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Abstract

In the history of English Language Teaching in Indonesia, several changes of curriculum have been made from time to time. The latest change in Indonesian English curriculum was done in 2006. Unlike all previous curricula, in this latest change, each school has freedom to develop KTSP as school curriculum. The central government provides content standard which is put in Standard Competence and Basic Competence as the main reference to develop school based curriculum or Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP). Freedom given in curriculum development has created problems in the implementation. No schools develop their KTSP on their own. Teachers use the details from CBC and modify them to make KTSP. Teachers copy from one another and publishers then claim it as their KTSP. This process of developing the KTSP makes them unconfident to use it as the road map to their teaching and learning process.

This research is to find out how teachers interpret KTSP and implement it in the teaching and learning process. Interviews and observations were done to find out how these teachers developed lesson objectives and activities in a two-week training to support the research. Documents analysis is to confirm whether or not teachers planning their lesson in complying with the curriculum.

INTRODUCTION

Change of curriculum is undeniable. The more rapid the changes in the society the more often curriculum has to be changed. The change is also done to fulfill the demand of globalization in academic as well as vocational. As Leonard J. Waks (2003) mentioned, globalization is the main important aspect that change education and the way to conceptualize education. It is also discussed by Olaf Jorgenson (2006) that rapid change is also shown by the shift of industrial economy to one based on the instantaneous, global traffic of information. To prepare the students, schools should consider the changes in the community by revisiting and changing their direction of curriculum.

Challenge in curriculum change is at the stage of introducing and socializing it to schools and its implementation. “The introduction of a new curriculum poses a range of challenges to teachers with regards to the underlying assumptions and goals, the subject demarcations, the content, the teaching approach and the methods of assessment.” (Kate Bennie and Karen Newstead, 1999)
In Indonesia the last curriculum change was in 2006, it was from KBK (Competence Based Curriculum) to KTSP (School Based Curriculum). KTSP gives more opportunity for school to develop its curriculum. The Indonesia government regulation number 22, 23, and 24 year 2006 about content standard and graduate competence standard should have been implemented at primary and secondary level of education. School should develop its own curriculum based on guidelines produced by National Education Standard (BSNP).

For English subject, the content of the previous curriculum, KBK, and KTSP does not change. The aim remains the same i.e. developing students’ language competence which emphasize on reading and writing. In KBK as well as KTSP English language is positioned at its function as a tool for communication. Agustien (2006) mentioned,

The 2004 English curriculum is designed based on the government regulation stating that the level of achievement in every curriculum is stated in terms of competence (Chapter III, Article 8, Point 1); that the learning process is carried out by developing reading and writing culture; and that (Chapter III, Article 21, Point 2); that the competence for language subjects should emphasise the ability to read and write (Chapter III, Article 25, Point 3) suitable for the levels of education; and that the standards of competence for high schools are aimed at increasing / improving the learners’ intelligence, knowledge, personality, integrity, and life skills in order to live independently and to pursue further education (Chapter III, Article 26, point 2).

Communicative approach was considered to be too broad to be implemented and therefore the new curriculum was developed based on functional linguistic approach. This is actually to make sure that the English lesson introduced at school is functional enough for the learners to communicate ideas. With consideration that language is a tool to convey meanings, the curriculum developers believed that systemic functional linguistic, introduced by M.A.K. Halliday, is the most appropriate to be adopted as the fundamental principles of English curriculum in Indonesia. Halliday (1994) stated that language is a system for making meanings. By using language those meanings are transferred in text format. Halliday (1985:10) further mentioned, “Any instance of living language that is playing some part in a context of situation, we shall call a text. It may either be spoken or written, or indeed in any other medium of expression that we like to think”.

