



**International Journal of Education, Social Studies,
And Management (IJESSM)**

e-ISSN : 2775-4154

Volume 2, Issue 3, November 2022

The International Journal of Education, Social Studies, and Management (IJESSM) is published 3 times a year (**February, Juny, November**).

Focus : Education, Social, Economy, Management, And Culture.

LINK : <http://lppipublishing.com/index.php/ijessm>

**A Comparative Study: Similarities and Differences between
Indonesia's Curriculum and Philippine's Curriculum**

Agus Nasir¹, Hendri Yawan², Saifullah³

¹ Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Indonesia

² Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Indonesia

³ Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The school curriculum of Indonesia has changed three times over the same period since 2004. Meanwhile the new curriculum of Philippine was changed in 2012. This study attempted to compare Indonesia 2013 curriculum (K13) with Philippine curriculum K to 12 (K12) regarding their development and enactment while also uncovering the embedded cultural values and influences on both curricula. The discussion also tried to investigate how the two curricula have impacted different stakeholders involved. This research was conducted by reviewing the collated official curriculum documents published by education ministry of the two countries and analysing facts and issues emerged from related studies and articles. The study reveals that the similarity of both curricula reforms lies at the fact that both curricula are deliberately reformed in response to the actual needs of society in each country. Meanwhile, the difference might be seen from the lens of curricula purposes in which K13 was designed to strengthen social and religious values while K-12 was focused on the development of knowledge and skills. The findings suggest that Indonesian curriculum needs to be made more practical instead of being too philosophical while gradual and continuous evaluation in necessary aspects is more recommended than total reforms which tend to result in longer adaptation and transition process.

Comparative study, curriculum, Indonesia, Philippine

[10.52121/ijessm.v2i3.121](https://doi.org/10.52121/ijessm.v2i3.121)

hendriyawan@usn.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received

20 November 2022

Revised

25 November 2022

Accepted

05 December 2022

Keywords

Doi

Corresponding

Author 

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum 2013 (K13) was released by the government of Indonesia in 2012 to replace the previous curriculum namely school-based curriculum (KTPS). The ministry of education, which serves as an official educational agency, has the full authority to design, author and evaluate the documents of K13 in every levels of basic schools, including the responsibilities to provide

curriculum guides, teachers trainings, teacher guide books and students textbooks (PP No. 32 the year of 2013, Article 77P).

Despite its positive spirit of changes, the policy has received some criticism from educational practitioners. Some believe that the regulation contradicts the spirit of decentralisation in education, previously implemented in KTSP (Ahmad, 2014). In fact, it has gradually reduced the regional government involvement in designing curriculum, which is only responsible in coordinating and supervising the local content of curricula. At schools, the roles of teacher are only to design lesson plan based on the intended competencies of K13 as well as to implement it in the classroom.

K13 was firstly enacted at all levels of school as regulated by Mendiknas, Muh. Nuh in 2012. However, Nuh's successor, Anies Baswedan changed the policy a year later after considering the feedbacks from some stakeholders. The main issue is the ill-preparedness for textbook availability, school administrators and teacher proficiency. The minister further regulated only 6,221 schools as a model to continue implementing K13 and other schools must reimplement KTSP (BSNP, 2016). Nevertheless, the dual curricula enactment leads to other issues such as teachers' confusion, effectiveness of its implementation and irrelevancy of intended competencies of both curricula (Reswari, 2018).

Such condition also resonates with Philippines context, but its curriculum integration into education system is likely more organised. Firstly, the development of the newest curriculum called K-12 is highly centralised in which Department of Education (DepEd) is fully responsible of developing the curriculum (Sergio, 2012). Secondly, despite criticism from some sectors, Aquino, who serves as President of Philippine, signed the K-12 into law in 2013 (Ellar, 2015). With the law, K-12 could be fully applied at all level of public schools in the following year. This process is basically the third phase of implementation plan. The preceding two phases were carried out in 2012, starting with the implementation of K-12 in Kindergarten level, then followed by the enhanced curriculum implementation for primary school level (ACEI-Global, 2016).

