



QUESTIONING ALIENATION OF HUMANITIES DISCIPLINE IN ENGLISH EDUCATION CURRICULUM

¹Rahmat Setiawan, ²Ferra Dian Andanty*

^{1,2} English Language Education Department, Faculty of Teaching,
Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya

ABSTRACT

The English language education curriculum tends to focus on technical language issues (skills) and educational aspects. In fact, language proficiency is acquired through practice, training, and habit. Educators must have cognitive, psychological, and sociological understanding. This is the problem: English language learning tends not to involve the humanities in its curriculum. This research aims to explore the factors that make the English Education curriculum less likely to include humanities disciplines while it has crucial impact to the quality of English teaching and learning. In methodology, the type of research is qualitative. The approach in this research is case study. The data collection technique in this research is Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The type of FGD used in data collection is Single Focus Group which supports an explorative space to support the provision of data in the analysis. There are three parts to conducting FGDs: pre-activity, activity, and post-activity. The research employs the thematic analysis technique. There are three main results can be drawn implicitly by the researcher from the perspective of the English Education lecturers: Theoretical-Based Orientation, Skillset Target, and Positivistic Ideology. Firstly, the English Education curriculum processes English language learning through theories. Secondly, the English Education curriculum focuses on the English language skillset. Thirdly, the English Education curriculum aims to produce English teachers who will teach English focusing on the learning process and the learners' internal problems in the classroom, not the learners' external problems.

Keywords: *Curriculum; English Education Department; Humanities*

ABSTRAK

Kurikulum pendidikan bahasa Inggris memiliki kecenderungan untuk difokuskan pada masalah teknis bahasa (*skill*) dan aspek kependidikan. Padahal kemampuan berbahasa didapat dari praktik, latihan, dan kebiasaan. Pendidik harus memiliki pemahaman kognitif, psikologis, dan sosiologis. Ini yang jadi permasalahan pembelajaran bahasa Inggris cenderung tidak melibatkan disiplin humaniora dalam kurikulumnya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi faktor-faktor yang menyebabkan kurikulum Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris kurang memasukkan disiplin ilmu humaniora, padahal ini memiliki dampak krusial bagi pengajaran dan pembelajaran bahasa Inggris. Secara metodologis, jenis penelitian ini adalah kualitatif. Pendekatan dalam penelitian ini adalah studi kasus. Teknik pengumpulan data dalam penelitian ini adalah Diskusi Kelompok Terbatas (FGD). Jenis FGD yang digunakan dalam pengumpulan data adalah *Single Focus Group* yang mendukung ruang eksploratif untuk mendukung penyediaan data dalam analisis. Ada tiga bagian dalam melaksanakan FGD: pra kegiatan, kegiatan, dan pasca kegiatan. Penelitian ini menggunakan teknik analisis tematik. Ada tiga hasil utama yang secara implisit dapat ditarik peneliti dari sudut pandang

E-ISSN: 2621-9158
P-ISSN: 2356-0401

*Correspondence:
ferradian@unipasby.ac.id

Submitted: 02 November 2024
Approved: 25 November 2024
Published: 09 December 2024

Citation:
Setiawan, R., & Andanty, F. D.
(2024). Questioning alienation of
humanities discipline in english
education curricula. *Celtic: A Journal
of Culture, English Language
Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*,
11(2), 322-336. Doi:
10.22219/celtic.v9i1.37239

dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris: Orientasi Berbasis Teori, Target *Skillset*, dan Ideologi Positivistik. Pertama, kurikulum Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris memproses pembelajaran bahasa Inggris melalui teori. Kedua, kurikulum Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris berfokus pada keahlian bahasa Inggris. Ketiga, kurikulum Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris bertujuan untuk menghasilkan guru Bahasa Inggris yang akan mengajar Bahasa Inggris dengan fokus pada proses pembelajaran dan permasalahan internal peserta didik di kelas, bukan permasalahan eksternal peserta didik.

Kata Kunci: *Kurikulum; Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris; Humaniora*

INTRODUCTION

Professional development is an important aspect of teaching that allows educators to stay up-to-date with the latest trends. It is a never-ending process that helps teachers improve their skills and become more proficient in their work (Avalos, 2011; Molla & Nolan, 2020; Postholm, 2018). Of course, this competence allows teachers to achieve certain skills to deal with emerging situations, starting from the disruption of education technology (especially during the COVID-19 pandemic) (Chin et al., 2022), The dynamics of the transformation of curriculum guidelines and standards, to non-technical issues outside the classroom such as psychological, social, and even cultural factors. It is this last point (the discipline of humanities) that is crucial to discuss because its existence is not considered crucial, even though its consequences are felt quite strongly.

