, & Noni, 2013; Zein, 2017d) and the other is the inadequacy of teacher education programmes (Dewi, 2016; Zein, 2016a, 2016b).

Some studies focus on the lack of competencies of teachers in a number of domains. Hawanti's (2012) qualitative study shows how teachers were not adequately prepared to teach English in primary schools. The study suggests teachers' agreement on the necessity for the government to develop a curriculum for primary school English teaching. Teachers, however, varied in their knowledge and beliefs about learners. Teachers with an English education background tended to be more pedagogically versatile, while those without this background tended to demand discipline and obedience from learners. These results, Hawanti argues, require significant adjustments on the part of teacher educators to develop training programmes that can match teachers' knowledge and beliefs. Assessing teachers' competencies was the motivation of a study conducted by Sikki et al. (2013). The researchers collected data from 1,415 teachers in South Sulawesi in the districts of Makassar, Bantaeng, Bulukumba, Wajo, Bone, Sidrap, Soppeng, Pangkep, Parepare and Enrekang. The findings of their study show that a great majority of the teachers were not proficient English users – a point also raised in Renandya, Hamied, and Nurkamto (2018) to reflect the general condition of the English teaching workforce in Indonesia. Primary school teachers were noted to have low confidence in their English proficiency and found it difficult to use the language for instruction. According to Sikki et al., the teachers also lacked competencies in methodology, including lesson and syllabus planning, developing tasks for teaching speaking and listening, and developing and administering authentic assessment for young learners. The researchers call for teacher education to attend to these aspects in order to better prepare the teachers. In an attempt to investigate the professional development (PD) needs of primary English teachers, Zein (2017d) collected data from teachers and teacher educators. His study shows that teachers' needs could be categorized into three broad areas: language, pedagogy and knowledge. In terms of language, classroom discourse and pronunciation were major issues articulated by participants of the study. In terms of pedagogy, teachers needed further training to integrate language skills, provide satisfactory feedback, manage the classroom appropriately, and select and adapt teaching materials. Teachers also needed further knowledge concerning young learners and how to develop learning activities that match their needs.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Foregrounding her research on the limited attention given by the government for teacher professional development (TPD) for primary schools, Dewi (2016) conducted a study on blended TPD. Her research involved teachers from five primary schools in Bandung, West Java, and was aimed to investigate the efficacy of a blended programme intended to assist teachers in incorporating Android mobile applications into classroom pedagogy. The findings of the study point to the flexibility, accessibility and usefulness of the programme. *Telegram* was cited as a more useful application than *Edmodo* in representing immediate communication. The success of the programme led Dewi to call for a more facilitative role at the macro-level to help support teacher development. The call for a facilitative role also appears in Zein (2016a). While Complexity Theory has been used to examine the complex, non-linear systems of SLA (see Larsen-Freeman, 1997), Zein employed it to further examine the role of government-based training agencies in the PD of primary English teachers. The results of his study show the theorization of a TPD model involving complex and dynamic interactions between stakeholders. The study points to the need to differentiate the facilitative role that is best played by educational administrators, teachers' groups and school principals and the expertise role by teacher educators in order to draw a fine line for effective TPD design and implementation.

Other studies suggest different practices of teacher education. Wati (2011) conducted a study to investigate the efficacy of an English training programme in Rokan Hulu, Riau. Involving 55 primary teachers, the study collected data through questionnaires. The findings of the study point to the efficacy of the programme to improve teachers' confidence and motivation, but further provision on teachers' pedagogical content knowledge was still needed. Wati calls for more teacher education programmes to cater for this, placing it early during the programme and giving pedagogy much more time. Zein (2016b) collected data from 23 teachers, 14 teacher educators and 3 school principals to identify factors affecting the efficacy of PD for primary English teachers. The findings of the study show that the inadequacy of in-service PD was attributed to factors such as the shortage of quality teacher educators. Moreover, bureaucratic issues were also influential in undermining the design and implementation of PD programmes, as intrusion from educational administrators often resulted in poor training management and ambiguous selection of teachers who could attend the programmes. In an earlier study, Zein (2015) involved teachers and teacher educators to investigate their perceptions regarding policy measures for improving pre-service teacher education. The findings of the study suggest the need for redesigning pre-service education curricula and for providing specific preparation for primary English teachers. The study calls for pre-service teacher education to develop integrated language components that equip teachers with strong language proficiency as well as content-based instruction that integrates language and content for PD.

3.3 Policy

The issue of English being an optional subject in primary schools has been ongoing for many years (see Lestari, 2003; Zein, 2017a). Researchers are divided as to whether English should be made compulsory. Some researchers think it is best to maintain the optional status of English in primary schools. For Karea (2016), this is desirable because English is not included in the national examination as long as it is an optional subject. This allows focus to be directed to 'teaching children oral communicative competence rather than merely language knowledge' while allowing teachers 'to be creative and innovative to improve their potential and efficacy' (p. 260).

Others (e.g. Hawanti, 2014; Zein, 2017c), on the other hand, hold a different opinion. For Hawanti (2014), the optional status for primary English education actually 'has created problems for its own implementation' (p. 168). Teachers have not been adequately prepared because the policy is not strong enough to push for an agenda on teacher education to help teachers improve their pedagogical content knowledge. The policy also does not provide teachers with curricular guidance. Because English is not compulsory, there is no curriculum for teachers.

Working on the same line of reasoning, Zein (2017c) used Kaplan and Baldauf's (2005) framework of language-in-education policy goals to make policy recommendations particularly on access policy,

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

personnel policy and curriculum policy. In terms of access policy, Zein called for the officialization of English in primary schools and defended a more critical approach in which English is suited to the local context. His suggestion to lower the objectives of primary school instruction and to cater for the teaching of English along with Indonesian and indigenous languages in primary education is in line with his other proposal for a curriculum that promotes linguistic diversity in the classroom (Zein, 2017a). Zein (2017c) called for a more effective mechanism of recruitment and rewards for primary school teachers. Agreeing with Hawanti (2014, p. 169), who states that 'the teacher education policy… does not have the capacity at present to resolve the problems', Zein also called for a specialized preparatory course on primary English education as part of the policy.

Zein's (2017a) article is a review of the current practices and challenges on policy on elementary English education. Highlighting notable challenges such as the mismatch between teachers' qualifications and the professional skills they ought to perform and pedagogical concerns relating to employing suitable methodology, the article also points to future prospects for elementary English education. It articulates the importance of adopting a holistic view of multilingualism to take into account linguistic diversity in Indonesia as well as the apparent need for English instruction. It suggests the need for a framework of education that could allow for the establishment of multilingual education consisting of Indonesian, English and indigenous languages. Although this suggestion was later accepted as a policy proposal to accommodate multilingual education by the then Minister of Education and Culture, Dr Anies Baswedan, a political decision by President Joko Widodo resulted in the removal of Dr Baswedan from office. In 2017, the government decided to abolish the teaching of English in primary schools through the Revised Curriculum 2013.

Overall, the surge of research interest in primary English education reflects the growth of the increasing number of primary schools offering English education in the past 15 years. Researchers have attempted to uncover the pedagogical complexity surrounding primary English education, with a strong emphasis on pedagogy and teacher education. This is understandable since primary English education is relatively new. Research on pedagogy and teacher education reflects the aspiration of researchers to develop pedagogically appropriate teaching approaches to help primary school teachers, a great majority of whom have not been prepared to teach English. This is a common issue that is also found in other contexts such as East Asia (see Butler, 2015). On the other hand, research on policy shows the continuing political contestation of primary English schooling, which, as opposed to teaching English in secondary and tertiary education, remains under-supported. The divided opinions among researchers regarding the role of English in primary education reflect this heated debate.

4. Secondary education

Studies on secondary education cover several areas of interest, including curriculum changes, materials development, teachers and learners' characteristics and interactions, and national examination (NE).

4.1 Curriculum changes

Before 2013, the English Curriculum adopted in senior high school (SHS) was the 2006 KTSP or Competency-Based Curriculum. Then, through National Minister's Regulation No. 69, it was replaced by the 2013 Character-Based Curriculum or the 2013 Curriculum. Since its first introduction, the latter curriculum had sparked harsh debates among education practitioners and researchers. Shadowed by those debates, some scholars studied the reasons why the 2013 Curriculum was introduced, whether the teachers and students were ready to implement it and the problems encountered in the field, etc. Based on the papers he reviewed, Putra (2014) argued that there were two factors leading to the introduction of the 2013 Curriculum: (1) the NE which tested only listening and reading; and (2) teachers' poor communicative competence. These factors had driven the teachers to focus their teaching on skills that did not require them to produce the spoken language. They dedicated their time to teaching reading intensively, rather than extensively, together with grammar and vocabulary, paying less attention to speaking, listening and writing. As the 2013 Curriculum adopted a GBA in text

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

selection for reading, Putra (2014) foresaw that the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum would be problematic because the decrease of teaching hours was not followed by a sufficient reduction in the text types introduced, namely five text types for junior secondary schools and ten text types for senior high schools. He argued that the 2013 Curriculum should be fine-tuned in accordance with real classroom situations followed by teachers' quality improvement.