In addition to the dynamic shift, the implementation of both curricula also has attracted a range of responses from some stakeholders. In this sense, the central government of Philippines pays serious attention on the curriculum reform by allocating more fund from the annual budget to realise such ambitious goal (Abulencia, 2015). This is not exaggerating to label "ambitious goal" as one of the issues of K-12 is to add the period of study at basic education level, initially from 10 years to 13 years of study. Philippines' basic

education before K-12 was the shortest in Asia, only 6 years of primary school and 4 years of secondary school (Ellar, 2015). As a result, with the additional 1 year of kindergarten and two years of senior high school level, the government should be ready to deal with the shortage of classrooms, textbooks, teachers and school administrators within 3 years preparation (Abulencia, 2015).

The issue is also alerted by Dr. Isagani Cruz, an education expert in Philippine, who argues that such task is insurmountable in which other aspects should also be taken into account, not only about facilities, but the philosophical foundation and the content of curriculum and teachers' acceptances (Ellar, 2015). He also contends that the education cycle length does not necessarily correlate with better performance of students. Political opponents of government administrator in corporation with the ACT (Alliance of Concerned Teachers) even initiated a petition against the K-12 implementation, pointing the issues of ill- preparedness, the additional expense for parent and national financial burden (Tucay, 2015, Abulencia 2015).

Regardless of the aforementioned criticism, public sentiment on K-12 implementation is relatively positive. It could be seen from the study undertaken by Invento, Lerias, and Ceniza (2017) who digitally investigated the public perceptions occurring on mainstream social media and news websites towards K-12 implementation. It further reveals that public has a high optimism towards the government's preparedness of implementation in terms of facilities, staff and finance. Students also echo the same optimism in the study conducted by Montebon (2015). They believe that learning science under K-12 curriculum help them develop scientific skills, attitudes, and values.

In Indonesia, the tension of curriculum reform in society is not as high as in Philippines because K13 does not radically change the education system. In fact, public reaction is mostly positive. A series of massive surveys carried out by Ministry of Education in 2014 shows that the public opinion indicates optimism that the main goals of K13 would be achievable and successfully implemented. The survey involved 1397 respondents, which consisted of parents, educational practitioners, social figures, foundation administrators and school communities in ten provinces of Indonesia (Sugianto, Sutopo & Nuryanto, 2014). The criticism mainly addresses to the hurried implementation of K13, leading to the ill- preparedness at school level.

RESEARCH METHODE

The aims of this study are to investigate the similarities and differences between the two curricula in terms of philosophical foundations, purposes, to assess and to evaluate how some curriculum

features can be learned and installed from one to the other, it is conducted by a comparative approach. This study is carried out by critically comparing the official curriculum documents obtained from Ministry of Education (MoE) official websites of both countries, and studying findings from previous studies on the same focus. In terms of implementation and influences of the curricula on several groups, this research also discusses emerging issues from reliable online news articles. This study is categorised as literary research, hence there is no particular population and samples identified within the course of this study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Philosophical foundations

“Philosophy lies at the heart of education endeavour”. It is Schubert’s words to express how significant philosophical foundation on the development of a curriculum. It is pivotal to guide curriculum developers to shape all components of curriculum, including to decide what counts as “official knowledge” in a curriculum (Apple, 1993). In practice, philosophical foundation on curriculum development is widely influenced by the cultural context and characteristic of each nation (Black & Wiliam, 2005).

In Indonesia, social justice, cultural identity and religious values rooted in society significantly leverage the development of K13. Those values are explicitly stated in Pancasila and 1945 Constitution (BSNP, 2016). Due to limited space, however, let me discuss specifically on two issues. To begin with, the first principle of Pancasila is “to believe in one God” which indicates that education in Indonesia should be as a means to develop spiritual and character dimensions. Secondly, social justice, which is vividly mandated in the third point of Pancasila, is one of the pillars in implementing K13. That is why the notion of inclusivity comes to be highly valued in K13 enactment. Through this curriculum, therefore, the government expects that education could be served fairly across the regions without undervaluing diversities embedded within communities (Nurfuadah, 2014). It is also intended to bridge the gap that reminds existing between rural and urban areas, advantaged and disadvantaged students’ social background, normal and special need students and high performed and underperformed students.

