

## Teaching English for Young Learners (TEYL) in Indonesia: Policies, Implementations, and Future Directions

Fadhlur Rahman <sup>1</sup>, Asirah <sup>2</sup>, Nizar Saputra <sup>3</sup>, Muntasir <sup>4</sup>, Rizka Safitri <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UIN Sultanah Nahrasiyah Lhokseumawe

<sup>2</sup> The University of Adelaide

<sup>3</sup> Monash University & Universitas Samudra

<sup>4</sup> Universitas Syiah Kuala

<sup>5</sup> Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga

**Abstract.** The teaching of English For Young Learners (TEYL) in Indonesia has become increasingly prominent in response to globalization and the growing need for English proficiency in academic and professional spheres. Despite this rising demand, the implementation of English education at the early childhood and primary school level encounters significant challenges. These include inconsistent educational policies, a lack of adequately trained teachers, and insufficient teaching and learning resources. This study investigates the current landscape of English language education for young learners in Indonesia by examining national education policies and classroom practices. The research identifies key issues such as the incongruent of a standardized curriculum, minimal pre-service and in-service teacher training specific to TEYL, and disparities in access to quality English instructions and materials between urban and rural schools. Therefore, this current study proposes a strategic roadmap aimed at enhancing the quality and effectiveness of TEYL in Indonesia. These include policy reforms, targeted teacher development programs, curriculum enhancements, and improved resource allocation. The findings are intended to inform policymakers, educational institutions, and practitioners in developing a sustainable roadmap for TEYL in Indonesia.

**Keywords:** *TEYL, Indonesia, English, Children, Young Learners*

**Abstrak.** Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris untuk anak (TEYL) di Indonesia semakin genting sebagai respons terhadap globalisasi dan meningkatnya kebutuhan akan kemahiran bahasa Inggris di lingkungan akademik dan profesional. Meskipun permintaan ini terus meningkat, implementasi TEYL menghadapi tantangan yang signifikan. Tantangan tersebut meliputi kebijakan yang tidak konsisten, kurangnya guru yang cukup terlatih, dan sumber daya pengajaran dan pembelajaran yang tidak memadai. Penelitian ini mengkaji lanskap TEYL di Indonesia dengan menganalisis kebijakan pendidikan nasional dan praktik di kelas. Isu-isu utama seperti ketidaksesuaian kurikulum, minimnya pelatihan guru, serta ketimpangan akses terhadap bahan ajar bahasa Inggris berkualitas antara sekolah perkotaan dan pedesaan. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini mengusulkan peta jalan strategis yang bertujuan untuk meningkatkan kualitas dan efektivitas TEYL di Indonesia. Hal ini meliputi reformasi kebijakan, program pengembangan guru yang ditargetkan, peningkatan kurikulum, dan alokasi sumber daya yang lebih baik. Temuan ini dimaksudkan untuk memberikan masukan kepada pembuat kebijakan, lembaga pendidikan, dan praktisi dalam mengembangkan roadmap yang berkelanjutan untuk TEYL di Indonesia.

**Kata Kunci:** *Bahasa Inggris, Indonesia, Anak-anak, Pembelajaran*



## Introduction

English language has functioned as the primary lingua franca in cross-border communication in the 21st century, with its expanding role in international trade, diplomacy, digital technology, and access to scientific knowledge (Rahman & Saputra, 2021). In a global context marked by the acceleration of information flows, human mobility, and knowledge-based economic integration, English proficiency is no longer just an additional asset, but a strategic need (Azmy et al., 2024). The developing countries, including Indonesia, are facing the urgency to prepare the younger generation to be able to participate competitively in the global (Syahriani et al., 2023; S. Zein, 2018). Hence, the initiative to introduce English learning from an early age is seen as a long-term investment that can strengthen human capital and enhance national competitiveness.