A prediction that the 2013 Curriculum would be problematic at the implementation level is supported by Sundayana (2015). The researcher studied the teachers' readiness and ability to implement the 2013 Curriculum. Using a questionnaire, he found that the teachers interviewed were ready and competent to implement the 2013 Curriculum. However, the relationship between the two variables was rather weak, indicating that their readiness might not come from the teaching competence they had, but from external factors such as regulations or pressure from the working environment. Gani and Mahjaty (2017) explored the problems of the 2013 Curriculum implementation from the point of view of the acquisition of content, teaching and learning processes, and evaluation standards. Using a questionnaire administered to teachers from three schools in Banda Aceh, they showed that the respondents' knowledge about implementing the 2013 Curriculum was low: 40% for content knowledge, 41% for process knowledge and 36% for evaluation knowledge. Gani and Mahjaty argued that this low level of knowledge may result in pedagogical problems. A similar conclusion was reached by Jasmi (2014), who observed that a teacher in a SHS did not create a lesson plan. Instead, she modified some from the internet as was commonly done by teachers in the previous Competency-Based Curriculum. Jasmi found the teacher also had difficulty when constructing the assessment section of the lesson plan because there were too many aspects to evaluate and too many documents to complete. In a similar vein, Ashar and Irmawati (2016) observed that some steps were missing from an English lesson of a teacher at a vocational secondary school, including preliminary activities, integrated learning implementation, selection of learning resources and media, and the concluding stage. The deficiencies were caused by the shortage of time allocation, complicated assessment procedures, and the lack of teachers' understanding of the 2013 Curriculum. Problems with assessment were also seen by Rukmini and Saputri (2017), who studied the implementation of authentic assessment to evaluate productive skills. The researchers found that limited time allotment, class size and the complex nature of authentic assessment had driven the teachers to shift from teaching to assessing (p. 268). The researchers thought this may be due to the fact that evaluation portfolios would be checked by school supervisors. Moreover, teachers would also use the portfolios for marking purposes.

Another criticism of the 2013 Curriculum came from Widodo (2016), who argued that it did not demonstrate key curriculum components such as materials, method and techniques, and assessment from relevant theories of language, language learning and language teaching. He contended that it did not specifically highlight any key principles of reframing English language curricula in the Indonesian secondary education sector from a critical perspective. He proceeded to offer six principles. First, teachers should play a role not only as curriculum transmitters but also as curriculum makers and developers. Second, rather than being enacted in a top-down manner, curriculum development should be initiated by teachers. Third, teachers should base their teaching on their own local or situated context. Fourth, assessment and teaching should be dynamic, a process of developing what students have learned. Fifth, teacher education should be revitalized to produce teachers who play a developmental role. Sixth, TPD in which teachers play an active role should be sustained.

Other researchers investigated the impact of policy changes on the curriculum in terms of the emergence of EMI. In implementing Law No. 32/2004 on the National Education System, the Indonesian government introduced international standard schools (ISS) in 2005, which endorsed EMI for science subjects together with Bahasa Indonesia for social sciences. This EMI policy raised controversies among education observers, educators, researchers, non-government organizations and policymakers (see Sukyadi, 2015).

Coleman (2011) observed that EMI practice in secondary schools varied from school to school. Some schools exclusively teach subjects in English. On the other hand, some schools only use English to open and close lessons, delivering lessons mainly in Indonesian (p. 10). Coleman's

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

observation was in line with Haryanto's study (2012); he found that EMI was not significantly related to students' academic performance. The teachers themselves were aware that they were not proficient in English and had difficulty conveying the subject content in English. These findings are in line with Fitriati (2015), who found that teachers' positive language ideology did not always go hand in hand with their language practice in the classroom. Teachers' limited English language competence and lack of knowledge of language acquisition and language pedagogy threatened the success of EMI implementation.

In his further examination of the complexity of EMI policy in Indonesia, Coleman (2016b) cited how students' reading competence based on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) was low, making it unrealistic to expect that they would be able to learn in classrooms where English is the medium of instruction. Coleman further observed that the EMI policy also constrained students' ability to process information and interact with the teachers, lowered the prestige of Bahasa Indonesia and hastened the decline of local languages. In the long run, it would create a tension between English-speaking upper class and Bahasa Indonesia- and indigenous-speaking lower class (pp. 226–227). Coleman's findings are parallel with the ESACDP report (2013). The report shows that from 1339 fledgling international standard schools, no school had become an ISS or achieved all the requirements, and one of the most difficult criteria to meet was EMI.

The EMI policy ended in 2013 when the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia revoked Chapter 50, Paragraph 3 of the Act of the 2003 National Education System, which legalized the policy. Since then, the use of EMI has been limited to some private schools (Walker, Liyanage, Madya, & Hidayati, 2019) which are independent of government funding either at primary or secondary levels. However, as noted by Walker et al., EMI policy is booming through internationalization programmes at tertiary level. Student exchange programmes initiated and funded by the government of ASEAN countries, such as South East Asia Teachers (SEA Teachers) and South East Asia Technical and Vocational Education (SEA TVET) have encouraged state teacher education universities to create a teaching practicum where English is used as a medium of instruction. Other methods of teaching, such as Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) offered by overseas universities, have also increased the demand for EMI in tertiary education.

4.2 Materials development

Some Indonesian researchers are also interested in studying textbooks, tools that many teachers heavily depend on to succeed in their teaching. Researchers studied textbooks from an internal structure viewpoint, such as content difficulty and thematic progression, while others explored the inclusion of culture and ideologies. With regard to the internal structure of textbooks, Putra and Lukmana (2017) examined progression and complexity in reading texts. They found that, regardless of the inconsistent progression of text complexity within each textbook, there was a consistent pattern of text complexity progression across grade levels; the higher the grade, the more complex the texts are. However, complexity progression of NE texts between JHS and SHS is not significantly wide. First, as reported by Aziez (2015), it was found that both JHS and SHS NE texts belong to the same K4 (4,000-words) level (the number required to 95% comprehend the texts). Second, the difference of the 4,000-word coverage between JHS and SHS is also small. Aziez (p. 16) further indicated that the running word by the 4,000 words in NE texts of JHS was 95.80%, while it was 95.96% for SHS. For vocabulary beyond 2,000 basic words, the coverage in JHS NE texts is 7.83%, as opposed to 7.61% in SHS NE texts. This means that JHS students need to know 109 new word families in the texts, while SHS students need to know 93 new word families.

A number of studies were carried out to examine the compatibility of textbooks with the interests of the users. For example, Goridussukur, Madya, and Bismoko (2018) investigated whether English textbooks used in secondary high schools fulfilled the needs of their multicultural, multilingual and multi-ethnic students. They showed that most of the contents of the three textbooks they examined had strictly followed the national standard. Consequently, the contents in general did not take into

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

account the differences of Indonesian students in terms of ethnicity, geographical areas, socio-economic background, gender, interest, motivation, ability and other related factors. They reported that the difficulty level of the books was suitable only for students in big cities who had more access to learning resources, implying that they were not suitable for students with limited competence and resources and living in the many remote areas in Indonesia. While Goridussukur et al. (2018) looked at the relevance of textbooks from the point of view of cultural, linguistic and ethnic varieties, Margana and Widyantoro (2017) observed them with regard to the students' cognitive development. They observed that government-distributed textbooks put emphasis on recall and text comprehension. Therefore, teachers were enthusiastic when they were introduced to new ways to develop reading materials that would enhance learners' high order thinking skills.

From a visual mode perspective, Ena (2013) examined whether electronic textbooks published by the government in 2008 were visually representative in terms of ethnicity, religion, gender and socio-economic status (SES). She found that minority Melanesian ethnic groups were under-represented. From a religion perspective, only Islam and Christianity were represented by human images, while Hinduism and Buddhism were represented by the images of objects. From a gender point of view, women were under-represented, while men were presented as having a wider range of roles as shown by their occupations and the tasks they performed. Three socio-economic status groups: low, mid and high were represented in the English e-textbooks and most of the visual images represented the mid-SES group. Also, the textbooks promoted the ideology of ELF in that the goal of English language learning was not to achieve native-like competence, but to be able to use English for intercultural communication.

4.3 Teachers and learners: Characteristics and interactions

Teachers and learners are the main actors that determine whether learning objectives are met or not. Bearing this in mind, issues concerning learners' characteristics and learning strategies have been dealt with by Indonesian scholars and education practitioners. It is generally believed that language learning strategies play a significant role in the success of language learning. They have been found to be instrumental in the acquisition of language skills (Oxford, 1991, 2011).