Genre based approach is considered to be the most appropriate to be adopted in 2006 curriculum, because it gives more room for students and teachers to go through process of producing text. It also gives perspective that learning to read and to write is not different from learning to speak (Emi Emilia, 2011). Therefore in conducting lesson in genre based approach teachers are expected to apply these following learning cycles in developing students’ literacy. The cycles are (1) Building Knowledge of Field (BKOF); (2) Modelling of the Text (MOT), (3) Joint Construction of the Text, and (4)
Independent Construction of the Text (ICOT). This cycle can be applied either in producing oral as well as written text (see Cornish 1992; Hammond et al 1992; Burns, Joyce and Gollin 1996; Feez with Joyce 1998). The application of genre based approach curriculum in the class requires teachers to use methodology that help students to develop literacy. Feeze and Joyce (2002:24) indicate that: “Approaching language learning from the perspective of texts requires an accompanying methodology which can enable the students the knowledge and skills to deal with spoken and written texts in social contexts.”

This means that teachers should be able to breakdown the lesson into series of meaningful activities that lead the students to the production of a text. In BKOF stage for example, a teacher does elicitation that can bring out the knowledge students have in a particular topic. From this point the teacher builds a model using familiar vocabularies that make the students aware of what kind of topic they produce.

It is clearly mentioned that to plan a lesson, an English teacher should refer to the KTSP. Curriculum or KTSP should be perceived as the guidelines in planning the learning process. Teachers are supposed to include standard competence, basic standard, material, learning activities, learning indicators, assessment, time allocation and resources in a lesson plan that is called RPP (Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran) for each of the lesson unit (see PP No. 19, 2005 and PP No. 20, 2005). Syllabus is developed by school based on Content Standard and Standard Competence of Graduate, and guidelines provided by the government to develop KTSP.

Furthermore it is stated in PERMEN No, 41, 2007 that,

RPP dijabarkan dari silabus untuk mengarahkan kegiatan belajar peserta didik dalam upaya menempat KD. Setiap guru pada satuan pendidikan berkewajiban menyusun RPP secara lengkap dan sistematis agar pembelajaran berlangsung secara interaktif, inspiratif, menyenangkan, menantang, memotivasi peserta didik untuk berpartisipasi aktif, serta memberikan ruang yang cukup bagi prakarsa, kreativitas, dan kemandirian sesuai dengan bakat, minat, dan perkembangan fisik serta psikologis peserta didik.

The practice in the field; however, shows many teachers have difficulties in developing the KTSP. Teachers often copy from each other and document them as the school’s document. Prof. Dr. Nana Syaodih Sukmadinata and Dr. Erlany Syaodih Hipkin mention, “Beberapa temuan dari penelitian menunjukkan banyak sekolah yang kurikulumnya mencontoh atau mengambil alih dari sekolah lain tanpa mengadakan perubahan dengan kondisi dan kebutuhan sekolah sendiri.”

Teachers have difficulties for two reasons. Firstly, they have the responsibility for developing their own curriculum for their own schools. The national guidelines which are presented as a very broadly meant document should be translated into school curriculum with only little support they get from workshops on KTSP. Secondly, genre approach is relatively new to most teachers and most of them have very
limited idea on the implementation in the classroom. These two main challenges have made teachers uncertain on what to follow when they conduct their teaching and learning process. This lead them into difficulties in defining objectives in lesson plan.

It is clearly mentioned that every individual English teacher should be able to prepare her own lesson plan in order to lead interactive lesson with appropriate varieties of activities to make the lesson challenging and fun. Teacher should always make the students independent in doing their learning. There should not be teachers who have no skill in developing RPP as well as implement it in the classroom. This which consists of standard of competence , (PP No. 19, 2005, chapter IV, article 20; DEPDIKNAS, 2006; PERMEN No. 41, 2007) . The syllabus is developed by a teacher or group of teachers supervised by department of education based on standard of content, standard competence of graduate and guiding of arrangement of school-based curriculum.

Ideally, according to Lachiver & Tardif (2002), curriculum change is managed in a logical five-step process: 1. an analysis of the current offerings and context; 2. the expression of key program aims in a mission statement; 3. a prioritization of resources and development strategies; 4. the implementation of the targeted curricula change; and 5. the establishment of monitoring tools and processes. Having experience of meeting English teachers in many regions in Indonesia, it is found that teachers often find difficulties in developing their RPP because the lack of knowledge and less control. Mujiran (2006) explained that most of education institutions have never prepared teachers to be curriculum developer. It was also mentioned in Kompas, an Indonesian daily newspaper that many teachers in Jakarta are not ready to implement KTSP. Implementation of a new curriculum demands the government to be sure about the teachers’ understanding of the curriculum and how they implement in the classroom. The process of introducing it should be structured in order that the intention of changing the curriculum correlates the implementation.