In Indonesia, the integration of English into elementary school reflects the policy awareness that second language acquisition is more optimal when started during early cognitive and affective development (Azmy et al., 2024; Bachrudin Musthafa, 2010; Meisani & Musthafa, 2019). The theoretical basis for this is rooted in findings from neurolinguistics and educational psychology, which show that elementary school-aged children have greater phonological flexibility, developing pragmatic sensitivity, and a natural tendency to learn through play, imitation, and social interaction (Bland, 2019; Hwa-Froelich, 2022; Wilcox et al., 2022). By providing early exposure to English, policy makers (the ministry of education) hope to establish a strong fundamental basis of receptive skills (listening and reading), which will then facilitate the development of productive skills (speaking and writing) at the next level (Zein & Coady, 2021). However, international experience shows that the success of early English education is not solely determined by the age at which learning begins, but rather by the quality of input, consistency of exposure, pedagogical approach, teacher capacity, and the relevance of the material to the socio-cultural context of the students (Belhouane & Derradj, 2023).

According Suwanto & Rahman (2022), policy implementation in Indonesia faces a heterogeneous context: disparities between urban and rural areas, gaps in the distribution of qualified teachers, variations in school infrastructure support, and differences in community attitudes toward foreign languages. In many elementary schools, especially in remote areas, the limited number of teachers with adequate linguistic and pedagogical competencies poses a challenge in providing rich and

meaningful learning experiences (Malini & Tan, 2017). On the other hand, elite or private schools in urban areas are better able to provide specialist teachers, supporting technology, and language co-curricular programs. This asymmetry has the potential to widen the achievement gap between groups of students, making the agenda of equity a crucial issue in policy evaluation.

Structural problems further complicate the situation. The high student-teacher ratio reduces the intensity of individual feedback; the absence of systematic formative assessment weakens teachers' ability to adjust differentiation strategies; and the lack of professional practice communities reduces opportunities for continuous pedagogical reflection. Furthermore, pre-service and in-service teacher training programs are not always aligned with the specific needs of teaching English to young learners (TEYL), which requires competence in managing classroom dynamics, orchestrating multi-sensory input, and integrating social-emotional skill development with linguistic goals.

The gap between macro policy objectives (e.g., increasing global competitiveness and national foreign language literacy) and the micro reality of classroom implementation is evident in the variation in student achievement in pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, and motivation. This phenomenon underscores the need for a comprehensive analysis across dimensions: (1) regulatory—how policies are translated into operational guidelines; (2) professional—how teachers' capacities are developed, updated, and supported; (3) pedagogical—methods, materials, assessment, and classroom management; and (4) sociocultural—how parents' attitudes and expectations and the local language ecology influence learning practices.

A synthesis of previous research confirmed that teacher quality is a more crucial determinant than simply the age at which learning begins; an early start without mastery of TEYL competencies, communicative strategies, and phonological sensitivity only produces superficial achievements, whereas trained teachers are able to catch up for age differences through structured, meaningful, and differentiated input (Ching & Lin, 2018; Ekşi & Gazi, 2015; Inan & Karaca, 2021; Rahman & Saputra, 2021). This effectiveness is reinforced by the application of a task-based communicative approach and games that are in line with children's cognitive characteristics and affective needs, so that vocabulary retention, communication courage, and engagement increase compared to conventional drilling methods (Kabesh, 2023; Pinter, 2015). At the same time, the integration of local cultural elements and planned translanguaging has been shown to reduce affective barriers, deepen semantic understanding, and foster intrinsic

motivation, in contrast to the practice of target language exclusivity, which often triggers anxiety and reduces participation (Rahman & Saputra, 2021; Xie & Ding, 2017). Even in the context of limited resources, teachers who are able to design low-cost multimodal teaching materials (using gestures, pictures, real materials) can provide a quality input experience that is competitive with technology-based classes, as long as scaffolding strategies are optimized (Darwis & Hasanah, 2020; Uztosun, 2018).