With regard to reading skill acquisition, Tobing (2013) reported that reading strategies had a significant relationship with reading comprehension. More reading strategy usage mean more reading comprehension. When the students were trained to use predicting, text mapping and summarizing, their literal and inferential reading comprehension significantly improved (Mistar, Zuhairi, & Yanti, 2016). In respect of writing skills, Mistar, Zuhairi, and Parlindungan (2014b) reported that successful learners used strategies such as self-monitoring, planning, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, cognitive compensation, self-evaluation, authentic practice and mental processing more frequently than less successful learners did. The same was true for speaking skills, where successful learners employed more cognitive interaction strategies as well as other strategies related to cognitive interaction, self-evaluation, fluency-orientation and metacognitive planning, among others (Mistar, Zuhairi, & Umamah, 2014a). Mistar's studies show that training in learning strategies will improve students' reading, writing and speaking skills.

When talking about teachers' characteristics, Indonesian scholars mainly refer to teachers' competences, as stipulated by the National Education Minister's Regulation No.16/2007, which include personal, social, pedagogical and professional competence. However, some teachers' characteristics are reported on, namely insufficient reading ability, translanguaging and motivating students. Mahfud (2011) documented that teachers' competence in comprehending genre-based texts which they were supposed to teach to their students was at the 'fair' level (65.38%). With this level of competence, it would be hard for them to encourage their students to acquire advanced reading ability. While poor reading ability was seen as negative, translanguaging was seen by Mujiono (2016) as positive because it allowed teachers to engage their students in the teaching and learning process. In his study, Mujiono observed that TRANSLANGUAGING was employed for various purposes including to

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

involve students in learning activities, manage the classroom, alleviate fatigue and express irritation. Concerning student motivation, Astuti (2013) observed that teachers of English in the SHS context influence their students' motivation by building a good rapport with them. They accomplished this by creating appropriate teaching materials and employing interactive teaching strategies.

Indeed in Indonesia, the interaction between teachers and students is crucial for successful learning since in many cases the classrooms is the only place where students are exposed to English. Because of this, many researchers are interested in exploring this area. Student–teacher interactions are mainly studied from the perspective of interaction strategies and personal interactions. Different interaction strategies seem to be employed by teachers. Rido, Nambiar, and Ibrahim (2016) reported that master teachers or exemplary teachers employed four kinds of interaction strategies: control of interaction or interaction management, elicitation or questioning, speech modification or feedback, and repairing or error treatment. The researchers viewed that these strategies were able to promote interactive learning. Interaction strategies were also realized through teacher talk and student talk. According to Puasa, Asrifan, and Chen (2017), teacher talk appeared in the form of explanations, teacher questions, teacher feedback and the modification of teacher speech, while student talk appeared in the form of student responses and student questions. Puasa et al. (2017) reported that students were generally influenced by teacher talk. They adjusted their language choice when responding to teacher questions. When the questions were in English, the students would answer them in English. When the teachers' questions were in their mother tongue, the students would answer them in their mother tongue. However, when the teachers translated questions into the students' first language, the students would still strive to answer them in English. Therefore, rather than using translation in asking questions, Puasa et al. (2017) recommended simplifying the questions in English.

Student–teacher interaction could also determine students' motivation for learning. Maulana, Opdenakker, den Brok, and Bosker (2011) investigated the relationship between students' perceptions of teacher interpersonal behaviour and learning motivation. They found they were associated. Both influence and proximity dimensions are related to more autonomous motivation, while influence is also associated with more controlled motivation. Maulana, Helms-Lorenz, and van de Grift (2015) reported that teachers' teaching behaviour is a significant predictor of students' controlled and autonomous motivation. The effect of teaching behaviour is stronger for pupils' autonomous motivation than for controlled motivation.

Research shows that teacher questioning practices could determine not only the success of language learning but also student cognition. Good questions can encourage students to learn and ask better questions (see Sunggingwati & Nguyen, 2013). Findings from the study demonstrated that teachers who relied on textbooks for establishing reading class activities and selecting question types, and were mainly exposed to low-level questions mostly available in the books, would face challenges in generating high-level questions and required assistance in order to do this.

4.4 NE

Before 2015, the NE was used to determine study completion and school admission. This role raised controversy among education stakeholders, especially concerning the negative effect of the NE, such as preparation drill, students' cheating, answer key leakage and the security of test items. In this context, Sukyadi and Mardiani (2011) and Furaidah, Saukah, and Widiati (2015) examined the washback effect of the NE on high-achieving and low-achieving schools. They found that low-achieving schools had more negative washback than high-achieving schools. Low-achieving schools realized that their students' competence would make it impossible for them to pass the NE without extra effort, while the pressure on students was too high. Consequently, they did whatever they could to solve the problem.

In an attempt to improve the quality of the NE, in the academic year of 2014/2015, the government introduced a computer-based national examination (CBNE). This type of testing delivery aimed to reduce the negative washback of the paper-based NE. CBNE is a policy which came together with the decision that the NE was not a determinant of study completion and school admission. At the

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

beginning of its introduction, the government implemented the CBNE in some piloted schools possessing the required information and communications technology (ICT) infrastructure. Gradually, more and more schools were involved. However, considering the geographical landscape of Indonesia, the administration of the CBNE has raised complex issues. Retnawati et al. (2015) pointed out that in implementing the CBNE the schools would have to prepare their own electronic equipment such as servers and laptops. Some areas outside Java Island experienced internet and electricity problems and this would be a problem in the administration of the CBNE. In addition to infrastructure difficulties, many test proctors did not have any experience in the CBNE and would need to be trained for that purpose. Finally, the students themselves did not know why they should use ICT for examinations. Even so, the CBNE has proved promising seen from a character-building perspective. The national average CBNE score has decreased, but the overall test validity has increased.

We have reviewed articles on ELT in secondary schools covering curriculum changes, materials development, EMI, teachers' and students' characteristics and interactions, and NE. Of these areas, the main problems are the politicization of educational policies and poor teacher competencies. Consequently, future research should address issues such as the present functions of the NE, the relationship between language education and character building, and the role of teacher education.

5. Tertiary education

In Indonesian tertiary education, English is a compulsory subject with a minimum of two credit hours for all students, regardless of their majors. This section discusses current research on English language education at tertiary level, covering relevant domains such as pluricentric English, EMI and pedagogical issues.

5.1 Pluricentric English

Several studies have pointed to the pluricentric approach to teaching English, such as English as an international language (EIL) and ELF.

The EIL perspective is the major tenet from which studies by Dewi (2017a) and Zacharias (2011, 2014a, 2014b) were conducted. A classroom action research project connected with a teacher education programme was carried out by Zacharias (2011). She found that

> the integration of EIL needs to be accompanied by providing safe and reflexive spaces allowing the learners to interact, process, and discuss the new concepts… (to) gain new understandings and awareness on how the student-teachers develop their understandings and even navigate their insecurity and hesitancy in using the approaches (p. 123).

In terms of which English(es) to teach, Dewi (2017a) reported a study involving 14 English language educators with an Indonesian background on how the tertiary English teachers perceive what varieties of English to teach in their higher education institutions. They reported that their selection of English variety was due to external factors and suggested that 'they would teach either American or British English because of textbook availability, not because of their beliefs. However, there were participants who stated that in teaching one of the varieties, they would also share information about the existence of other varieties with their students' (p. 145). Zacharias (2016) also underlined the tendency among student-teachers towards 'native' English as the variety that should be taught, as '… many STs [student-teachers] in the present study continue to believe that credible teacher identities can only be projected through speaking native speaker's English … to establish their credibility as English language teachers' (p. 336). Overall, the EIL approach itself is somewhat new to many student-teachers, with Zacharias (2014b) herself arguing:

> Students' limited (lack of) representation of Englishes in their EIL materials point to the continued efforts that need to be done to expose students to these new Englishes so that student-

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

> teachers can be more informed on how linguistically and culturally diverse English has become today (p. 228).

Researchers such as Mambu (2018) and Widiati and Hayati (2018) were also interested in the pluricentric approach to English language teacher education, seeing this rather differently through the ELF perspective. Mambu (2016) collected data from undergraduate students through audio-recorded classes, journal entries and students' comments on *Schoology*. His study demonstrates that scaffolded classroom discussions and exchanges through *Schoology* were effective to negotiate the notions of ASEAN awareness and social justice as an integral component of ELF use in the ASEAN community. Coming from a slightly different angle, the development of intercultural competence in teacher education for ELF is the focus of Widiati and Hayati (2018). The researchers analysed curricular documents from ten teacher education institutions offering courses relevant to the development of intercultural competence. Their study suggests the inseparable relationship between language and culture in the curricula. They argued for an ASEAN-oriented curriculum in pre-service education that allows for renewed linguistic and cultural competence to be integrated within teacher education.