Compared to K13, Philippines’ educational framework is highly influenced by Dewey’s philosophical perspective who initiated the idea of pragmatic relationship in which the actual needs of society should be translated into education system (Papong, 2014). In other words, Dewey believes that there must be a relevance between what is taught at school and what is needed

by everyday life of people. Thus, K-12 serves to respond the urgent needs of strengthening basic education in Philippines by lengthening the period of basic education in order for learners to master the basic skills for the demands of 21st century.

Comparing the purposes of two curricula

The aim of K13 is explicitly stated in BNSP (2016) that it is intended to enhance the four core competences; social attitudes, religious values, knowledge and skills. These core competences serve as a guide for teachers to develop basic competences each subject. According to Muh Nuh, the former minister, the first two competences which are not literally mentioned in the previous curriculum are the main purposes of Indonesia's educational issues (Nurfuadah, 2014). For instance, Indonesia has been day-to-day suffered from the high number of corruption and terrorism cases. By integrating the religious values and social attitudes such as honesty, tolerance and social care, into every educational practice at schools, K13 is highly expected to create not only knowledgeable and skilful, but also good- ethical, faithful, caring and honest people (Kemendikbud, 2012). This is intertwined with the MacMurray's (as cited in Fielding, 2012) idea of knowledge of community, putting schools as a place for expressing wisdom, empathy, love and caring for one another.

It is different from the case of Philippine's curriculum reform which is grounded in response to its short basic education cycle (Ellar, 2015). The congested curriculum is believed as the primary cause of the lowest results in several comparative international tests compared to its neighbouring countries (Sergio, 2012). Additionally, with 10-year basic education, the graduate students are averagely too young and unskilled to compete with the labour force and entrepreneurial world, leading to the high rate of unemployment (Danilo & Orale, 2016). Hence, the extension of two years in high school level is the solution to empower and equip students with vocational, technical and entrepreneurial skills (Sergio, 2012).

Having discussed above, it is evident that the similarity of both curricula reforms lies at the fact that both curricula are deliberately reformed in response to the actual needs of society in each country. Conversely, the difference could be seen from the lens of curricula purposes itself. K13 is designed to strengthen social and religious values while K-12 focuses on the development of knowledge and skills.

In addition to the stated purposes, Riep (2015) argues in his research investigation that K-12 system has intentionally promoted privatisation as it gives a privileged venue for private corporations to take part in education sector. For instance, APEC (Affordable Private Education Centres) has been

established by a joint venture between British Company Pearson and Ayala Corporation to run affordable world-class schools (Ellar, 2015). On the one hand, this could help the government reach disadvantaged families to have an affordable education for their children. On the other hand, privatisation has no doubt to increase the quantity of low-cost schools, but quality is somehow taken for granted. How they take profit from such scheme? Riep (2015) assumes APEC schools are intentionally designed to produce flexible and cheap labours for local and global corporations. Such business entails a range of cutting costs designed to reduce expense and increase rates of profitability. Riep's (2015) finding also indicates that to generate more profits, APEC schools and other similar chains employ unlicensed teacher for low wage and provide facilities that do not comply to standards. Such practice off course could lead to undesirable effects on teaching and learning quality (Ellar, 2015)

In K13, although it is not explicitly stated within curriculum document, the purpose of K13 is to flourish nationalism among citizen. Nationalism is defined as "feeling of oneness in the minds of people of the particular country, regardless to their languages, cultural aspects, religious aspects etc" (Schleicher, 1993). Unlike Philippines, Indonesia is a multicultural country that comprises a hundred of diverse languages, cultures, religions, and ethnics. K13, therefore, is designed to encompass those diversities embedded within students. Apart from K13 policy, for instance, the Ministry of Education has issued a educational policy by removing English as a compulsory subject in primary school and reducing its time allotment in secondary schools (Purnama, 2014). For this reason, the government believes Bahasa Indonesia must be strengthened as a lingua franca in educational instruction at schools and to enhance a sense of nationalism among diverse languages (Yawan, 2022). Even though the policy has received critics from some parties, say for instance pointing the issue of the urgent need of English in the incoming era of AFTA and AEC (Purnama, 2014), the government remains consistent to further implement such a controversial policy.