According to Nikolov & Timpe-Laughlin (2021), the acceleration of students' language accuracy and fluency development lies in the continuous integration of micro-formative assessments. For instances, using oral performance checklists, mini-portfolios, and self-reflection—accompanied by specific feedback on tasks, will benefits young learners rather than relying only on periodic summative evaluations. Authentic classroom practice transformation is also more likely to occur through community-based continuous professional development models (lesson study, peer observation) because their cycle of reflection–experimentation–contextual adaptation fosters internalization of change, compared to one-off transactional training (Ching & Lin, 2018; Garton & Tekin, 2022). On the other hand, simple technologies—audio storytelling, basic phonics applications, and voice recordings for self-monitoring—provide expanded exposure to input and encourage self-regulated learning (Kabesh, 2023). Especially in schools with limited face-to-face hours, as long as the implementation is guided by explicit linguistic goals that is essential for the development of early communicative competence.

This study aims to identify key factors that hinder and support the effectiveness of English language learning for elementary school students in Indonesia, while mapping the gaps between policy ideals and practical realities. This study aims to highlight: (a) the extent to which policies have covered implementation prerequisites (teacher quality, resources, assessment and monitoring); (b) which pedagogical strategies show evidence of effectiveness in increasing participation and initial achievement; (c) a roadmap model that has the potential to be scalable and sustainable for the future of TEYL.

The urgency of this research is also supported by the need to formulate distinct recommendations that are not only normative but also evidence-informed, taking into account feasibility, acceptability, and sustainability. Theoretically, this study contributes to the TEYL discourse in developing countries by exposing the dynamics of interaction between macro policies and micro agents (teachers and students) in a resource-constrained environment. Practically, the findings can be used as a reference for formulating more targeted and measurable quality improvement strategies.

Thus, this research is strategically positioned to bridge the global aspiration for language competence with the local reality of Indonesian early childhood and primary education. Generating a deep understanding of the determinants of success and failure will open up space for context-based interventions that support the creation of inclusive, relevant, and transformative English language learning for Indonesia's younger generation.

## Methodology

This study uses a qualitative design to gain an in-depth insight into the policies, classroom implementation practices, and future development directions of Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) in Indonesian elementary schools (Lichtman, 2023). The research focuses on three areas: (1) policy and regulatory frameworks; (2) pedagogical practices and resource utilization in the classroom; (3) needs, challenges, and models for continuous improvement.

The research began with a systematic content analysis of official policy documents (Hecker et al., 2019), including ministerial regulations and policies, national curriculum frameworks, and module implementation. These documents were analysed using predetermined categories focusing on competency objectives, time structure requirements, teacher role expectations, assessment frameworks, and resource support provisions. Following the document analysis, semi-structured interviews were conducted with key stakeholders across institutions, including policymakers (n=5) to understand policy intentions, school supervisors (n=10) to gather oversight perspectives, teachers (n=30) representing diverse geographical regions of Sumatera, Kalimantan, and Java to capture regional implementation variations, and material designers to understand curriculum resource development processes. The third phase involved non-participant classroom observations using a structured protocol to assess student engagement levels, input delivery strategies, scaffolding techniques, integration of local cultural elements, and formative assessment practices across approximately 20 classes, with two observation cycles per class to ensure reliability. Finally, a comprehensive review of teaching materials was undertaken, examining textbooks for curriculum alignment, worksheets for pedagogical effectiveness, and digital/media for integration potential and cultural sensitivity.

Data were then transcribed and analysed through six phases of thematic analysis: familiarization, initial coding, theme search, review, naming, and synthesis. The analysis

combined deductive codes based on the TEYL conceptual framework with inductive codes from field findings. Triangulation of sources, methods, and researchers was applied to enhance credibility. Member checking was conducted by confirming theme summaries with some informants. Ethical aspects were maintained through informed consent, anonymization, and secure data storage. Final findings were integrated to generate strategic recommendations for strengthening TEYL policy and practices.

## Results and Discussion

### Overview of Context, Status, and Regulatory Dynamics (Policy)

The policy on teaching English to young learners (TEYL) in Indonesia is undergoing an evolutionary process marked by shifts in curriculum orientation, partial decentralization, and tensions between competitive global expectations and the realities of the elementary school ecosystem (Zein, 2017). Since the era of the Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK 2004) and School-Based Curriculum (KTSP 2006), English at the elementary school level has generally been positioned as an optional local content (*muatan lokal/mulok*), not a core national subject. Thus, the offering course are heavily influenced by local government policies and school capacity.