5.2 EMI programmes

As reported by Hamied and Lengkanawati (2018), EMI study programmes have existed in Indonesian higher education since the 1920s with the first graduates becoming very proficient in English. In its further development, the implementation of EMI must take into consideration the multilingual and multicultural nature of Indonesia, both from the point of view of teaching methods and teaching materials. When an EMI programme is offered in a community in which oral discourses are more prevalent than written discourses, then pedagogically there should be more attention paid to helping students in their writing development. In a community with rich cultural values, EMI contents could be modified to cater to those cultural values. Likewise, given the preference of most policymakers at the national level to maintain the national language and the existing indigenous languages, questions about how much a foreign language is to be accommodated in the classroom should be dealt with first.

Floris (2014) found that students and teachers deemed it important for English to be used as a medium of instruction. However, she also observed that teachers faced such problems as student difficulty in responding in English as the majority of them had insufficient English. It was then suggested in both studies (Floris, 2014; Hamied & Lengkanawati, 2018) that there should be a policy from concerned higher education institutions to address the insufficiency of the students' capacity, in their English proficiency and their mastery in the field of study, as assessed in their entry selection test to get into the programme. It would be detrimental to EMI if the graduates from the programme did not reach the level of competency in their field of study as outlined in the programme goals. English would then become the culprit for the failure in their undergraduate programme, when the language barrier has some negative impact on students' overall academic performances.

Dewi (2017b) conducted a study on how university lecturers of English and other subjects perceived EMI, in various higher education institutions. The results reveal that perceptions of EMI at the tertiary level in Indonesia are complex, involving not only linguistic matters but also larger issues such as national identity and sentiment towards English as a medium of instruction. EMI programmes at the tertiary education level have proliferated. This occurs as a response from higher education institutions to the Minister of Research and Higher Education's plan to implement a compulsory bilingual curriculum across all universities in Indonesia. It is believed that bilingual classrooms involving English and Indonesian could enhance employability upon graduation and help internationalize higher education institutions.

5.3 Pedagogical issues

Studies in this section have revealed various pedagogical issues relating to methodology (e.g. Astika, 2014; Masduqi, 2011; Sukirlan, 2014) and beyond methodology (Dewi, 2014; Manara, 2013).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

One of the issues in the teaching–learning process is the lack of contact between the teacher and their students. This is exemplified by Astika (2014), who found that contacts between pre-service teachers and mentor teachers were infrequent, and when they took place, the focus of discussion was mainly on teaching preparation and assessment. This could be due to

> their concern on personal issues; how they felt when teaching, what they learned, or assessment of their teaching practice. The need for positive, personal, and professional relationships with the mentor teachers and other school staff might not have been viewed as a factor that could ensure success of teaching experience (p. 26).

To improve teaching methodology, the use of the internet has been suggested. With regard to internet-based teaching, Cahyono and Mutiaraningrum (2016) reported on a specific case of internet-based teaching for a writing class. They found that ' it improves students' writing quality and quantity, scaffolds active and independent learning, motivates students' learning, provides learning flexibility, and raises students' confidence' (p. 205). However, the study also indicated the importance of teachers' role in using the internet effectively, especially when confronted with students who are not sufficiently familiar with it. It was then recommended that more intensive management and training programmes be made available for teachers so that teachers throughout the country could have equal knowledge and the skills needed to implement internet-based teaching.

Other researchers identified issues and concerns that had arisen. For example, Masduqi (2011) identified the absence of daily exposure to English, citing the minimal use of English in social interactions outside the classroom where students have quite limited contact with English speakers. This has resulted in students not having real-life examples of how to use the target language outside the classroom. Another problem that Masduqi identified was the fact that very few university lecturers made use of the opportunity to undertake research in language education and disseminate their findings. Therefore, their professional knowledge is always insufficient to provide their students with solid, field-tested techniques and research-based skills, which could amplify their impact on their students' achievement in learning. From a different perspective, Sukirlan (2014) suggested the importance of providing a place for teaching communication strategies for tertiary students. Four reasons were suggested for the need of teaching time for these strategies: (1) promoting learners' awareness of using their linguistic resources to minimize communication problems; (2) enhancing learners' communicative competence; (3) bridging the gap between classroom and real-life communication; and (4) promoting students' security, self-confidence and motivation to communicate (p. 2033). The gap between what is perceived as necessary at the tertiary level of teacher preparation and what is actually needed in schools, as reported by Riyanti (2017), could impact the quality of input in higher education. It was found that during microteaching activity, student-teachers 'tended to enact identities as regimented, less authoritative, technology-minded teachers, [but then] they became more creative, authoritative, flexible and patient in dealing with [their] students' (Riyanti, 2017, p. 333) when they were teaching at schools. Similarly, Sulistiyo (2015) reported a finding in his study that 'microteaching courses in the programme are not adequate in preparing student-teachers with the basic skills they need to teach well in the practicum schools' (p. 248).

Beyond methodology, researchers have been interested in areas such as the interrelationship between language and cultures, language and identity, and learning autonomy.

Gandana and Parr (2013) carried out a case study on a teacher's beliefs, understanding of the English language and intercultural language teaching. Gandana and Parr showed how offering an intercultural language teaching course is complex procedurally because an institution has to take into account the already acquired local values and customs as well as expectations of the institution where the course is offered. In this study, the teacher indicated her difficulty in running the course as her 'autonomy and agency as a teacher were challenged by a number of contextual factors, such as the hierarchical institutional culture, curricular demands prescribed by the faculty as well as limited resources' (pp. 241–242). A study conducted by Dewi (2012) has responded to the questions of how

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Indonesian university stakeholders perceive English in relation to identity, whether or not English is viewed as a manifestation of imperialism, and whether or not English is seen as influencing national and religious identities. It was found that there were positive and negative views on English, but the positives outweigh the negatives. University lecturers indicated enthusiasm to be able to communicate using an international language. It was also found that both teaching staff and students in the participating universities had the confidence to say that English does not adversely affect their identity as Indonesians. Looking at the somewhat broader context, Manara (2013) sees tensions in the teaching of English in Indonesia. For Manara, English teaching displays conflicting ideas between 'complex interrelations of global and local interactions' and the teachers' 'high awareness of their linguistic realities, evaluation of current trends in English acquisition' (p. 33). English is seen as having 'double-edged functions', as it 'has the potential to be a killer language or to be the medium of multilcultual and multilingual identities and self-actualization' (p. 33).

Lengkanawati (2017), who conducted a study on learner autonomy involving graduate high school teachers came to the conclusion that 'autonomy was not yet common among Indonesian students, but … in the Indonesian contexts learner autonomy is a necessity and has a significant impact on EFL learning' (p. 230). She also found that many of the learning autonomy principles were not feasible to apply, arguing that Indonesian university students still expected to be spoon-fed in their learning. This is in line with Masduqi's observation (2014) on the difficulty of developing critical thinking among university students as they are mostly not accustomed to autonomous learning: '[t]he notion of learner-centredness … does not generally align with learner expectations, previous experiences of education, and attitudes to learning' (p. 391).

While most of the studies we reviewed were contextually foregrounded in English departments catering for prospective English teachers, we found little research conducted in the context of English language and literature departments. We also did not encounter studies examining English for pre-departure training that provides IELTS or TOEFL preparation for those wanting to study overseas. We also note the scarcity of research relating to the compulsory English that is prescribed in the first or second semester at university, called *Mata Kuliah Dasar Umum* (General Subject Courses) (MKDU). The same applies to research into the process of preparing academic staff in non-English departments where attention to teaching EMI has increased.

6. Discussion and conclusion

Our examination of English language education in Indonesia based on research at three levels of education and the nation's linguistic ecology has yielded several key observations. One important theme is the central importance of English language pedagogy. Some research has raised concerns regarding teachers' limited teaching competency, while others focus on teaching strategies that could lead to improved pedagogy, ranging from applying songs, the incorporation of ICT, classroom discourse and the utilization of culturally appropriate teaching materials. Indonesia has clearly benefited from the increasing number of scholars completing their postgraduate studies overseas, enabling them to produce research that is updated and in line with international research trends. This explains why recent studies have also examined pedagogy as it relates to intercultural language teaching, learning strategies, learner autonomy and identity, and teacher-student interaction – areas that were absent from scrutiny a decade ago. Furthermore, several of the studies reviewed in this article are within the domain of language teacher education. They are foregrounded on the apparent need to improve teacher professionalism both at pre-service and in-service levels. This is in line with the increasing pressure on teachers and teacher educators to develop their competency, as stipulated by Law No. 14/2005 on Teachers and Lecturers. However, with this law in mind, only a few studies moved beyond fact-finding. This explains why the concluding sections of many of the studies are limited and generally have inadequate implications for teacher education. Clearly, one challenge for Indonesian researchers in producing pedagogy-based research is to address this issue. What may prove influential in future studies is the examination of the issues of interest discussed (e.g. intercultural language

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

teaching, learning strategies, learning autonomy) for the purpose of making language teaching motivating and inspiring for learners, as Lamb and Wedell (2015) have pioneered in contexts where official provision is limited and resources are scarce.