Educational psychology is a very important field for teachers as it provides them with knowledge of psychological theories and principles to guide their practice in the classroom. Educational psychology studies how students learn in different settings to identify approaches and strategies to make learning more effective (Schutz & Muis, 2023). They apply the science of psychology to improve the learning process and increase educational success for all students. Understanding educational psychology is important for teachers as it helps them understand students' motivations, social and environmental contexts, their learning history, and their strengths and weaknesses. Educational psychology helps teachers understand what students need to succeed in school and meet their specific needs. By applying theories of human development, educational psychologists help teachers understand individual learning and inform the learning process. In short, educational psychology is important for teachers because it helps them create a positive learning environment, understand students' needs and develop effective teaching strategies (Koyyada, 2020; Patrick et al., 2011; Poulou, 2005; Woolfolk Hoy, 2000).

Besides Psychology, Sociology is also an important subject for teachers to learn as it helps them understand the complex human relationships that exist within the classroom and outside of it. The sociology of education helps teachers to be aware of certain outcomes of group behaviour, and to understand the attitudes, values, and beliefs of the people around them, enhancing effective teaching and learning processes. This explains that the sociology of education has provided important insights into the way schools affect individuals and groups, and it is vital for teachers to study the sociology of education. Through the study of sociology, teachers can develop an understanding of individual differences and detect what is wrong with students. By studying sociology, teachers can think about each student on an

individual level and cater the curriculum to the needs of each student (Doherty et al., 2013; Guerrero Serón, 2007; Molla & Nolan, 2020; Shimburi, 1979). Therefore, sociology is an important subject for teachers to learn as it helps them understand the society around them and the individuals in it, which in turn can help them make better decisions in the classroom.

Apart from Psychology and Sociology, Cultural Studies is also very important for teachers as it helps them understand their students' diverse backgrounds and create an inclusive learning environment. By studying the culture of their students, teachers can gain a deeper understanding of their students' experiences, beliefs and values. This understanding can help teachers adapt their teaching methods to meet the needs of their students and create a more equitable learning environment (Cook et al., 2022; Green & Hickey, 2022; Trifonas, 2020). Cultural Studies can also help teachers recognise and challenge their own biases and assumptions, which can lead to more effective teaching practices. In addition, teaching cultural heritage can inspire students to learn more about their own culture and the cultures of others, promoting a more tolerant and accepting society (Dilekli & Tezci, 2020; Huang et al., 2021; Watkins & Noble, 2022; Webber, 2021).

Of course, there are many humanities disciplines that cannot be described here in detail, but we can see that their role is not considered as crucial as issues or topics about Learning Plans, Instructional Design, Learning Assessment and so on, as if teachers must understand these to be professional, even though teachers are service traders and they sell services to students. Students have various psychological, sociological, and cultural backgrounds. It can drive their critical and creative thinking. That is the essence of [critical] pedagogy. If we only focus on the technicalities of learning, we are indoctrinating them, whereas schools should liberate them towards their potential, thus, the absence of humanities approaches or disciplines is important to emphasise (Apple, 2012; Biesta, 2015; Utami & Alfian, 2017; Wattimena, 2018).

In other words, the purpose of this research is to expose the problem of the absence of humanities in Education study departments, even though Education study departments produce prospective educators. The absence of humanities disciplines could be one of the roots of how our generation has competence but is less able to develop due to teachers who do not understand students psychologically, socially, and culturally.

The novelty of this research can be seen from its comparison with research that explores the same field. The first is research written by (Hrastinski, 2021), entitled *Digital Tools to Support Teacher Professional Development in Lesson Studies: A Systematic Literature Review*. This research aims to investigate the use of digital tools to support teachers' professional development in lesson study. While lesson study models are typically based on the premise that teachers prepare and observe lessons in schools, the research reviewed suggests that digital tools open up new ways of conducting lesson study. Six themes on using digital tools to support teachers' professional development in lesson study were identified: analysing video from teachers' classrooms, analysing external video resources, fictional animation as a complement to video, structured digital lesson study work, hybrid teacher collaboration and digital teacher collaboration. In other words, the use of digital tools to support teachers' professional development in lesson study is important.