Further, in the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum (K13), this position became even more flexible: the main focus was directed at strengthening basic literacy in Indonesian, mathematics, and character education, while English could still be taught through local content or extracurricular activities. Furthermore, In the more recent phase of policy reform (e.g., the *Merdeka Belajar* and *Kurikulum Merdeka* initiatives), the emphasis has shifted to flexibility in teaching tools, projects to strengthen the Pancasila student profile, and the autonomy of educational units; however, there has been no formal elevation of elementary school English to a compulsory national subject. As a result, there are sharp variations in: (a) time allocation (from 0 hours to 2–3 hours per week), (b) rationale for introduction (orientation towards advanced examinations vs. communicative exposure), and (c) teacher recruitment models (assigned classroom teachers, non-English graduates, to specialist honorary teachers).

Analysis of policy documents shows that the implied official objectives more often emphasize “awareness” and “exposure” than the achievement of measurable instrumental communicative competence in elementary schools. However, at the level of public rhetoric, the narrative of global competitiveness is often used to justify early adoption, creating inconsistencies between parental expectations and curriculum

coverage. National assessments do not yet include English performance indicators for elementary schools, so there is no structured systemic pressure to improve quality or report on achievements. Thus, the absence of national graduation competency standards in elementary schools has two consequences: (1) schools with high resources develop internal curricula (sometimes adopting the CEFR framework in a fragmented manner) and (2) low-resource schools eliminate it altogether or leave only minimal lexical drilling.

In terms of teacher qualifications, there are no binding regulations specifically for TEYL; teacher certification policies (through Teacher Professional Education) focus more on junior high/high school levels for English subjects. This gap has created a situation where many elementary school teachers who teach English do not have a background in TEYL pedagogy (e.g., principles of child phonological development, task-based adaptation, early bilingual literacy). Professional development depends on regional initiatives, the Education Quality Assurance Agency (*LPMP*, now *BPMP/BGP*), or informal communities (mini *MGMP*, WhatsApp groups). Structural incentives for continuous Continuing Professional Development (CPD) participation are low because TEYL in elementary schools is rarely used as a school performance indicator.

The educational technology framework in national policy encourages the integration of digital platforms/tools/apps in general (teaching material repositories, *Merdeka Mengajar* modules), but there is no specific curation channel for adaptive TEYL materials for the emergent level. This has an impact on the fragmentation of material quality: some teachers use imported commercial books that are not culturally contextual; others use simple worksheets without the principles of phonological and thematic input sequencing. On the other hand, the space for local innovation is actually open—the lack of top-down homogenization provides opportunities for cultural adaptation, planned translanguaging, and integration of local wisdom (S. Zein, 2018)—but these opportunities are often not realized due to limitations in instructional design capacity.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the TEYL policy landscape in Indonesia is characterized by: optional status, fragmentation of standards, excessive variation in quality, lack of accountability indicators, and the absence of a systemic pathway for improving TEYL teacher capacity. Although the flexibility of school autonomy is in line with the spirit of contextual differentiation in the *Merdeka* Curriculum, the absence of minimum reference guidelines (minimum viable standards) poses the risk of widening competency gaps between regions.

### **Implementation: Classroom Practices, Teacher Capacity, Resources, and Assessment**

The results of integrating survey and qualitative data (in accordance with the methodology described above) show a spectrum of practices ranging from “structured meaningful exposure” in high-performing urban schools to “shallow quantitative drills” in rural schools with a shortage of specialist teachers (Ching & Lin, 2018). The main dimensions of implementation can be described as follows.

#### ***Teacher Profile and Pedagogical Competence***

Most teachers who teach English in elementary schools are not graduates of English education or do not have specific TEYL training. Teachers with a background in early childhood and primary school teacher rely on general intuition for teaching children but often lack: (1) communicative task design that maintains a focus on form (FoF episodes), (2) strategies for managing game-based activity transitions, and (3) exploitation of phonology (rhymes, chants, minimal pairs) for early phonemic acquisition. Teachers who are graduates of English education tend to be linguistically strong but do not always adjust the cognitive load or perception of children's attention span ( $\pm 10$  minutes per segment). The key factor that distinguishes between more effective and less effective classes is not the age at which students begin learning, but the teacher's ability to combine multimodal input (gestures, visuals, realia) with progressive linguistic scaffolding (Azmy et al., 2024).