Second, several studies reviewed in this article have also shown a move towards considerations of Indonesia's linguistic ecology. There are studies that highlight the ongoing tension resulting from the introduction of English into the curricula, usually citing the potential threat that English brings to learners' multilingual background. Others focus more on the utilization of English in the development of learners' linguistic repertoire. While this issue has appeared in mainstream applied linguistics research for quite some time (see Canagarajah, 2013), in Indonesia this has only recently gained ground. This clearly indicates the recent efforts by Indonesian scholars to keep abreast of international research trends. The general tendency is that recent research has attempted to explore how English can play a role vis-à-vis the Indonesian language and one or two indigenous languages that many of the learners also speak. This is a welcome move, given that English has been in direct linguistic contestation with the Indonesian language and is often detrimental to the linguistic ecology overall (Zein, 2019). At a time when English is so important that ensuring equal opportunity to acquire it has become 'a moral issue' (Lamb, 2011, p. 202), provision of English should not harm linguistic ecology. The problem is that this has always been the case. Coleman (2016a) uses *naga*, a mythical serpent in Indonesian iconography, as a metaphor for English, depicting its potentially destructive role. Coleman asserts that the language has become 'an instrument of social exclusion, closing off opportunities to those whose linguistic repertoire is limited to the local languages and/or Indonesian' (p. 67). Meanwhile, Sugiharto (2015a) argues that Indonesians 'view and treat English with awe and seek educational alternatives that can equip them with this language. As a consequence, the preservation of local languages through education remains in limbo, with their users gradually but surely abandoning them' (p. 232).

With this background, and since the bulk of research examined in this paper does not consider the considerable benefits of mother-tongue instruction for language preservation (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), especially in the early years of primary school, it is high time that future research focused on how English is situated within the context of multilingual education. The overriding principle is for multilingual education to contribute to language maintenance through mother-tongue instruction, tackle the educational imperative of nation building through Indonesian and the ever-present aspiration to attain proficiency in languages of global importance that suit the Indonesian context (e.g. Arabic, English). This provides room for the implementation of multilingual education models, which are outlined in Zein (2020): (1) Language Revitalization Programme; (2) Two-way Multilingual Programme; (3) Transitional Multilingual Programme; (4) Language Awareness Programme; (5) Alternate Days Model; (6) Alternate Subjects Model; and (7) Supplementary Model. These models emphasize mother-tongue instruction for language preservation, especially in the early years of primary school, and the development of literacy in Indonesian while allowing for the inclusion of English and other languages of global importance (e.g. Arabic, Mandarin) in primary and/or secondary education. These models are designed according to linguistic vitality levels in speech communities. Some communities whose languages are critically endangered may opt for Language Revitalization Programme, Two-Way Multilingual Programme, or Transitional Multilingual Programme; while others whose main concern is on adding to learners' linguistic repertoire may implement the Language Awareness Programme or Alternate Days Model. Assessment of language vitality will need to be conducted by speech communities, so as to identify which model best suits them. Then consideration will have to be made as to which language should be adopted as the medium of instruction, which language should be adopted to teach which subject(s), and which language(s) should be taught as subject(s). At primary level, for example, this means ensuring the teaching of indigenous languages and Indonesian as media of instruction and the teaching of English or Arabic as a subject.

The growing body of research on English and linguistic ecology has been mainly focused on familiar areas in Java. Studies in 'acquisition poor environment' such as those in South Sulawesi (Pasassung, 2013) and those seeking an explanation for rural youth's motivation in learning English (Lamb, 2013) are the exception rather than the norm. This issue warrants further scrutiny in areas such as eastern

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Indonesia, where research has been notably absent. In seeking an explanation for this, one has to consider the professional background of Indonesian teachers and researchers who are often confronted with heavy teaching workloads, unsatisfactory infrastructure and limited opportunity to develop their academic potential. This is not to say that teachers and researchers from western Indonesia tend to have reduced teaching workloads, but improved infrastructure and wider opportunities for capacity building (i.e. teacher education) are imperative to ensure more coverage of research in eastern Indonesia. This is important given the fact that eastern Indonesia is so diverse that there are approximately 384 indigenous languages spoken in the Indonesian provinces of Papua and Western Papua alone, whereas 66 languages are spoken in Maluku and 68 on Timor and its neighbouring islands (Badan Bahasa, 2017). Investigating what English means to the people in these regions and how it is taught in less documented areas would bring a clearer picture of Indonesia's highly diverse linguistic ecology as a whole. Given that they are regions of the lowest linguistic vitality (Florey & Himmelmann, 2010), researching the teaching of English in the face of language endangerment in these areas is of considerable importance. For example, how English competes with Indonesian, major indigenous languages and RLFs that have been argued to be detrimental to locally used indigenous languages (see Anderbeck, 2015) is under-represented in scholarship. It is necessary to investigate how English interacts with, impacts and is impacted by other elements of Indonesia's superglossia (Zein, 2020).

For scholars such as Sugiharto (2015a) and Kohler (2019), ideological contestations are always at play. Studies reviewed in this article have shown a tendency for such contestations, although this has not been discussed explicitly, nor systematically. Indonesia's linguistic ecology is highly dynamic and complex and is influenced by political contestations, erratic social trends, deeply-rooted religious beliefs and pervasive cultural values. This explains the emergence of repetitive questioning over the portrayal of male and female characters as well as the inclusion of cultural elements in teaching materials. Pertinent to this issue is the role of English in building the character of Indonesian learners, which has become socially normative in the country's educational landscape, as stipulated in President Joko Widodo's *Nawa Cita* policy. How to present English to align with the Indonesian people's religious and sociocultural values in terms of character building is a major challenge. More research that examines the complex relationship between English, religious and sociocultural values in the linguistically diverse Indonesia is needed. In this regard, it may be useful to note the increased popularity of research addressing the pluricentric perspectives of English such as EIL and ELF, as opposed to the nativist ideology associated with EFL that highlights the importance of subscribing to the 'native' English culture. While issues such as native-speakerism and varieties of English characterizing EIL and ELF have been quite widely disseminated, an area of neglect includes the relationship between pluricentric perspectives and character building. Zein (2018a) has recently argued that the adoption of the ELF perspective is in alignment with character building, but his assertion requires empirical grounds. We therefore recommend future research to examine this area of interest. Further, it is interesting to note that the adoption of the pluricentric perspectives is evident in studies relevant to primary and tertiary education, but it is entirely absent in studies relevant to secondary education. This might have been affected by the general tendency of research in secondary education that is more influenced by the nativist ideology. Lecturers at tertiary level who undertake their studies overseas are generally more well-informed about international research trends, hence bringing their understanding of the pluricentric perspectives to their student-teachers. Many of these lecturers are also well-connected with teachers at primary level, a level of education showing a dire need for training a few years ago when the role of English was widely contested. Thus, the role of pluricentric English in secondary education needs further research investigation.

This review also shows the inextricable relationship between policy and English language education. This issue is best seen in the light of the ambivalent policy attitude of the Indonesian government in which popular reasoning has often played a role in policy design. The multiple changes of curriculum within a short period of time are a case in point. Some senior government officers prior to the introduction of the 2013 Curriculum were worried about the impact of frequent curriculum changes on the

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

future generation of Indonesia because frequent changes often confuse students and some curricula require them to take heavy studying load. Some policymakers wanted to look helpful in the eyes of teachers who regularly had difficulties in developing lesson plans, learning materials and assessment instruments. However, rather than empowering the teachers, the government supplied all the curriculum components to teachers. Widodo (2016) noted that in secondary education this means moving teachers from curriculum developers to becoming curriculum transmitters. Furthermore, the strong support given to EMI programmes at secondary and tertiary education is indicative of the lofty dreams of the government for internationalizing its education system. Such a level of support, however, is absent in primary education where retaining the optional status of English has been an ongoing debate for more than a decade (Zein, 2017a). The ambivalent policy attitude is also exacerbated by often limited policy rationale. This is evident in the dubious introduction of the 2013 Curriculum, as well as the *Rintisan Sekolah Berstandar Internasional* (International Pilot Project State-run Schools) (RSBI) policy that was then revoked only a few years after being implemented. Moreover, ambivalent policy attitude can be seen in the case of policy discontinuance regarding multilingual education, where the newly appointed education minister failed to act on a policy plan initiated by the previous minister. Clearly, the period under review in this article witnessed significant, albeit sporadic, changes of national educational policy. Although studies on policy at the three levels of education clearly reflect these changes, they seldom appear as baseline studies or comprehensive evaluation projects. Most of the research is within a narrow language education paradigm, usually adopting a descriptive rather than a critical approach. Future research therefore needs to address these issues.