The next research is research written by (Hiew & Murray, 2021), entitled *Enhancing Huber's Evaluation Framework for Teacher Professional Development Programme*. This research presents a framework for evaluation through teacher professional development programs, which is based on Huber's (2011) evaluation theory. This research draws on a study of the English Language Teacher Professional Skills Enhancement (ProELT) programme in Sabah (Borneo), Malaysia. The research adopted an exploratory sequential design with mixed methods: questionnaire survey, individual interviews, and focus group discussions (FGDs). From the findings, four new components have been added to Huber's evaluation framework, namely: (1) participant selection, (2) incorporation of Adult Learning principles, (3) follow-up support, and (4) programme impact assessment. This enhanced framework makes a significant contribution to programme designers and providers, in providing them with additional guidance to consider when designing the pre, ongoing and post phases of a teacher professional development programme.

Other relevant research is written by (Giraldo, 2021), entitled *A Reflection on Initiatives for Teachers' Professional Development through Language Assessment Literacy*. This research examines the language assessment literacy initiative and its possible impact on teachers. It seeks to discuss the relationship that exists between language assessment literacy and teacher professional development. Language assessment literacy training can nurture teachers' knowledge and skills. In conclusion, advancing teachers' overall language assessment literacy can contribute to their professional development.

From the three studies presented above, it can be seen that teacher professional development always revolves around technical matters, or teaching and classroom matters, some see technology as a tool or instrument (media), some see evaluation as important, and some see improving language literacy as a crucial factor. All are technical and none look at the nontechnical factors that this study seeks to explore. This means that there is a newness to this research that tries to go beyond existing research related to teacher professional development.

This research novelty uniquely explores nontechnical factors in teacher professional development, an aspect that has been largely neglected in earlier studies. This study diverges from the prevalent emphasis in existing research on technical aspects—such as the use of technology as a teaching tool, classroom management strategies, evaluation techniques, and language literacy improvement—by also disseminating the teaching concentration on the humanistic, psychological, and sociocultural dimensions. This distinctive viewpoint provides a new insight into the ways in which teachers' professional development and teaching efficacy. On the other edge, detailed contributions are scattered on an area: expanding the scope of English teacher professional development and curriculum. It refers to developing the teachers' psychological repertoire, which transforms their teaching wisdom to innovate, teachers' sociocultural perspective, including diversity, equity, and inclusion in teacher-student interactions, which contributes in providing a more holistic approach to understanding students' growth. The curriculum, which is believed in years, contribute to the result of English the low-literacy in Indonesia, that is the point, why did not they try to drag back the essence of learning by providing humanistic literacy to the teachers and focusing on practical experiences? Humanities disciplines can a transformation, Language, in this context

is English, is doing, not knowing. In this point, this research conclusively proposes a provocative question: What systemic and ideological factors contribute to the marginalization/alienation of humanities in English education curricula?

METHOD

Approach

This type of research is qualitative. The approach in this research is case study. This approach was used because it is characterised by fundamental features such as intensive entailing the comprehensive collection and analysis of a substantial amount of data. Qualitative research primarily aims to comprehend the subjective experiences, interpretations, and viewpoints of individuals involved in the particular situation.

Data

The data in this study are statements which are coded by Q1 to Q5 with initialised name of the sources. The statements are taken from FGD (Forum Group Discussion) conducted with lecturers in an English Language Education Department. The source of data in this research is the transcripts of the FGD.

Participants

There are 3 lecturers (1 senior lecturer who have been teaching over 20 years, 2 novice lecturers who have been teaching for 5 years), who will be interviewed and they are from English Language Education Department in a university in Surabaya. All participants are English Language Education Lecturers with English Language Education Background in the level of Bachelor and Master. They are initialised with faked names: Sky, Sea, and Sun. Five main questions (Q1-Q5) were posed to the participants as discussion starters: 1) why is the English language competence index of our society (Indonesia) low? 2) What is the main purpose of planning an English Language Education curriculum? 3) Why unlike Indonesian Language Education which involves many sciences, such as psychology, sociology, literature, and linguistics, English Language Education tends to prioritise linguistics over literature, even though in literature, we learn morals, environmental criticism, gender equality, social issues, and so on? 4) What do English teachers expect? Whereas to be able to speak English, people can choose more intensive Tutoring Institution options? and 5) what do you think about humanities disciplines in the universe of English Education?

Data Collection

The data collection technique in this research is FGD. The type of FGD used in data collection is Single Focus Group which supports an explorative space to support the provision of data in the analysis. There are three parts to conducting FGDs: pre-activity, activity, and post-activity. In the pre-activity phase, what was prepared were: 1) Determining the objectives, 2) Developing a list of questions to lead the discussion, 3) Recruiting discussion participants relevant to the topic, 4) Scheduling and preparing the date, time, and location, as well as agreement, consent, and determination of the method for recording. In the activity phase, what was done were: 1) Welcome and introduction, 2) Asking questions, 3) Responding to maintain objectivity, 4) Recording key points and quotes, and 5) Summarising key points. In the post-activity phase, what was done was: 1) Reviewing the recordings/notes, and

2) Transcribing the recordings or analysing the notes to identify themes (looking for patterns, recurring points, and contrasting perspectives).