Influences on the curricula reforms: who benefits and loses?

Having explored the purposes of curricula reforms, it is also worth discussing the influences on the transformation of both curricula. In this light, some factors may contribute to the reform of a curriculum such as political interest, economic demands, social-cultural dynamic and globalisation (Resh & Benavot, 2009). For the sake of clarity, let me elaborate the two issues in the following paragraphs.

In a curriculum transition, political interest is always there to accommodate those who have political power in a country (Apple, 1993). The

latest curriculum transition in Indonesia is evident that curriculum development and political agenda is inseparable. After the fall of Suharto's regime in 1998, Indonesia had afterward committed to decentralising education sector (Raihani, 2007), but it seems to pay lip service since the curriculum development remains fully controlled by the central government, giving little space for regional governments involvement. Four-time curriculum changes in the last 13 years are evident that Indonesia's curriculum reform is immensely influenced by those who are ruling the ministry of education. The negative stigma even adheres to this official agency that "changing minister means changing curriculum". Critics further claim the new minister basically reforms the national curriculum just for the sake of a legacy. In fact, personal and group interests come to be firstly valued in its reform rather than the national issues. For instance, Indonesian Corruption Watch (ICW) indicates that the shortly frequent changes of curriculum in Indonesia are allegedly due to motives for corruption (Linggasari, 2014). It is unsurprising since the budget allocation for K13 development is \$ 221 million (Kompas, 2013). This condition is detrimental to the education system that tried to be empowered through the new curriculum. Ironically, K13 is intentionally designed to be a character builder for students but in the middle of curriculum enactment, several stakeholders have been found guilty for committing corruption (Antara, 2017).

Unlike K13 reform, neoliberalism significantly affects the national curriculum transition in Philippine. Opponents argue that K-12 only hides behind the slogan of "catching up" with the global standard in which the students should be prepared for the challenges of ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) and Asian free Trade Agreement (AFTA) (Basilio, 2014). Thus, the additional two-year high school students must be equipped with the entrepreneur, academic and skilled labour needs for the work force. Neo liberal approach also has reduced the budget allocation for public schools but promotes privatisation and capitalisation in education sector. In cooperation with private sectors and non-profit organisation, for instance, the government has launched a voucher system to support the funding of K-12 enactment (Riepp, 2015). Neoliberal effects are also evidenced by the existence of four optional career pathways in high school which mostly emphasises on technical, vocational and livelihood tracks to satisfy the demands of local and global market labours (Riepp, 2015). The effect of neoliberalism has been indeed alerted by Biesta (2004) who believes neoliberal roles in the postmodern education have gradually shifted the heart of education to be more likely a marketable commodity rather than a social service.

As a result, private sectors highly take benefits from K-12 because its aims are well aligned to supply the skilled, professional, vocational, engineer workers for the needs of capitalist system. Corporation could benefit from the abundant supply of technical workers and labours. The more the supply of employees is, the more meagre of job vacancies would be. In effect, such scenario would cause the gradual lowering of wages due to working competition, especially in the recent era of AFTA and AEC.

Conversely, some stakeholders would be disadvantaged from this situation. Firstly, Higher education institutions (HEI) would shortly encounter the impacts of K-12. It is estimated the additional two years would make HEI missing two cohorts of enrolment. This would significantly reduce teaching positions in HEI and plunge freshman enrolments from 2016 to 2020 (Ellar, 2015). Secondly, the parents would be burdened with additional expense for their children as the extension of two-year secondary level is not fully funded by the government (Abulencia, 2015).