A small scale research was conducted to support what the researchers believe that many teachers are in fact still struggling with the development of KTSP and how to implement it in their RPP. Teachers still believe in what textbook writers have provided them with instructional materials that give them direction. The study is seeking for teachers’ perception towards the importance of curriculum as their guidelines in teaching. It is intended to give suggestions to teachers on how important it is the role of curriculum is in directing the teaching and learning process, in choosing appropriate materials, and assessment. It is hoped that the study will give input for school to seriously develop their KTSP in order that it helps teachers and students to achieve the real objective of learning English.
THE OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

Considering the dilemmatic situation that teachers face in applying curriculum in their teaching and learning conduct, the research is to investigate:

a. How teachers utilize KTSP to conduct teaching and learning process.

b. How teachers define objectives for a lesson unit in the class.

c. Whether or not teachers use different resource to guide them running the class

A BRIEF THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

There are a number of clearly stated theories on the important role of curriculum in deciding the teaching and learning process as well as resources and assessment. Among many others Clark (1985) mentioned that curriculum is used in deciding learning objectives, resources to provide learning experience for learners, the writing of principles to help teachers in deciding their classroom practice and assessment. Therefore he stated that the key elements are objectives, content, and methodology.

RELEVANT PREVIOUS RESEARCH

A number of research related to the implementation of KTSP in schools were done. Among many others is the implementation of KTSP in the teaching of English Naturalistic Study in SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta (Sukiran, 2010) Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta in 2010. The research shows that some of the weak aspects of KTSP is that teachers have difficulties in developing ones that can help them to conduct more effective lesson, although they know that KTSP can help them.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How do the 12 SMP English teachers use KTSP in developing lesson plan?

2. What challenges do those teachers encounter with when planning lesson?

3. What might help those teachers to deal with the challenges?
THEORIES RELEVANT TO THE OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH

The role of curriculum in the teaching and learning process

Curriculum has a vital role in the teaching and learning process. It is the road map of education activities which has to contain objectives that teachers should achieve at a certain period of time. Curriculum determines the instructional materials to use, the teaching techniques to apply as well as assessment for the learning. In line with this Robertson (1971:566) in Yalden suggested that,

the curriculum includes the goals, the objectives, content, process, resources, and means of evaluation of all learning experiences planned for pupils both in and out of the school and community through classroom instruction and related programs.

In designing classroom activities teachers should use the breakdown of curriculum objectives into syllabus before they develop lesson plans with more specific objectives. These smaller units are usually easier to implement. Mckay (1978) in Brow (1995) focuses more on syllabus that has been organized more directly to language teaching.

The most important part of a language curriculum is objectives that lead to language acquisition. They are the set of directions that guide instructional material to use, teaching methodology, etc. The content of the curriculum is designed to promote improvement of proficiency level. Richards in Nunan (1989) mentions that:

Proficiency, however described, refers to a product of result of successful language acquisition, and since it represents a very general concept, need to be operationalised in making decision about content and procedure in teaching. This is done through the development of program goals and objectives. In language teaching, a number of different ways of stating objectives are commonly employed, variation in practice reflecting different perceptions of the nature of second or foreign-language proficiency. Current approaches include behavioral, process, content, and proficiency based objectives, (Richards, 1984:10).

Lesson planning as the smallest unit to bring to class should clearly bring about the concept from the curriculum and from the syllabus, in this context is KTSP. The formulation of objectives for the learning in the classroom should be specific and measurable. Posner (1992) mentioned that, “Learning objectives are the intended educational consequences of particular courses or unit of studies.” In the field different terminologies are used to actually mention the same thing, instructional objectives, specific objectives etc.