#### ***Instructional Approach***

Schools that adopted task-based and game-mediated learning reported increased participation and vocabulary retention; they designed a simple cycle: pre-task (activation of language schemata through songs) – task (role-playing buying and selling with real objects) – language focus (reflection on the phrase “How much is...?”) – expansion (mini project of making a classroom kiosk). Other classes focus on word-for-word blackboard translation, spelling the alphabet, and copying a list of vocabulary words on the theme of “animals” without pragmatic context (Iqbal et al., 2023). Planned translanguaging implementation (e.g., bridging Indonesian to clarify pragmatic functions before modeling again in English) appeared in schools where teachers participated in communities of practice (S. Zein, 2018). Conversely, in many classes, translanguaging occurred ad hoc without explicit linguistic goals, sometimes



dominating to the point of reducing exposure to target input. The integration of local culture (folktales, names of local figures) is still sporadic; teachers often use imported stories (fables, myths, legends, adventure stories, fairy tales, and contemporary stories) without adaptation, thereby diminishing affective relevance (Kabesh, 2023).

### ***Materials and Resources***

Limited digital devices are not always a fatal obstacle when teachers are skilled at using low-cost multimodal media. Field studies show that classes with only blackboards, handmade flashcards, and real objects (plastic fruit, cardboard coins) can achieve 70-75% target language interaction during the task phase; this requires detailed input script planning. However, in other schools, access to devices (school tablets) has led to dependence on phonics drilling applications without integration into the context of communication (Ilham et al., 2024). Commercial textbooks often feature universal themes (My Family, Food, Animals) that are not always synchronized with the *Merdeka* Curriculum's cross-subject projects, resulting in missed opportunities for interdisciplinary integration (e.g., linking the theme "Food" with local nutrition projects). The curation of authentic children's audio materials (songs, storytelling) is still weak; teachers often use YouTube content without considering lexical density or speaking speed.

### ***Classroom Management and Student Engagement***

Effective classrooms feature a rotation of high-energy activities (action songs) to focused activities (listening discrimination) with ritualized transitions (countdowns, gesture codes). Less effective classrooms exhibit high transition time (dead time >20%), which reduces input exposure. Grouping strategies (pairs, small groups) are rarely used optimally in schools with permanently arranged desks; physical reorganization of the space poses a logistical challenge (difficulty in planning, coordinating, and executing the complex steps). Teachers who adopt routines (greeting circle, word of the day) create an affective consistency that facilitates the participation of shy children.

### ***Assessment and Feedback***

Most assessments still consist of vocabulary copying assignments or multiple-choice quizzes; the use of micro-oral rubrics (e.g., a checklist of self-introduction skills with 3 elements: greeting, name, closing) is still in the minority. Innovative classes use

mini-portfolios (monthly voice recordings) for self-monitoring of pronunciations, triggering an increase in self-regulation. Feedback is more often evaluative (“Wrong, repeat”) than descriptive formative (“Good try; be careful with the /θ/ sound at the start of ‘three’”). Lack of formative assessment literacy hinders the provision of measurable weekly micro-targets.

### ***Professional Developments and Practices***

One-off workshop programs produce short-term improvements (e.g., adoption of new games), but without reflective mentoring, practices revert to old patterns. Communities of practice (local lesson studies) that implement the plan-teach-reflect cycle produce contextual adaptations (e.g., task modifications based on a density of 40 students) and strengthen the confidence of non-specialist teachers. The biggest barriers to participation are the administrative burden and lack of career credit recognition.

### ***Contextual Gaps***

Private urban schools often start partial English immersion (morning routines in English) but risk overexposure without adequate L1 (first language) scaffolding for children whose basic Indonesian literacy is not yet established (Azmy et al., 2024). Some rural schools do not offer English at all until grades 5 or 6, reducing readiness for the transition to junior high school, which assumes a baseline vocabulary. This gap widens disparities when facing first-level intermediate material.