The research employs the thematic analysis technique. It is utilized due to its adaptability in addressing the thematic issues encountered in the data mining process, allowing for the adjustment of data exploration based on the categorized discoveries (Christou, 2023; Majumdar, 2022; Rosairo, 2023). The process of data analysis involves the following steps: (1) becoming acquainted with the data; (2) converting the data into numerical form and masking the names of subjects; (3) constructing themes; (4) verifying the themes; (5) defining the themes at the start of each exploration segment; and (6) doing the analysis.

FINDINGS

It is crystal clear, in the FGD that has been conducted, there are five key questions to spark the discussion. The first question was related to the reasons why Indonesian people have low English literacy. The second question was related to the most substantive aims and objectives of the English Education study programme. The third question related to the comparison between Indonesian and English Education which is quite contrasting, where Indonesian Education involves more linguistic and literary studies, compared to English Education which focuses too much on skills. The fourth question refers to the expectations of the lecturers who created the curriculum to produce reliable English educators, if only to be able to speak English, many tutoring institutions offer the same thing. The fifth question refers to what their views are related to expertise in the humanities which actually supports the completeness of teaching competencies for educators, including English educators. From the long and rigorous discussions that have been conducted based on the five main questions, three main results can be drawn implicitly by the researcher from the perspective of the English Education lecturers: *Theoretical-Based Orientation*, *Skillset Target*, and *Positivist Ideology*.

In the first question, related to the low English literacy of Indonesians, Sky said that the government is not serious in mobilising English literacy, so the environment and society are not supportive. He also added that the school and its curriculum cannot guarantee competence if it is not supported by the environment. This can be seen from the following quote, "... uhm, it's difficult. In Indonesia, it seems that the government is not serious about creating an ecosystem that builds English literacy organically ... speaking English, being made fun of by friends, parents don't care ... the teacher's job is already heavy, we also have to teach English optimally ..." (Sky, Q1). This is also supported by the opinion of Sea, who stated that the quality of language should be practice, but here, it is difficult to create a system or environment that makes them practice English. This is evidenced by the statement, "... students here [English Education Department] are also reluctant to talk to friends in English, when I asked, they replied that they were embarrassed. This is a weird phenomenon ... there is something I don't understand, why they are currently shy, when they should be able to ..." (Sea, Q1). Sun went deeper by pointing out that it is the education system and perspectives that make the English literacy of Indonesians low. This is revealed in the following statement, "The system here doesn't seem to

work, it doesn't fit the purpose. You can imagine, those who study here [English Education Department], do not want to study diligently, even though they are the candidates of English teachers. If they lack competence, teaching 50 students per class, how many hundreds of thousands or millions of generations will be damaged with the *low-standard* teachers? With their status [the teachers], they should see, they are the example and pride of their students ... there is also a bizarre thing, when they cannot speak English, I have heard statements that they are nationalists, they stated that the important thing is to be able to speak Indonesian ..." (Sun, Q1). In conclusion, the discussion on the first issue or question is that the problem of low English literacy in society is due to the education system and environment, as well as perspective. This perspective, if unravelled, can be rooted in a manipulative process of turning incompetence into nationalistic pride.

In the second question, related to the main purpose of planning an English Language Education curriculum, Sea said that the plan of English Education is to produce prospective English teachers who have good English competence. This can be observed from Sea's statement, "...Of course, the goal is for their competence" (Sun, Q2). This was also affirmed by Sky. She said, "... An English teacher must be able to speak English, especially skills, because that is what is taught to students" (Sky, Q2). In line with Sea and Sky, Sun also said the same thing, "Skills are important, that's why the curriculum always involves learning more skills" (Sun, Q2). However, when the researcher tried to spark with the question, "Isn't language learning not supposed to be technical, for example, children are told to practice pronunciation, memorise vocabulary, understand sentence formulas, and so on, but they lack practice? Didn't we learn our mother tongue when we were young, we didn't memorise vocabulary, understand which is subject, which is predicate, and so on?" Sea replied, "What else, they have to master the skills ..." (Sea, Q2). Sky added, "We should all realise and agree that skills are crucial ..." (Sky, Q2). However, Sun did not respond and did not provide clarification regarding the researcher's question. From the second question, it can be inferred that they believe that the preparation of the English Education curriculum for students who are projected to become English teachers is to make them able to speak English and teach it to their students. This goal is accommodated with the rationality of English skill mastery (vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and so on).