Choice of instructional materials comes after a syllabus is developed. It is not the materials that direct the syllabus, but it is the syllabus that directs the materials. Brown (1995) suggests,

The teaching activities called syllabuses are predominantly concerned with the choices necessary to organize the language content of a course or program. The procedures involved in developing a syllabus should eventually include examining instructional objectives, arranging them in terms of priorities, and
then determining what kinds of techniques and exercises are required in order to attain those objectives. Brown (1995: 141)

In a program or a class where syllabus is not employed as guidelines, lesson is defined by teachers as routine activities that do not require a destination. In a school context this tendency happens because lessons should just be conducted. Monitoring system by headmasters has not yet become part of the process. Therefore, the lack of the use of syllabus in a school context often does not stop teacher from teaching the class.

Research done by Sukiran in 2010 suggested that (1) the teachers should not only increase their communicative competence, but also have to change their point of view of the KTSP implementation, (2) the school as the educational institution should complete the school with some learning facilities such as sets of multimedia and provide more skillful and competent teachers, (3) the government should take into account the readiness of the lower department and schools in KTSP implementation, and (4) the other researchers develop some dimensions which have not been developed in this research.

In my opinion the result of the research above may create controversies especially number 2 regarding facilities. Suggestion number 3 shows that in reality many schools are not ready to employ the 2006 curriculum.

RESEARCH METHOD

The study is in the form of a case study. The focus is to investigate SMP teachers’ perspective on the importance of following objectives in the curriculum in conducting their lesson. Teachers are observed intensively in the training they join that focuses on developing learning objectives.

PARTICIPANTS

The study is specifically intended to see how teachers perceive KTSP and 12 English teachers from different schools were interviewed. Teachers are all civil servants who attended training from 12 to 17 December 2011. They were selected randomly.

INSTRUMENTS

Personal interviews, as fairly open-ended type of instrument, were conducted for gathering personal responses and views privately (Brown, 1995) since the study requires the participants to give real opinion and insight about the development and implementation of KTSP.
Observation during the training is focused on the process how teachers define objectives and materials for their lessons.

These following questions are employed as guidelines to interview

- When you decide your semester plan what reference do you usually use?
- It is assumed that by policy each school has its KTSP as its curriculum, how do you develop/modify/adapt KTSP in your school?
- How do you use KTSP to decide your teaching materials, methods of teaching and assessment?
- How do you breakdown the objectives in the KTSP to your daily lesson plan?
- How does KTSP relate to national exam?

DATA COLLECTION

Data taken from the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Essential points extracted from the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When you decide your semester plan what reference do you usually use?</td>
<td>There were 11 teachers mentioned that they used, standard isi and Standard Kelulusan. They adopted the document of KTSP which was not their product. They were required to submit their lesson plan for the whole semester at the beginning of the semester. 1. Teachers used textbook to determine their semester plan and they did not know if they had the document at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is assumed that by policy each school has its KTSP as their curriculum, how do you developed/modify/adapt KTSP in your school?</td>
<td>None of the 12 teachers have ever had experience in developing KTSP on their own. They usually got the KTSP either from publisher or from their friends. Further I asked where their friends got from. They said it was from the previous curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do you use KTSP to decide your teaching materials, methods of teaching and assessment?</td>
<td>None of the 12 teachers mentioned the necessity of using KTSP to decide the teaching materials in class. They all just used the provided textbook (the text books from school). In the learning process teachers relied on the textbook. One of them who is a teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of grade 9 used LKS (*lembar kerja siswa*/*students’ works books*) to give the students extra exercises for exam.

4. How do you breakdown the objectives in the KTSP to your daily lesson plan? All the 12 teachers explained that at the beginning of the semester they used *standard isi* and *standard kelulusan* to develop lesson plans for the whole semester. They often copied from what they had from the past year or used their friend’s. So in their daily plan teachers did not use KTSP.

5. How does KTSP relate to national exam? It was answered that some of the information in KTSP was in a national exam.

Data obtained from Observation

Teachers needed almost 4 hours to break down objectives from KTSP to plan an 80-minute lesson.

The learning activities that they plan did not match with the objectives they have stated.

Teachers seemed to be more comfortable using textbook as their main reference to decide activities in the class. Although in the training they attended they were exposed to a number of interactive classroom activities to trigger them, they have not been able to apply.