CONCLUSION

Having compared the curricula transitions in both countries, we argue that there is something missing in both curricula developments, which is the involvement of two important stakeholders; students and teachers. Although the curricula developers assume the curricula documents are already well written for the sake of students' needs, it seems just formality without touching the real context of students. If we look closer at the history, the changes of Indonesia's national curriculum gave less impact for the quality of education. The issue is that teachers as a frontline actor are always excluded in the process of curriculum development. In fact, it makes them confused to translate the new curriculum into their pedagogical practice. Moreover, integrating attitude, religious values and skills into scientific approach and authentic assessment is highly challenging and time consuming. Such condition becomes more problematic since teachers' quality remains low, evidenced by the recent teacher test result where 80% of Indonesian teachers are unqualified to teach. Instead of simultaneously changing curriculum, therefore, the government must shift the focus on improving the teacher expertise by strengthening LPTK (Teacher Training and Educational Institutions) and PPG (Teacher Certification Program). What is said by shifting the focus does not necessarily mean to take curriculum reform for granted. Changing curriculum is a must to catch up with the updated needs of people, but it is just the antithesis of reforming curriculum without the courage to reform teacher's knowledge of pedagogical practices. In addition, none of stakeholders must be marginalised in the process of curriculum

reform because the government, private sectors, parents, teachers, school administrators and students must work together as a unit of change in order to successfully implement the curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Abulencia, A. (2015). *The Unraveling of K-12 Program as an Education Reform in the Philippines* (Vol. 1).
- Ahmad, D. (2014). Understanding the 2013 Curriculum of English Teaching through the Teachers' and Policymakers' Perspectives. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development (IJERED)*, 2(4), 6-15.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2005). Lessons from around the world: How policies, politics and cultures constrain and afford assessment practices. *Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 249-261.
- Danilo, S. H., & Orale, R. L. (2016). Senior High School Curriculum in the Philippines, USA, and Japan. *Journal of Academic Research*, 1(03), 12-23.
- Invento, A. C. B., Lerias, T. J., & Ceniza, A. M. (2017). *Sentiment Analysis on the Impact of K-12 Program in the Philippines using Naïve Bayes and Lexicon Approach with Code Switching*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Information Technology.
- Montebon, D. (2015). *K12 Science Program in the Philippines: Student Perception on its Implementation* (Vol. 2).
- Papong, E. (2014). The Influence of John Dewey's Educational Thought on Philippine Education. *Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy*, 8(1), 62.
- Raihani, R. (2007). Education reforms in Indonesia in the twenty-first century. *International Education Journal*, 8(1), 172-183.
- Sergio, M. R. S. (2012). K-12 education reform: Problems and prospects. *Ateneo de Naga University Press*.
- Antara. (2017). Corrupting K13 socialisation fund, regional educational administrator is in prison for 1,5 year. Retrieved from <http://mediaindonesia.com/read/detail/108220-korupsi-dana-sosialisasi-k13-mantan-kadisdikpora-divonis-1-5-tahun-penjara>
- Apple, M. W. (1993). The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense?. *Discourse*, 14(1), 1-16.
- Biesta, G. (2004). Against learning. Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning. *Nordic Studies in Education= Nordisk Pedagogik*, 23, 70-82.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2005). Lessons from around the world: How policies, politics and cultures constrain and afford assessment practices. *Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 249- 261.