In the third question, related to the comparison between Indonesian Language Education which involves many sciences, such as psychology, sociology, literature, and linguistics, English Language Education tends to prioritise linguistics over literature, even though in literature, we learn morals, environmental criticism, gender equality, social issues, and so on. Sea said that in Indonesian Language Education, they can already speak Indonesian, so they focus on scholarship, while in English Language Education, they have to have English skills first, then scholarship. This is what Sea said, "... they [students] can already speak Indonesian, but English? They have to focus on that [English language skills] first" (Sea, Q3). This was also echoed by Sky, "How can you understand if you can't communicate?" (Sky, Q3). While Sun believes that, "... ideally we should be able to make them learn science

while improving their English competence. But how? The environment must be supportive” (Sun, Q3). When the researcher asked a reactive question, why not provide literary works, such as novels or short stories, discussing moral values, issues, and various other topics? Don't they automatically read the text? As they read, they familiarise themselves with vocabulary, sentence structure, and certainly language learning practice?” Sea responded, “None of us like novels?” (Sea, Q3). Sky explained, “Since we were in college, we had this kind of curriculum, the biggest portion was English education and skills, second was linguistics, and the least was literature” (Sky, Q3). Meanwhile, Sun explained, “It seems like our culture is not about reading literature” (Sun, Q3).

The researcher also asked responsive questions by questioning their insights on the importance of a teacher understanding psychology, social science, and culture. Sea said that, “Teachers work on rubrics, questionnaires, assessments, learning media, and anything related to the learning process in the classroom” (Sea, Q3). The researcher asked, “is learning only in the classroom?”, Sun responded, “Of course not, we give them [students] assignments and the assignments are part of learning at home” (Sun, Q3). The researcher gave a bold statement about social class differences and students’ *non-classroom* conditions, “For example, there are students who look *lazy* to do assignments, in class they always sit at the back, never actively involved in class, how do you *judge* students like that?” Sky replied, “We work based on assessment and curriculum. If they can’t write, memorise vocabulary, can’t do English speaking, and other skills, that’s what we assess. Moreover, if they are lazy, or have disrespectful behaviour such as sleeping in class, or not actively discussing, their grades might be low” (Sky, Q3). The researcher continued the question, “Are you familiar with them? I mean, their social life background? Who is their family, what neighbourhood are they in?” Sun replied, “Of course we know, we have the data in our school” (Sun, Q3). The researcher continued to ask with a supposition, “Just in case, if someone falls asleep in class, because this morning they helped their parents sell food at the market? If there are students who sit at the back and are passive because their children feel uncomfortable in class? If there are students who excel but in English class they are like very bad students? Is there an assessment to assess these external things?” Sea gave a simple statement, “There is a counselling service, we focus on our obligation to teach English” (Sea, Q3). From this, it can be concluded that they have a *positivistic* perspective that there is X and X is English skill as if English skill is a different universe from linguistics, literature, or other disciplines, although in fact, the media or reading texts used to learn the skill come from other disciplines. Moreover, they see that the learning space is the classroom and the task, the external problems of the learners are not included as issues in the learning process. How can a teacher have this perspective? The answer is simple, because the curriculum moulds teachers with a rigid and frozen perspective, and those teachers educate students in the same way. In fact, professions related to education should understand and implement a humanist approach.

In the fourth question, related to English teachers' expectation. The researcher poured a triggering question, "If it is just about learning English, people can choose more intensive Tutoring Institution options than joining School or English Department?" Here, Sea replied, we provide a different learning experience" (Sea, Q4). Sky continued, "In the Tutoring Institute they don't get a bachelor degree or Education Certificate" (Sky, Q4). The researcher responded, "Is the certificate important when students are not competent?" Sun replied, "I realise that a certificate should represent competence" (Sun, Q4). The researcher reviewed Sea's statement, "Can you give specific examples of the different experiences?" Sea said, "Everyone clearly knows that the learning experience in the classroom and in the Tutoring Institute are different." This answer seems to infer that there are abstract things that they have not been able to infer. From all the statements, it can be concluded that they see that the main purpose of providing the curriculum is to make them able to speak English and they believe that what the school or college provides is different from the Tutoring Institution.