To conclude, the implementation of TEYL in the field is determined by teacher capabilities (knowledge–design–reflection), a culture of formative assessment, and a creative resource or ecology-based, not simply the presence or absence of technological tools or the age at which it begins. Structural weaknesses include the lack of minimum practice standards, low-quality feedback, and the limited scale of sustainable practice communities.

## **Future Direction for TEYL in Indonesia: Strategies, Systemic Recommendations, and A Future-Focused Roadmap**

Given the findings related to policy inconsistencies and implementation variations, the future direction of TEYL needs to balance contextual flexibility and the establishment of a minimum reference framework to ensure equity. Strategic recommendations can be mapped into several pillars.

***Establishing Minimum Reference Standards Without Full National Mandate***

Instead of making elementary school English a straight core subject (which could potentially burden low-resource schools), the government could publish a two-level *Minimum Achievement Profile* (e.g., Level A: simple exposure & response; Level B: basic formulaic expression) as a voluntary guideline. This document contains descriptions of micro-communicative performance (e.g., “can understand one-step routine classroom instructions”), rather than a static vocabulary list. This serves as a reference for schools to design local curricula and map internal gaps. The communicative descriptor-based approach avoids premature academic demands.

***Strengthening Teacher Capacity through a Structured Community of Practice Model***

We need to scale up national TEYL lesson study with the support of a digital platform that accommodates: (1) anonymized micro-teaching videos, (2) a library of adaptive tasks according to theme and student density, (3) a rubric-based feedback forum. Provide modular micro-credentials (e.g., “Early TEYL Phonology – 15 course credits”) linked to career incentives (credit points or recognized certificates). Prioritize a cycle-based approach (plan–teach–reflect) over linear webinars. Matching funds can be allocated through small block grant schemes for schools that serve as community hubs.

***Open Platform for Context-Driven Teaching Tools***

We need to develop bilingual (English–Indonesian) TEYL Open Educational Resources (OER) that integrate local culture (customs, urban legends/stories, specific flora or fauna, beliefs, foods) with task design (pre-task→task→focus→extension). Each unit must include pronunciation audio (child’s speech development), low-tech (printed materials, boards, etc.) and high-tech (interactive: software/devices, tablets, smartphone, speech generating devices, etc.) options, and adaptive translanguaging guidelines (when to bridge L1–L2). Curation is done by a panel of accomplished teachers and child linguistics experts; open licensing encourages adaptation.

***Reform of Formative Assessment Practices***

We need to develop a micro-formative assessment toolkit: oral performance checklists, simple storytelling rubrics, audio portfolio templates. Training emphasizes transformative feedback: descriptive actionable (“Add one adjective to make your

sentence clearer”) rather than judgmental. Integrate simple voice recording features in teacher apps to track phonological progress. Link internal formative reporting to parent meetings, shifting expectations from final grades to competency growth.

### ***Adaptive Implementation Plans by Institutional Type***

We need to provide a layered guidance for institution. For instances, Tier 1 (schools without specialist teachers) focuses on routines, chants, and functional lexical chunks; Tier 2 (semi-specialist teachers) adds simple task-based cycles; Tier 3 (specialist teachers) integrates mini project-based activities (e.g., classes create a mini local picture dictionary). This plan prevents a “one-size-fits-none” approach and provides a clear progression path.

### ***Meaningful Technology Integration and Human-Interaction First Principle***

We need to limit the use of purely drilling applications; establish a 70:30 principle, 70% of session time for human/teacher-student or student-student interaction; 30% or less for targeted digital tools (Ilham et al., 2024). Develop self-record-compare-reflect features so students can evaluate their pronunciation against a model, stimulating self-regulation. Ensure offline caching for areas with low connectivity. Guidelines for selecting children's audio content include: speech rate <120 wpm, planned lexical repetition, clear prosody, high density of formulaic chunks.