When teachers did the peer teaching to show how they used their lesson plan, they had difficulties in getting the students to interact. They produced instructional materials and the worksheet that still lead to more teacher centered activities.

DATA ANALYSIS

Analysis from interview results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Essential points extracted from the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When you decide your semester plan what reference do you usually use?</td>
<td>There were 11 teachers mentioned that they used <em>standard isi</em> and <em>Standard Kelulusan</em>. They adopted the document of KTSP which was not their product. They were required to submit their lesson plan for the whole semester at the beginning of the semester. One teacher used textbook to determine her semester plan and she did not know if she had the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

This fact shows that it is not only teachers who are not clear about the importance of lesson plan and KTSP as the product of teachers to guide them in teaching. When the lesson plan is required to be submitted at the beginning of each semester, it means teachers and head masters still treat KTSP as document instead of working documents that can be revised from time to time. The respondents in this research have never thought that KTSP is the integral part of a teaching and learning process. The existence of KTSP is mainly as a legal document that teachers use to write lesson plan that they use as administrative requirements, but not substantially used. Headmasters let teachers rely on textbook to guide the teaching and learning process. Instead of staging objective from Standard Isi and Standard Kelulusan to KTSP and instructional objectives for lesson plan, teachers directly connect them to materials in the textbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>It is assumed that by policy each school has its KTSP as their curriculum, how do you develop/modify/adapt KTSP in your school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the 12 teachers have ever had experience in developing KTSP on their own. They usually got the KTSP either from publisher or from their friends in MGMP (cluster of teacher development activities). Further I asked where their friends get from. They said it was from the previous curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

MGMP usually initiates the development of KTSP based on the previous curriculum Competency Based Curriculum. MGMP lets English teachers in the cluster to copy and use the KTSP. This finding confirms with the result of the observation where teachers find difficulties in understanding indicators in KTSP. It is assumed that a number of teachers who were actively engage during the process of writing KTSP would understand better.

The dissemination of KTSP was not done evenly. Teachers who were lucky to join socialization training were not necessarily those who were capable enough to multiply their knowledge and skill in applying the teaching of English at school level.

The respondents in this research are members of MGMP who rarely are active in
MGMP activities. This practice presumably that has caused teachers often have difficulties in designing their own instructional materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>How do you use KTSP to decide your teaching materials, methods of teaching and assessment?</th>
<th>None of the 12 teachers mentioned the necessity of using KTSP to decide the teaching materials in class. They all just used the provided textbook (buku paket from school). In the learning process teachers relied on the textbook. One of them who taught grade 9, used LKS (lembar kerja siswa/students work book) to give the students extra exercises for exam.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Discussion:

Teachers can survive conducting their lesson without even understanding the role of KTSP and let alone use it because they are exposed to textbook which looks too glossy to miss. Publisher is confident to announce that the materials they sell have followed the latest KTSP. In this case in fact publishers which have no school make their own assumption about the standar isi/content standard.

Textbook has become the source of material as well as treated as curriculum. This is what makes teachers feel secured enough even without applying KTSP in their practice. The danger of it is that the numbers of books sold in the market are varied. Some books are probably accredited by the ministry of education some are not. There is no guarantee of that the level of language as well as the varieties of activities support the children in learning English.

Worksheets which are translated into LKS (Lembar Kerja Siswa/ students work book) are treated as enrichment materials in the form of multiple choice items. This even makes teachers feel secured because it can also prepare the students for national exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>How do you breakdown the objectives in the KTSP to your daily lesson plan?</th>
<th>All the 12 teachers explained that at the beginning of the semester they used standard isi and standard kelulusan to develop lesson plans for the whole semester. They often copied from what they had from the past year or used their friend’s. So in their daily plan teachers did not use KTSP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The fact that teachers do not employ KTSP for conducting teaching and learning process is opposing the government policy. Policy No 19, 20, 2004 and government policy No 41, 2007 mention that KTSP should be produced by schools to cater for the need of more appropriate lesson for the children.