In the fifth question, related to their opinion about humanities disciplines in the universe of English Education, Sea replied, "Psychology, Sociology, Culture, and other Humanities disciplines are actually very interesting to learn, but I'm afraid they will interfere with the educational portion of the curriculum. A teacher should be able to manage classroom, instructional design, making lesson plan, innovating with learning media, technology, and other things" (Sea, Q5). Sky continued that, "We might be able to include Educational Psychology, Sociology of Education, and so on, but we have to see that the curriculum that is schemed by the English Language Education Department is to produce prospective English teachers, not prospective psychologists or sociologists, or culturalists. So, I think, the status might be there, but it is not crucial" (Sky, Q5). Sun concluded this statement with, "Maybe we should evaluate the main purpose of the curriculum first, if it is in English Language Education, then the focus should be on English skills" (Sun, Q5). From the statements, it can be concluded that they think that humanities disciplines are not as crucial as education issues related to classrooms, learning media, lesson plans, and the like.

DISCUSSION

There are three main results can be drawn implicitly by the researcher from the perspective of the English Education lecturers: *Theoretical-Based Orientation*, *Skillset Target*, and *Positivistic Ideology*. This result is actually taken from the interpretation of the researcher to the statements of the interviewees. For sure, the interpretation delves into the space of implied meanings elaborated by the interviewees. Thus, this subjective perspective crystallises the result of the research. The implication of results can be elaborated here.

Theoretical-Based Orientation here refers to proficiency. Basically, language learning does not focus on understanding, mastering theories or formulas, because the spirit of language is a means of communication and language is mastered from practical habituation, not theory. Many adults struggle with acquiring languages

through theory rather than experience. Traditional methods of conscious learning, such as rote memorization, are less efficient in adults than in children. Adults' learning styles and cognitive structures differ from those of children. Adults tend to use *System Two* of the mind, which is connected with conscious effort and slower learning, whereas children use *System One*, which is associated with automatic and unconscious learning. Furthermore, people frequently fight with the tyranny of their mother tongue, which can result in cross-translation and the development of a second language system highly impacted by the first. This can lead to a less effective and accurate learning process.

Additionally, adults may not receive the same quantity of intelligible information as children, which is critical for language learning. To overcome these obstacles, it is necessary to take a different approach to language learning. This may include subconscious training, which enables adults to learn language skills as *System One*, making the learning process more efficient and stress-free. It is also crucial to create a stress-free learning atmosphere that promotes fun and meaningful interactions, as this can help with language acquisition. This can be maximised when we use creative learning media such as literary texts, or technology that stimulates them to actively and productively create something from their imagination. Teachers should understand that there are extroverts and introverts, so children who are good at writing should be directed towards writing, not public speaking, and vice versa. In other words, when teachers have a baseline of humanistic thinking, they will definitely not focus on theory, they focus on their students to be able to practice English competence. To summarize, the challenge of learning languages through theory without practice is a difficult one that requires a different method for adults than for children. Understanding the particular hurdles that adults encounter and implementing a more effective learning technique can help them overcome these obstacles and attain fluency in a second language.

There some implications of this point. First, there is absence of Practical Implementation. A theory-centric curriculum often generates a disparity between the instruction provided and the practical requirements in the field. Language, as a medium of communication, necessitates a practice-oriented methodology and practical experience, rather than solely theoretical understanding. Second, there is insufficient interdisciplinary comprehension. Humanities disciplines, including the philosophy of language, culture, and communication ethics, are frequently marginalised due to an emphasis on targeted orientation: language competence. Learning language is not just about the structure, the theory, the formula, nevertheless, it is about the practice and experience. Here, the humanities can enhance language instruction by highlighting the social and cultural contexts of language. This can warn a pivotal point, third, static curriculum formulation. Theoretical frameworks frequently yield inflexible curriculum, hindering adaptation to the evolving requirements of students or shifts in the global landscape. The point is, teaching cannot be focused on the material textbook-ally, especially in language teaching, specifically, in English language learning.

Studies have shown that when teachers are trained, they focus too much on technical things like learning goals, grading methods, and literacy, and not enough on the non-technical things that make education work well. For instance, (Shkedi, 2009) talked about how curriculum designers need to think about more than just the material. They also need to think about how to get students interested in learning through different teaching methods and resources. This method is different from what you found about how the English program does not pay enough attention to non-technical factors.

Skillset Target here refers to the English skills that must be mastered. For example, speaking, learners are encouraged to speak English while they have no insights to talk about. People are able to speak not because their tongue is capable, but because they have thoughts or feelings to express, so they can convey what is inside them, or the insights they have. Similarly, with writing, learners have to have something to write about, because it is impossible for people to write from nothing. Then what often happens, just like what we experienced when we were in high school, is that teachers are oriented towards memorising Tenses formulas and vocabularies. In fact, the researcher learnt all that from reading. In other words, there is no need to separate skills and insights or multidisciplinary. The two should go hand in hand and be allies.