- Fransiscus. (2015). The result of teachers' competency test is disappointing. Retrieved from <http://www.jambi-independent.co.id/read/2015/11/20/3997/hasil-ukg-mengecewakan-nilai-guru-di-bawah-ratarata/>
- Fielding, M. (2012). Education as if people matter: John Macmurray, community and the struggle for democracy. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(6), 675-692.
- Kompas. (2013). \$221 million for curriculum. Retrieved from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2013/02/01/02134013/rp.249.triliun.untuk.kurikulum>
- Purnama, Y. (2014). English removal for elementary school in 2013 curriculum; a careless or careful step?. *Leksika*, 8(1)
- Lingasari, Y. (2014). ICW: Bermotif korupsi, kurikulum 2013 harus dihentikan [ICW: motives for corruption, 2013 curriculum must be suspended]. Retrieved from <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20141216164821-20-18539/icw-bermotif-korupsi-kurikulum-2013-harus-dihentikan>
- Nurfuadah, R. N. (2014). Alasan M Nuh menerapkan kurikulum 2013 [the reasons why Muh Nuh enacted 2013 curriculum]. Retrieved from <https://news.okezone.com/read/2014/12/10/65/1077137/alasan-m-nuh-menerapkan-kurikulum-2013>
- Resh, N., & Benavot, A. (2009). Educational governance, school autonomy, and curriculum implementation: diversity and uniformity in knowledge offerings to Israeli pupils. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(1), 67-92.
- Schleicher, K. (1993). *Nationalism in education*. Peter Lang Pub Inc.
- Sugianto, Sutopo & Nuryanto, A. (2014). Tanggapan terhadap implementasi kurikulum 2013 [public opinion toward the implementation of curriculum 2013]. *The research and development education and culture ministry*. Retrieved from <http://staffnew.uny.ac.id/upload/132296045/penelitian/tanggapan-masyarakat-terhadap-implementasi-kurikulum-2013.pdf>
- Tempo. (2014). Teachers find difficulties in assessing students. Retrieved from <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/624118/kurikulum-2013-guru-kesulitan-beri-nilai-murid>
- The Ministry of Education and Culture. (2012). *Dokumen kurikulum 2013* [Document of 2013 curriculum]. *The Ministry of Education and Culture*. Retrieved from <https://desyandri.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/dokumen-kurikulum-2013.pdf>

- Tucay, M. (2015). *K-12: who loses, who profits*. Retrieved from <https://opinion.inquirer.net/85551/k-12-who-loses-who-profits#ixzz5Rcemb9tD>
- Ellar, A. J. (2015). Philippine K-12 system in the postmodern educational landscape. Retrieved from http://www.baybayin.com.ph/images/pdf/ellar_august2015.pdf
- BSNP (National Education Standard Board). (2016). Standar kompetensi lulusan pendidikan dasar dan menengah [Competency standard graduates of primary and secondary education]. *National Education Standard Board of Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://bsnp-indonesia.org/standar-nasional-pendidikan/standar-kompetensi-lulusan/>
- Riep, C. B. (2015). Corporatised education in the Philippines: Pearson, Ayala Corporation and emergence of Affordable Private Education Centers (APEC). *Education International*.
- Reswari, G. P. A. (2018) Teaching English in the KTSP curriculum and 2013 curriculum simultaneously: a case study of "a senior high school in Semarang", central java, Indonesia. Belfast: Queen's University
- Sugianto, Sutopo & Nuryanto, A. (2014). Tanggapan terhadap implementasi kurikulum 2013 [public opinion toward the implementation of curriculum 2013].
- The Ministry of Research Technology and Higher Education of The Republic of Indonesia. (2003). Undang-undang Republik Indonesia nomor 20 tahun 2003 tentang sistem pendidikan nasional [Act of republic of indonesia number 20 year 2003 on the national education system]. *The ministry of research technology and higher education of the republic of Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://sipuu.setkab.go.id/PUUdoc/173839/UU0202013.pdf>
- The Ministry of Education and Culture. (2012). *Dokumen kurikulum 2013* [Document of curriculum 2013]. *The Ministry of Education and Culture*. Retrieved from <https://desyandri.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/dokumen-kurikulum-2013.pdf>
- Yawan, H. (2022). Augmented Reality Application. *EDUTECH: Journal of Education And Technology*, 5(3), 652-663.
- Yawan, H. (2022). Yo si puedo: a cuban literacy program to strengthen literacy level in west papua. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*, 6(1), 82-92.

Copyright Holder :

© Agus. (2022).

First Publication Right :

© International Journal of Education, Social Studies,
and Management (IJESSM) This article is under:



Index