### ***A Three-Phase Roadmap***

Short Term (1–2 years): PCM (Pre-Construction Meeting) development, launch of community of practice pilots in 6 provinces, development of 40 priority basic theme OER units, beta version of formative assessment toolkit.

Medium Term (3–5 years): Expansion of national practice communities, integration of micro-credentials into the credit system, alignment of monitoring data (annual light surveys) to map PCM adoption; addition of interdisciplinary OER (Open Educational Resources) modules (bilingual STEM mini-projects).

Long Term (5–8 years): Longitudinal impact evaluation on junior high school readiness (formative diagnostic bridging test, not high-stakes), PCM adjustments based on evidence, scaling of lightweight AI adaptive platforms (task recommendations based on performance records), and exploration of possible semi-mandatory status in upper elementary grades if system readiness is met.

### ***Funding and Collaborative Governance***

Diversify funding sources through public-private partnerships for OER (with ethical guardrails: non-commercialization of core content). Form a consortium across LPTK (Teacher Professional Education Institution)–BPMP (Education Quality Assurance Centre) –teacher association universities to validate materials. Implement a transparency dashboard displaying PCM adoption metrics, the number of micro-credential certified teachers, and the level of assessment toolkit usage, maintaining accountability (Belhouane & Derradj, 2023; Steele et al., 2010).

### ***Focus on Equity and Inclusion***

Ensure that material design is friendly to students with special needs (audio with transcripts, dyslexia-friendly fonts, visual alt-text). Prioritize intensive assistance to districts with high transportation costs and low density of specialist teachers. Provide “trauma-informed and socio-emotional support” training modules for post-pandemic classes so that communicative interactions are not hampered by anxiety.

### ***Advanced Research Agenda***

Encourage small experimental research (design-based research) to test the effectiveness of planned translanguaging vs. partial immersion, as well as micro-corpus studies on the development of formulaic chunks in Indonesian children. This empirical data will iteratively update PCM and avoid normative stagnation.

The overall future direction depends on a paradigm shift: from the discourse of “the earlier the better” to “meaningful interaction quality and adaptive formative assessment.” By instilling non-coercive minimum reference standards, strengthening teacher capacity through cyclical communities of practice, and closing contextual material gaps, TEYL can move towards an equitable model that improves students' communicative readiness when entering secondary school. Success is not measured by quantitative vocabulary lists, but rather by steady growth in the ability to understand, respond, and build confidence in language use within the context of valued local socio-cultural norms.

### **Conclusion and Suggestions**

Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) in Indonesia faces complex challenges that require a holistic and collaborative approach to achieve effective and sustainable

implementation. Based on an analysis of national education policies, existing literature, and classroom practices, this study identifies critical issues such as policy inconsistency, a lack of trained teachers, unequal distribution of resources, and disparities in access between urban and rural schools. Therefore, strategic interventions are needed, including consistent education policy reform, the development of pre-service and in-service teacher training programs specifically for TEYL, the refinement of standard curricula, and a more equitable allocation of resources. The success of TEYL should not be measured solely by quantitative achievements such as vocabulary mastery, but rather by the continuous growth in students' ability to understand, respond, and build confidence in using English in accordance with the local socio-cultural context. By implementing a coherent and sustainable framework, TEYL in Indonesia can develop into a fair and inclusive model, thereby improving students' communicative readiness when entering secondary education and supporting Indonesia's national development goals in the era of globalization.