There are some implications of this point. First, false assumption of language to solely technical proficiency. An overemphasis on abilities like grammar or speaking proficiency frequently overlooks the creative and expressive dimensions of language. This constrains students' comprehension of language as a medium for articulating ideas, culture, and personal experiences. Second, insufficient development of soft skills instruction that emphasises only technical skills fails to foster the development of competencies such as empathy, critical thinking, or problem-solving, which are essential in cross-cultural relationships. Third, decreased student engagement in the humanities a curriculum without opportunities for humanities exploration may diminish students' interest in comprehending language within a sociocultural framework, leading to the detachment of language from real-life contexts.

There is comparable research to consider, Research in *Critical Pedagogy: Implications for English Language Classrooms in Asia*, written by (Valdez, 2020). This research underscores the significance of integrating components like multicultural education and critical literacy into English language instruction. Numerous courses prioritise language proficiency while neglecting the social and cultural contexts of students. This research demonstrates that a more inclusive teaching approach, incorporating diverse literacies (visual, digital, social), can improve students' learning experiences. This study challenges the conventional methodology of language instruction that emphasises procedures and technical competencies. The author asserts that language instruction should encompass wider social and cultural concerns. Employing critical pedagogy in English language instruction fosters active student participation, enhances comprehension of social realities, and equips them to become more socially literate generation.

Positivist Ideology is a science-based way of understanding the world. Positivists believe that there is little (if any) difference between the social sciences and the natural sciences, as society and social life operate according to rules, as does nature. This term, if understood simply, can be seen from its syllable, positive, which means true, absolute, and has a definite size. In the context of this research, the curriculum is shaped by positivistic people, who see that in order to be able to speak English, the focus is on the English skillset. Whereas empirically and in practice, they have to *fight* with external problems such as psychological, sociological, and even cultural. This means that the size of the English Education curriculum should consider the humanities disciplines, in order to maximise the potential of the curriculum to produce prospective English teachers who can understand the situation of students and their potential, without having to impose what is not suitable for their circumstances.

There are some implications of this point. First, simplification of language as a scientific entity. This ideology neglects the fact that language is a social construct that develops via interaction, practice, and experience. The positivistic approach emphasises quantifiable elements like exam scores or numerical evaluations, neglecting the nuances of authentic communication. Second, the lack of space for humanistic reflection. This perspective posits that pupils are instructed to adhere to objective criteria, such as examinations or rubric-based evaluations, without the chance to investigate the personal, social, and cultural aspects of language. Third, neglect of affective dimensions in learning. Positivist worldview diminishes focus on emotional components, including motivation, feelings, and individual student experiences, which are essential for substantive language acquisition.

Several studies, like a research written by Lees' (2007) , entitled *Beyond positivism: Embracing Complexity for Social and Educational Change*. Lees implied that the role of multiliteracies in language education, point to the need to teach English in a way that is not just formal. These works disagree with the idea that education should only focus on technical skills like language skills or ways to teach. Instead, they support a more complete approach that takes into account culture and social factors in language learning. This might help to set the tone for your positivist view, which puts a lot of weight on standard and measured results in education. Another shows that a purely positive view of education has its limits. A work written by Zembylas (2007), entitled *Risks and pleasures: A Deleuzo-Guattarian Pedagogy of Desire in Education*, exposed a deeper understanding of the complicated human experience in schools. This point of view questions the curriculum growth you are looking at and shows how it does not take into account the mental, emotional, and political aspects of teaching

CONCLUSION

Language is a medium of communication and the process of mastering language is through practice, this also applies to the process of mastering English. The problem is that the English Education curriculum tends to focus on theory, skills, and a positivistic view of the basis of curriculum formation which makes the

English Education curriculum disengages the involvement of humanities disciplines. There are three main results can be drawn implicitly by the researcher from the perspective of the English Education lecturers: *Theoretical-Based Orientation, Skillset Target, and Positivist Ideology*. Firstly, the English Education curriculum processes English language learning through theories. Secondly, the English Education curriculum focuses on the English language skillset. Thirdly, the English Education curriculum aims to produce English teachers who will teach English focusing on the learning process and the learners' internal problems in the classroom, not the learners' external problems.