Finally, with our emphasis on covering local publications, we note that research scholarship in those publications is still beset with problems, and there is an urgent need for our Indonesian colleagues to be more judicious in their research practice. We have found that many studies employed a single type or source of data, usually collected with either questionnaires or interviews, or a combination of the two. However, there has been an increase in the number of researchers who combine research methods creatively, allowing readers to examine recent issues with emerging perspectives (see, for example, Kramadibrata, 2016; Mambu, 2016). We note that there was considerable variability in the depth to which researchers addressed the topics of study, resulting in considerable difficulty assessing the quality of the work undertaken. A common issue was the lack of clarity in the description of research methodology, particularly in justifying the research approach and detailing data collection procedures. We encourage more precise description of ideas and recommendations when presenting research findings. Similarly, further research needs to cover research practice and academic writing among English language researchers and practitioners.

This leads to our final point that rigorous training into research and academic writing also needs to be undertaken. With the trend of English departments competing to establish their own local journals as part of accreditation, it is prudent to encourage universities to spend resources on the capacity building of academic staff. Seminars that encourage academic staff to publish in international journals have been ongoing in many universities throughout the country; this needs to be developed in a more systematic manner that allows for collaboration between researchers working in different institutions across the country or even internationally while enabling rigorous monitoring of methodological quality. Publication outlets such as *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, TEFLIN Journal* and *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching* could possibly facilitate such a process, assisting Indonesian scholars to reach the greatest potential in their research scholarship.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Maria Nagao for assisting us with the references. We also would like to thank anonymous reviewers whose feedback and insights were useful for the improvement of this article. Finally, we are grateful to the Editor of *Language Teaching*, Dr Graeme Porte, for editing the article and facilitating its publication.

References

Adaskou, K., Britten, D., & Fahsi, B. (1990). Design decision on the cultural content of a secondary English course for Morocco. *ELT Journal*, *44*(1), 3–10.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Adityarini, H. (2014). *An examination of the suitability of a pluricentric model of English language teaching for primary education in Indonesia* (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis). Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

Aisah, E. E., & Hidayat, D. R. (2012). Teacher talk on expanding ESL primary classroom discourse. *The New English Teacher*, *6*(1), 39–59.

Anderbeck, K. (2015). Portraits of language vitality in the languages of Indonesia. In I. W. Arka, N. L. Seri Malini, & I. A. M. Puspani (Eds.), *Language documentation and cultural practices in the Austronesian world: Papers from 12-ICAL Vol. 4* (pp. 19–57). Canberra, Australia: Pacific Linguistics, ANU Press.

Anwar, K. (1976). *Indonesian: Problems of development and use of a national language* (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis). University of London, London, UK.

Arka, I. W. (2013). Language management and minority language maintenance in (eastern) Indonesia: Strategic issues. *Language Documentation and Conservation*, *7*, 74–105.

Ashar, A., & Irmawati, I. (2016). The implementation of the 2013 curriculum of English at SMKN 1 Bantaeng: An Evaluative Study. *ELT Worldwide*, *3*(2), 156–167.

Astika, G. (2014). Reflective teaching as alternative assessment in teacher education: A case study of pre-service teachers. *TEFLIN Journal*, *25*(1), 16–32.

Astuti, S. P. (2013). Teachers' and students' perceptions of motivational teaching strategies in an Indonesian high school context. *TEFLIN Journal*, *24*(1), 14–31.

Aziez, F. (2015). Examining the vocabulary levels of Indonesia's English national examination texts. *Asian EFL Journal: Professional Teaching Articles*, *51*, 16–29.

Badan Bahasa [Language Agency]. (2017). *Data bahasa daerah 2017. (Indigenous languages data 2017)*. Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa.

BPS (Badan Pusat Statistik) [Indonesian Statistics Agency]. (2011). *Kewarganegaraan, suku bangsa, agama dan bahasa sehari-hari penduduk Indonesia: Hasil Sensus Penduduk* 2010. [Citizenship, ethnicity, religion, and daily languages of Indonesian: The result of demography census 2010]. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik.

Butler, Y. G. (2015). English language education among young learners in East Asia: A review of current research (2004–2014). *Language Teaching*, *48*, 303–342.

Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M., & Barnett, J. (2018). Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: Exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(4), 465–479.

Cahyono, B. Y., & Mutiaraningrum, I. (2016). Indonesian EFL teachers' familiarity with and opinion on the internet-based teaching of writing. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(1), 199–208.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 9–34.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Literacy as a translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*. London, UK: Routledge.

Coleman, H. (2011). Allocating resources for English: The case of Indonesia's English medium International Standard Schools. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language* (pp. 89–113). London, UK: The British Council.

Coleman, H. (2014). What are the foundations of Indonesia's 2013 National Curriculum? Paper presented at the 10th ITB-University of Leeds-British Council International Conference. Bandung, 3–5 June 2014.

Coleman, H. (2016a). The English language as *naga* in Indonesia. In P. Bunce, R. Phillipson, V. Rapatahana, & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Why English? Confronting the hydra* (pp. 59–71). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Coleman, H. (2016b). "To be consulted, to encourage and to warn": The impact and the limits of language-in-education research in the developing words. In R. Lawson, & D. Sayers (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic research: Application and impact* (pp. 215–234). London, UK: Routledge.

Coleman, H. (2017a). Milestones in language planning and development aid. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *18*(4), 442–468.

Coleman, H. (2017b). Bahasa Inggris Versi Indonesia (BIVI): Suatu gejala perubahan dalam kebudayaan Indonesia (Indonesian English Version: A symptom of change in Indonesian culture). Paper presented in Pertemuan Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia (PIBSI) Ke-39. Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, 7–8 November.

Damayanti, I. L. (2014). Gender construction in visual images in textbooks for primary school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *3*(2), 100–116.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (1998). Strategies for a successful national language policy: The Indonesian case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *130*, 35–47.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *English Australia Journal*, *18*(1), 22–23.

Dewi, A. (2011). English(es) for Indonesians: A review of literatures. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *1*(2), 143–155.

Dewi, A. (2012). Is English a form of imperialism? A study of academic community's perceptions at Yogyakarta universities in Indonesia. *Asian Englishes*, *15*(1), 4–27.

Dewi, A. (2014). *Perception of English: A study of staff and students at universities in Yogyakarta, Indonesia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dewi, F. (2016). Blended professional development for primary English language teachers: Design and evaluation. *Man in India*, *96*(12), 4777–4800.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Dewi, A. (2017a). The English(es) to teach after study and life in Australia: A study of Indonesian English language educators. *Asian Englishes*, *19*(2), 128–147.

Dewi, A. (2017b). English as a medium of instruction in Indonesian higher education: A study of lecturers' perceptions. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Diem, C. D. (2011). 3-Ls: A model for teaching young learners. *TEFLIN Journal*, *22*(2), 125–149.

Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ESACDP). (2013). *Evaluation of international standard schools in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Agency for Research and Developments (*Balitbang*), Ministry of Education and Culture, The Republic of Indonesia.

Ena, O. T. (2013). *Visual analysis of e-textbooks for senior high schools in Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Loyola University, Chicago, USA.

Fitriati, S. W. (2015). *Teachers' language ideologies and classroom practices in English bilingual education: An ethnographic case study of a senior high school in Central Java, Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Queensland University, Brisbane, Australia.

Florey, M., & Himmelmann, N. (2010). New directions in field linguistics: Training strategies for language documentation in Indonesia. In M. Florey (Ed.), *Endangered languages of Austronesia* (pp. 121–140). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Floris, F. D. (2014). Learning subject matter through English as the medium of instruction: Students' and teachers' perspectives. *Asian Englishes*, *16*(1), 47–59.

Frederick, W. H., & Worden, R. L. (2011). *Indonesia: A country study*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Furaidah, F., Saukah, A., & Widiati, U. (2015). Washback of English national examination in the Indonesian context. *TEFLIN Journal*, *26*(1), 36–58.

Gandana, I., & Parr, G. (2013). Professional identity, curriculum and teaching intercultural communication: An Indonesian case study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *26*(3), 229–246.

Gani, S. A., & Mahjaty, R. (2017). English teachers' knowledge for implementing the 2013 Curriculum. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, *8*(2), 199–212.

Gao, X., Liao, Y., & Li, Y. (2014). Empirical studies on foreign language learning and teaching in China (2008–2011). *Language Teaching*, *47*(1), 56–79.

Goebel, Z. (2015). *Language and superdiversity: Indonesians knowledging at home and abroad*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Goebel, Z. (2016). Superdiversity from within: The case of ethnicity in Indonesia. In K. Arnaut, M. S. Karrebaek, M. Spotti, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: Recombining spaces, times and language practices* (pp. 251–276). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Goridussukur, S., Madya, S., & Bismoko, J. (2018). Contextuality of the English textbooks used by senior high schools in Indonesia. *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology*, *9*(11), 995–1002.

Grimes, C. E. (1996). Indonesian: The official language of a multilingual nation. In S. A. Wurm, P. Mühlhausler, & D. T. Tyron (Eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas* (pp. 719–727). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hadisantosa, N. (2010). Insights from Indonesia. In R. Johnstone (Ed.), *Learning through English: Policies, challenges and prospects* (pp. 24–46). London, UK: British Council.