### Analysis from interview results

| Teachers needed almost 4 hours to break down objectives from KTSP to plan an 80-minute lesson. | • Although teachers had some knowledge on how to translate indicators in KTSP, they still struggled to translate the indicators to their lesson plan.  
• They thought that indicators were their instructional objectives to be transferred to lesson plan. This situation made teachers reluctant to use their lesson plan in class because they were not too confident.  
• Teachers felt more comfortable to rely on textbook which they thought, has given them direction. |
|---|---|
| The learning activities that they plan do not match with the objectives they have stated. | • Teachers did not apply strategies of developing activities that scaffold the students.  
• Teachers tended to just plan activities that directly lead to the final objective. Stages were not built. |
| Teachers seemed to be more comfortable using textbook as their main reference to decide activities in the class. Although in the training they attended they were exposed to a number of interactive classroom activities to trigger them, they have not been able to apply. | • This phenomenon indicates that teachers have actually got limited knowledge and skills in handling curriculum in relation to instructional materials.  
• They felt uncertain to follow KTSP document and develop their own activities that would probably make students more interactive and enjoy the lesson.  
• When teachers developed their own classroom activities to fit with the instructional |
When teachers do the peer teaching to show how they use their lesson plan, they have difficulties in getting the students to interact. They produce instructional materials and the worksheet that still lead to more teacher centered activities.

- Although finally teachers were able to write instructional objectives from KTSP, they still encountered difficulties in handling interactive activities.
- This situation has probably been caused by the teachers’ habit of using textbook which focused more on doing exercises instead of developing interaction.
- Another aspect that might happen was the teachers’ language proficiency to use in class. Their classroom language was limited.
- Teachers interpreted interaction more on when teachers said things to students or explain.

The observation has given evidence that teachers have not been skillful enough to develop instructional objectives. This can be because of limited knowledge on it or they do not have proper training on developing objectives from KTSP or curriculum properly. Teachers have difficulties understanding the national guidelines and they are reluctant to develop further to KTSP, therefore they also are not confident to develop lesson plan (RPP) for the purpose of guidelines to run the class.

From the whole week observation, the following summary can be derived that all participants had great challenges in determining learning objectives. The training should double the training time to allow teachers to learn more how to develop learning objectives. Their difficulties in defining objectives lead to the difficulties in deciding the learning materials.

**CONCLUSION**

a. It is investigated that the 12 SMP teachers develop their lesson plan before any semester begin. They write it according to the format required by the school, which has included Competence Standard, Basic Competence, indicators, time allotment, teaching methods, and evaluation. This document however does not help teachers in conducting lessons because it is hard to follow. The document is more considered as administrative requirement.
b. During the observation, when teachers are required to develop a lesson plan as a working document, they face problems in determining and breaking down the indicators in KTSP to instructional objectives.

c. Other challenges that teachers face are in choosing instructional materials and learning activities to meet the objectives. Because teachers are used to be exposed to textbook and neglect the curriculum, they need very long time to prepare a lesson. They find it hard to choose suitable instructional materials that may engage the students better and more relevant in terms of the content.

d. Activities chosen tend to be more teacher students interaction rather than student-student interaction. The reason is because teachers have limited ideas on developing worksheets that allows students to interact.

e. From the teachers’ perspective, publishers have helped them because they usually provide schools with KTSP that they develop together with textbook offered to the school. Teachers find it helpful because they do not need to develop KTSP nor the materials. Moreover because the KTSP is developed by the same publisher, teachers feel more secured.

f. Government’s intention to give more freedom to schools to determine their practice does not come with the school’s capability in developing curriculum. Therefore, teachers face challenges in creating fun and meaningful interactive activities in the lesson.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

a. Review on SK and KD should be done by teachers and curriculum experts.

b. A set of realistic guidelines with examples should be developed and distributed to schools.

c. Besides asking teachers to submit lesson plan (RPP) at the beginning of semester, head masters should monitor teachers’ daily plan.

d. Textbook writers should also be given guidelines on how to interpret KTSP in order that the materials they produce can support teachers.

e. Structured training should be conducted to familiarized teachers with the curriculum document.
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