REFERENCES

- Apple, M. W. (2012). Can Education Change Society? In *Can Education Change Society?* <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203083550>
- Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years. In *Teaching and Teacher Education* (Vol. 27, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007>
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2015). Beautiful Risk of Education. In *Beautiful Risk of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635866>
- Chin, J. M. C., Ching, G. S., Del Castillo, F., Wen, T. H., Huang, Y. C., Del Castillo, C. D., Gungon, J. L., & Trajera, S. M. (2022). Perspectives on the Barriers to and Needs of Teachers' Professional Development in the Philippines during COVID-19. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010470>
- Christou, P. A. (2023). How to use thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Tourism*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.4337/jqrt.2023.0006>
- Cook, L. D., Kamalodeen, V. J., Hunt-Anderson, I. E., Haynes-Brown, T., Weaver, L., Weaver, S. R., & Lee, L. S. (2022). Cultural studies in education: insights for the mixed methods researcher. In *International Encyclopedia of Education: Fourth Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818630-5.11077-2>
- Dilekli, Y., & Tezci, E. (2020). A cross-cultural study: Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for teaching thinking skills. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2019.100624>
- Doherty, C., Dooley, K., & Woods, A. (2013). Teaching sociology within teacher education: Revisiting, realigning and re-embedding. *Journal of Sociology*, 49(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783313504062>
- Giraldo, F. (2021). A reflection on initiatives for teachers' professional development through language assessment literacy. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v23n1.83094>
- Green, B., & Hickey, A. (2022). Cultural Studies and education: a dialogue of 'disciplines'? In *Continuum* (Vol. 36, Issue 5). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2022.2083583>
- Guerrero Serón, A. (2007). The double contribution of sociology to teacher training. *Revista Internacional de Sociología*, LXV(48). <https://doi.org/10.3989/ris.2007.i48.74>

- Hiew, W., & Murray, J. (2021). Enhancing Huber's evaluation framework for teacher professional development programme. *Professional Development in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1901236>
- Hrastinski, S. (2021). Digital tools to support teacher professional development in lesson studies: a systematic literature review. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLLS-09-2020-0062>
- Huang, F., Sánchez-Prieto, J. C., Teo, T., García-Peñalvo, F. J., Olmos-Migueláñez, S., & Zhao, C. (2021). A cross-cultural study on the influence of cultural values and teacher beliefs on university teachers' information and communications technology acceptance. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09941-2>
- Koyyada, K. (2020). Educational Psychology-Importance for Teachers & Education. *Research and Reviews Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 6(Issue 5).
- Lees, P. J. (2007). Beyond positivism: Embracing complexity for social and educational change. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(3).
- Majumdar, A. (2022). Thematic Analysis in Qualitative Research. In *Research Anthology on Innovative Research Methodologies and Utilization Across Multiple Disciplines*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-3881-7.ch031>
- Molla, T., & Nolan, A. (2020). Teacher agency and professional practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2020.1740196>
- Patrick, H., Anderman, L. H., Bruening, P. S., & Duffin, L. C. (2011). The role of educational psychology in teacher education: Three challenges for educational psychologists. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.538648>
- Postholm, M. B. (2018). Teachers' professional development in school: A review study. In *Cogent Education* (Vol. 5, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1522781>
- Poulou, M. (2005). Educational psychology within teacher education. In *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* (Vol. 11, Issue 6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13450600500293241>
- Rosairo, H. S. R. (2023). Thematic analysis in qualitative research. In *Journal of Agricultural Sciences - Sri Lanka* (Vol. 18, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.4038/JAS.V18I3.10526>
- Schutz, P. A., & Muis, K. R. (2023). Handbook of Educational Psychology. In *Handbook of Educational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429433726>
- Shimbori, M. (1979). Sociology of education. *International Review of Education*, 25(2-3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00598037>
- Shkedi, A. (2009). From curriculum guide to classroom practice: Teachers' narratives of curriculum application. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270902927030>
- Trifonas, P. P. (2020). Cultural Studies and Education. In *Springer International Handbooks of Education: Vol. Part F1618*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56988-8_19
- Utami, I. S., & Alfian, A. (2017). Konsep critical pedagogy Henry A. Giroux. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.32493/jpkn.v4i2.y2017.p145-154>

- Valdez, P. N. (2020). Research in critical pedagogy: Implications for English language classrooms in Asia. *PASAA*, 60.
<https://doi.org/10.58837/chula.pasaa.60.1.8>
- Watkins, M., & Noble, G. (2022). Reconstituting teachers' professional knowledge: using Cultural Studies to rethink multicultural education. *Continuum*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2022.2049212>
- Wattimena, R. A. A. (2018). Pedagogi Kritis: Pemikiran Henry Giroux Tentang Pendidikan dan Relevansinya untuk Indonesia. *Jurnal Filsafat*, 28(2).
<https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.34714>
- Webber, C. F. (2021). The need for cross-cultural exploration of teacher leadership. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 6(1).
<https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2021.1.2>
- Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Educational psychology in teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(4). https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3504_04
- Zembylas, M. (2007). Risks and pleasures: A Deleuzo-Guattarian pedagogy of desire in education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701243602>