Hamied, F. A. (2012). English in multicultural and multilingual Indonesian education. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education*. London, UK: Springer.

Hamied, F. A. (2013). ELT intricacies within the Indonesian language policy. In T. W. Bigalke & S. Sharbawi (Eds.), *English for ASEAN Integration: Policies and practices in the region* (pp. 32–40). Bandar Seri Begawan: IELTS.

Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2018). English as a medium of instruction in Indonesia: A case study. In R. Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds.), *English medium instruction programmes: Perspectives from South East Asian universities* (pp. 55–69). London, UK: Routledge.

Haryanto, E. (2012). Listening to students' voice: A survey of the implementation of English as medium of instruction in an international standard school in Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *3*(15), 111–119.

Hawanti, S. (2012). *Teachers' knowledge and beliefs about the teaching and learning of English in primary schools in Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.

Hawanti, S. (2014). Implementing Indonesia's English language teaching policy in primary schools: The role of teachers' knowledge and beliefs. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, *9*(2), 162–170.

Hermawan, B., & Noerkhasanah, L. (2012). Traces of cultures in English textbooks for primary education. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 49–61.

Hidayati, I. N. (2012). Evaluating the role of L1 in teaching receptive skills and grammar in EFL classes. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 17–32.

Jasmi, (2014). English teachers' difficulties in designing lesson plan based on 2013 curriculum: A case study in a senior high school in Cipatat, West Java. A paper presented at The 61st TEFLIN International Conference, *UNS Solo 2014*.

Jazadi, I. (2000). Constraints and resources for applying communicative approaches in Indonesia. *English Australia Journal*, *18*(1), 31–40.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2005). Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1013–1034). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Karea, S. (2016). *Indonesian secondary-trained EFL teachers teaching English to primary-age children: A study of motivational factors and EFL teaching knowledge* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Australian Catholic University, Victoria, Australia.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2018). From EFL to ELF: The time is right. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca: Perspectives from Indonesia* (pp. 191–203). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kohler, M. (2019). Language education policy in Indonesia: A struggle for unity in diversity. In A. Kirkpatrick & A. J. Liddicoat (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia* (pp. 268–297). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kramadibrata, A. (2016). The halo surrounding native English speaker teachers in Indonesia. *Indonesia Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*(2), 282–295.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 59–81.

Lamb, M. (2011). A 'Matthew Effect' in English language education in a developing country context. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language* (pp. 186–206). London, UK: British Council.

Lamb, M. (2013). 'Your mum and dad can't teach you!' Constraints on agency among rural learners of English in the developing world. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *34*(1), 14–29.

Lamb, M., & Wedell, M. (2015). Cultural contrasts and commonalities in inspiring language teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(2), 207–224.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/Complexity science and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, *18*(2), 141–165.

Lengkanawati, N. S. L. (2017). Learner autonomy in the Indonesian EFL settings. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 222–231.

Lestari, L. A. (2003). Should English be a compulsory subject in the primary schools? *Journal Bahasa dan Seni*, *31*(2), 197–213.

Madya, S. (2003). Education reform and its implication for EFL teacher competencies. *TEFLIN Journal*, *14*(1), 1–13.

Madya, S. (2007). Curriculum innovations in Indonesia and the strategies to implement them. In Y. H. Choi & B. Spolsky (Eds.), *ELT curriculum innovation and implementation in Asia* (pp. 1–38). Seoul, S. Korea: Asia TEFL.

Mahfud, R. (2011). The competence of EFL teachers in mastering genre-based texts. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *1*(1), 33–39.

Mambu, J. E. (2016). Investigating students' negotiation of religious faiths in ELT contexts: A critical spiritual pedagogy perspective. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *13*(3), 157–182.

Mambu, J. E. (2018). Critical pedagogy in the ELF era: An Indonesian-based English language teacher educator's reflection. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca: Perspectives from Indonesia* (pp. 41–57). New York, NY: Routledge.

Manara, C. (2013). "That's what worries me": Tensions in English language education in today's Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language*, *3*(1), 22–35.

Manara, C. (2016). "No need-lah, Uncle": Teachers' perspective on English(es) communication and pedagogy. *International Journal of Culture and History*, *2*(1), 9–14.

Margana, & Widyantoro, A. (2017). Developing English textbooks oriented to higher order thinking skills for students of vocational high schools in Yogyakarta. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *8*(1), 26–38.

Masduqi, H. (2011). Critical thinking skills and meaning in English language teaching. *TEFLIN Journal*, *22*(2), 185–200.

Masduqi, H. (2014). EFL reading in Indonesian universities: Perspectives and challenges in cultural contexts. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, *3*(3), 385–397.

Maulana, R., Helms-Lorenz, M., & van de Grift, W. (2015). Pupils' perceptions of teaching behaviour: Evaluation of an instrument and importance for academic motivation in Indonesian secondary education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *69*, 98–112.

Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M. C., den Brok, P., & Bosker, R. (2011). Teacher–student interpersonal relationships in Indonesia: Profiles and importance to student motivation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *31*(1), 33–49.

Medgyes, P., & Nikolov, M. (2014). Research in foreign language education in Hungary (2006–2012). *Language Teaching*, *47*(4), 504–537.

Mistar, J., Zuhairi, A., & Parlindungan, F. (2014b). Strategies of learning English writing skill by Indonesian senior high school students. *Arab World English Journal*, *5*(1), 290–303.

Mistar, J., Zuhairi, A., & Umamah, A. (2014a). Strategies of learning speaking skill by senior high school EFL learners in Indonesia. *The Asian EFL Journal: Professional Teaching Articles*, *80*, 65–74.

Mistar, J., Zuhairi, A., & Yanti, N. (2016). Strategies training in the teaching of reading comprehension for EFL learners in Indonesia. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(2), 49–56.

Moeliono, A. (1986). *Language development and cultivation: Alternative approaches in language planning*. Canberra, Australia: Pacific Linguistics, ANU.

Moeliono, A., & Grimes, C. E. (1995). Indonesian (Malay. In D. Tyron (Ed.), *Comparative Austronesian dictionary* (pp. 443–457). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Moodie, I., & Nam, H.-J. (2016). English language teaching research in South Korea: A review of recent studies (2009–2014). *Language Teaching*, *49*(1), 63–98.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Mujiono, M. (2016). Code switching in English instruction and factors affecting the language attitude of Indonesian EFL learners in using it. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, *2*(4), 12–24.

Murtisari, E. T., & Mali, Y. C. (2017). Impact of English on the Indonesian language and culture: High school students' perceptions. *Studies about Languages*, *30*, 90–104.

Musgrave, S. (2014). Language shift and language maintenance in Indonesia. In P. Sercombe & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Language, education and nation building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia* (pp. 87–105). London, UK: Palgrave.

Nababan, P. W. (1991). Language in education: The case of Indonesia. *International Review of Education*, *37*(1), 115–131.

Ningsih, H. K. (2016). *Multilingual re-instantiation: Genre pedagogy in Indonesian classrooms*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

Oliver, R., Chen, H., & Moore, S. (2016). Review of selected research in applied linguistics published in Australia (2008–2014). *Language Teaching*, *49*(4), 513–548.

Oxford, R. L. (1991). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Language learning strategies*. New York, NY: Longman.

Pasassung, N. (2013). *Teaching English in an 'acquisition-poor environment': An ethnographic example of a remote Indonesian EFL classroom* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

Porto, M., Montemayor-Borsinger, A., & López-Barrios, M. (2016). Research on English language teaching and learning in Argentina (2007–2013). *Language Teaching*, *49*(3), 356–389.

Prastiwi, Y. (2015). *Folktales as a medium of teaching English: Two primary schools in Solo, Indonesia* (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis). Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia.

Puasa, K., Asrifan, A., & Chen, Y. (2017). Classroom talk in bilingual class interaction. *Research in Pedagogy*, *7*(1), 106–121.

Purwo, B. K. (1990). *Pragmatik dan pengajaran bahasa: Menyibak kurikulum 1984 [Pragmatics and language teaching: Unravelling the 1984 Curriculum]*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.

Putra, D. A., & Lukmana, I. (2017). Text complexity in senior high school English textbooks: A systemic functional perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(2), 436–444.

Putra, K. A. (2014). The implication of curriculum renewal on ELT in Indonesia. *Parole*, *4*(1), 63–75.

Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC). (2015). *The World in 2050: Will the shift in global economic power continue?* Retrieved from www.pwc.co.uk/economics

Qoyyimah, U. (2016). Inculcating character education through EFL teaching in Indonesian state schools. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *11*(2), 109–126.

Raihani, R. (2017). Education for multicultural citizens in Indonesia: Policies and practices. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *48*(1), 1–18

Ratminingsih, N. M. (2014). *Pengembangan model pembelajaran bahasa Inggris induktif berbasis lagu kreasi* [The development of inductive learning English language model based on creation songs]. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *20*(1), 47–58.

Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *15*(3), 618–629.

Retnawati, H., Hadi, S., Nugraha, A. C., Arlinwibowo, J., Sulistyaningsih, E., Djidu, H., … Iryanti, H. D. (2015). Implementing the computer-based national examination in Indonesian schools: The challenges and strategies. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, *75*(6), 612–633.

Rido, A., Nambiar, R. M. K., & Ibrahim, N. (2016). Teaching and classroom management strategies of Indonesian master teachers: Investigating a vocational English classroom. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *22*(3), 93–109.

Riyanti, D. (2017). *Teacher identity development: A collective case study of English as a foreign language pre-service teachers learning to teach in an Indonesian university teacher education programme* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska, Lincoln, USA.

Rukmini, D., & Saputri, L. A. D. E. (2017). The authentic assessment to measure students' English productive skills based on 2013 curriculum. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(2), 263–273.

Sani, A., Sakti, S., Nuebig, G., Toda, T., Mulyanto, A., & Nakamura, S. (2017). Towards language preservation: Preliminary collection and vowel analysis of Indonesian ethnic speech data. International Conference on Speech Database and Assessments.

Sari, N. T. A. (2011). Visible boys, invisible girls: The representation of gender in 'Learn English with Tito'. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 84–104.

Setiasih, L. (2014). The role of home and classroom environments in promoting the students' EFL literacy at an elementary school in Bandung, Indonesia. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal*, *7*(2), 81–98.

Setiawati, L. (2012). A description study on the teacher talk at EYL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 33–48.

Setiyadi, B., & Sukirlan, M. (2016). Language attitude and motivation of the Islamic school students: How Madrasa students of the academic year 2013–2014 in Indonesia perceive English teaching and learning and native speakers of English. *Social Science & Humanities*, *24*(1), 329–348.

Sikki, E. A. A., Rahman, A., Hamra, A., & Noni, N. (2013). The competence of primary school English teachers in Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(11), 139–145.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2017a). *Ethnologue: Languages of Indonesia* (20th ed.). Dallas, TX: SIL International.
Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2017b). *Ethnologue: Languages of the Americas and the Pacific* (20th ed.). Dallas, TX: SIL International.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education - or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Steinhauer, H. (1994). The Indonesian language situation and linguistics: Prospects and possibilities. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, *150*(4), 755–784.
Sugiharto, S. (2015a). Disentangling linguistic imperialism in English language education: The Indonesian context. In M. Bigelow, & J. Ennser-Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 224–236). New York, NY: Routledge.
Sugiharto, S. (2015b). The multilingual turn in applied linguistics? A perspective from the periphery. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *25*(3), 414–421.
Sugiharto, S. (2015c). Translingualism in action: Rendering the impossible possible. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *12*(2), 125–154.
Sukirlan, M. (2014). Teaching communication strategies in an EFL class of tertiary level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(10), 2033–2041.
Sukyadi, D. (2015). The teaching of English at secondary schools in Indonesia. In B. Spolsky, & K. Sung (Eds.), *Secondary school English education in Asia: From policy to practice* (pp. 123–147). New York, NY: Routledge.
Sukyadi, D., & Mardiani, R. (2011). The washback effect of the English national examination (ENE) on English teachers' classroom teaching and students' learning. *K@ta*, *13*(1), 96–111.
Sulistiyo, U. (2015). *Improving English as a foreign language teacher education in Indonesia: The case of Jambi University* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.
Sundayana, W. (2015). Readiness and competence of senior high school English teachers to implement Curriculum 2013. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*(1), 29–36.
Sunggingwati, D., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2013). Teachers' questioning in reading lessons: A case study in Indonesia. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 80–95.
Suryati, N., Furaidah, & Saukah, A. (2017). The effects of dialogic reading strategy on EFL young learners' reading comprehension skills. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *23*(2), 176–182.
Tobing, I. R. A. (2013). *The relationship of reading strategies and self-efficacy with the reading comprehension of high school students in Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kansas, Kansas City, USA.
Vieira, F., Moreira, M. A., & Peralta, H. (2014). Research in foreign language education in Portugal (2006–2011): Its transformative potential. *Language Teaching*, *47*(2), 191–227.
Walker, T., Liyanage, I., Madya, S., & Hidayati, S. (2019). Media of instruction in Indonesia: Implications for bi/multilingual Education. In I. Liyanage, & T. Walker (Eds.), *Multilingual education yearbook 2019* (pp. 209–229). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
Wati, H. (2011). The effectiveness of Indonesian English teacher training programs in improving confidence and motivation. *International Journal of Instruction*, *4*(1), 79–104.
Widiati, U., & Hayati, N. (2018). How well prepared are Indonesian pre-service teachers to develop future students' intercultural competence? (A study of English as a Lingua Franca). In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca: Perspectives from Indonesia* (pp. 77–93). New York, NY: Routledge.
Widodo, H. P. (2016). Language policy in practice: Reframing the English language curriculum in the Indonesian secondary education sector. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English education policy in Asia* (pp. 127–151). New York, NY: Springer.
Zacharias, N. T. (2011). One teacher struggles to integrate EIL approaches in a microteaching class: An action research project. Paper presented at the 5th International Seminar at Satya Wacana Christian University, November 21–22, UKSW.
Zacharias, N. T. (2014a). Bilingual narratives in English (BNEs) in a language pre-service teacher education program. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language*, *2*(2), 209–221.
Zacharias, N. T. (2014b). Integrating EIL pedagogy in a pre-service teacher education program. *TEFLIN Journal*, *25*(20), 217–232.
Zacharias, N. T. (2016). Exploring identity construction of student teachers practicing ELF pedagogy in a microteaching course. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *26*(2), 321–339.
Zein, M. S. (2015). Preparing elementary English teachers: Innovations at pre-service level. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*(6), 104–120. Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol40/iss6/6
Zein, M. S. (2016a). Government-based training agencies and the professional development of Indonesian teachers of English for Young Learners: Perspectives from complexity theory. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *42*(2), 205–223.
Zein, M. S. (2016b). Factors affecting the professional development of elementary English teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, *42*(3), 423–440.
Zein, M. S. (2017a). Elementary English education in Indonesia: Policy developments, current practices, and future prospects. *English Today*, *33*(1), 53–59.
Zein, M. S. (2017b). The pedagogy of teaching English to young learners: Implications for teacher education. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *12*(1), 61–77.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Zein, M. S. (2017c). Language-in-education policy on primary EFL: The case of Indonesia. *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning*, *12*(2), 133–146.
Zein, M. S. (2017d). Professional development needs of primary EFL teachers: perspectives of teachers and teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, *43*(2), 293–313.
Zein, S. (2018a). From EFL to ELF: Implications for teacher education. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca: Perspectives from Indonesia* (pp. 21–40). New York, NY: Routledge.
Zein, S. (2018b). Translanguaging as a metadiscursive practice in the EYL classroom: Preparing prospective teachers. In S. Zein, & R. Stroupe (Eds.), *English language teacher preparation in Asia: Policy, research and practice* (pp. 47–62). New York, NY: Routledge.
Zein, S. (2019). English, multilingualism and globalisation in Indonesia: A love triangle. *English Today*, *35*(1), 48–53.
Zein, S. (2020). *Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Zentz, L. (2015). 'Is English also the place where I belong?': Linguistic biographies and expanding communicative repertoires in Central Java. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *12*(1), 68–92.
Zentz, L. (2017). *Statehood, scale and hierarchy: History, language and identity in Indonesia*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Subhan Zein (Ph.D., Australian National University) teaches at The University of Queensland, Australia. He is the author of *Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia* (Routledge, 2020). He is the lead editor of *Early language learning and teacher education: International research and practice* (Multilingual Matters, 2019) and *English language teacher preparation in Asia: Policy, research and practice* (Routledge, 2018); he is also the editor of *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca: Perspectives from Indonesia* (Routledge, 2018).

Didi Sukyadi is faculty staff of Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia with interest in semiotics, multimodality, assessment and language teaching. He has contributed a chapter to *Secondary school English education in Asia* (Spolsky & Sung, 2015). He is vice president of TEFLIN and vice chief editor of IJAL and founder of CONAPLIN. He also serves as external reviewer of professorship promotion at University of Malaya in the applied linguistics discipline.

Fuad Abdul Hamied is professor of language education at Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. He was vice rector of the university (1996–2003) and deputy minister for education at the Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare (2005–2010). He is currently president of Asia TEFL and chief editor of *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. His book chapters have appeared in leading publications by publishers such as Routledge and Springer.

Nenden Sri Lengkanawati is professor of English language teaching methodology at Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia where she trains teachers of English and supervises master's and doctorate students. Her publications in the areas of EFL methodology, language learning strategies and learner autonomy have appeared in *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, Asian EFL Journal* and *TEFLIN Journal*.

Cite this article: Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011–2019). *Language Teaching* 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UQ Library, on 28 Jul 2020 at 13:16:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208