## Reference

- Azmy, K., Rahman, F., Muntasir, & Martunis. (2024). Utilizing First Language (L1) In Teaching English: Examining the Beliefs of English Lecturers at Indonesian Universities Regarding the Use of L1 In English Language Instruction. *JTVE, Special Edition NARTC*, 9(2).
- Bachrudin Musthafa. (2010). Teaching English to Young Learners in Indonesia: Essential Requirements. *Educationist*, IV(2), 120–125.
- BELHOUANE, H., & DERRADJ, A. (2023). *The Effect of Socio-cultural Background on Learning English as a Foreign Language for Young Children*.
- Bland, J. (2019). Teaching English to Young Learners: More Teacher Education and More Children's Literature! *CLELEjournal*, 7(2), 79–103.
- Ching, F., & Lin, A. M. (2018). *Contexts of learning in TEYL*. In *The Routledge handbook of teaching English to young learners*. Routledge.
- Darwis, N., & Hasanah, U. (2020). The Effectiveness of Using Teaching English for Young Learner (TEYL) Module for Pre-service Teacher Based on Teacher Training Approach. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 8(1), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v8i1.1022>
- Ekşi, G. Y., & Gazi, A. A. (2015). Enriching Microteaching in Teaching English To Young Learners (Teyl): an Action Research. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 2(1), 26–41.
- Garton, S., & Tekin, S. (2022). Teaching English to young learners. In *In Handbook of practical second language teaching and learning* (pp. 83–96). Routledge.
- Hecker, S., Wicke, N., Haklay, M., & Bonn, A. (2019). How Does Policy Conceptualise Citizen Science? A Qualitative Content Analysis of International Policy Documents. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 4(1), 32. <https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.230>

- Hwa-Froelich, D. A. (2022). Social communication development. In *In Social communication development and disorders* (pp. 150–175). Routledge.
- Ilham, M., Rahman, F., Kholid, M., & Sari, D. D. (2024). The Efficacy of e-Guru Application in Boosting Learning Effectiveness: Does It Deliver Results? *International Journal of Social Learning (IJSLS)*, 4(2), 197–209.
- Inan, S., & Karaca, M. (2021). An investigation of quality assurance practices in online English classes for young learners. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 29(4).
- Kabesh, D. M. M. L. (2023). The Effectiveness of Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) Program on Fostering Early Primary EFL Teachers' Storytelling Performance. 30–1), 2(31, □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ssj.2023.306371>
- Lichtman, M. (2023). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Routledge.
- Malini, N. L. N. S., & Tan, V. (2017). International Journal of Education. *International Journal of Education*, 9(1), 53–58. <http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/ije/article/view/3718/pdf>
- Meisani, D. R., & Musthafa, B. (2019). Responses towards Policy on TEYL in Elementary Schools: A case study in Malang City. 254(060), 140–144. <https://doi.org/10.2991/conaplin-18.2019.29>
- Nikolov, M., & Timpe-Laughlin, V. (2021). Assessing young learners' foreign language abilities. *Language Teaching*, 54(1), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000294>
- Pinter, A. (2015). Task-based learning with children. In *Teaching English to young learners* (pp. 113–128).
- Rahman, F., & Saputra, N. (2021). English as International Language Revisited: Implications on South Korea's ELT Context. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 08. <https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v6i1.9383>
- Steele, J. L., Murnane, R. J., & Willett, J. B. (2010). Low-Performing Schools Attract and Keep Academically Talented Teachers? Evidence. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29(3), 451–478. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam>
- Syahriani, F., Yufriadi, F., & Fismanelly. (2023). Empowering the Future: Innovative Education Strategies for Global Skills in the Context of the Golden Generation 2045. *International Journal of Applied Educational Research (IJAER)*, 1(2), 121–134. <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijaer.v1i2.1077>
- Uztosun, M. S. (2018). Professional competences to teach English at primary schools in Turkey: a Delphi study. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(4), 549–565. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2018.1472569>
- Wilcox, G., MacMaster, F. P., & Makarenko, E. (2022). Cognitive neuroscience foundations for school psychologists. In *Brain-behavior relationships in the classroom*. Routledge.
- Xie, R., & Ding, D. (2017). The Influence of Local Context on the Games in Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) in Tongren (China). *International Journal of Education*, 9(2), 53. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v9i2.10998>
- Zein, M. S. (2017). Elementary English education in Indonesia: Policy developments, current practices, and future prospects. *English Today*, 33(1), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078416000407>
- Zein, S. (2018). Translanguaging in the EYL classroom as a metadiscursive practice: Preparing prospective teachers. In *in English Language Teacher Preparation in Asia* (pp. 47–62). Routledge.
- Zein, S., & Coady, M. R. (n.d.). *Early language learning policy in the 21st century*. Springer International Publishing.

