Journal of Pedagogy and Education Science (JPES)
VOL. 4, No. 02, pp. 412-428
journal.iistr.org/index.php/JPES
DOI: 10.56741/IISTR.jpes.001019

The Problems of Indonesian Education Policy with the Change of Curriculum as an Effort to Improve the Ranking of Education Quality in the World

[1]Syaiful Bahri, [1]Murni Yanto, [1]Baryanto, [2]Muhammad Mujtaba Asad
Corresponding Author: syaiful@iaincurup.ac.id
[1] Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia
[2] Sukkur IBA University, Sukkur, Pakistan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received 14 May 2025
Revised 16 July 2025
Accepted 31 July 2025

Keywords
Change of Curriculum
Education Policy
Education Quality
Global Competition
Student-Centered Learning

ABSTRACT

The curriculum is a fundamental yet often overlooked aspect of education, serving as the core of the learning process. It must be evaluated innovatively and dynamically to align with technological advancements and evolving societal needs. As technology progresses, education must adapt to equip future generations with relevant skills for global competition. A flexible, student-centered curriculum is essential, tailored to learners' needs, interests, and experiences. This study employs library research, analyzing books, journals, and articles to explore educational challenges in Indonesia, including curriculum issues, corruption in funding, limited teaching hours, and restrictive teacher autonomy in lesson design. Potential solutions are drawn from successful models in Finland, Germany, and Australia, whose adaptable and equitable education systems could offer valuable insights for Indonesia. By addressing these challenges through evidence-based reforms, Indonesia can enhance its educational framework, ensuring it meets contemporary demands while fostering student-centered learning.

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

Introduction

Education holds paramount importance for a nation. The reason is that education serves as the primary means to enhance human potential, enabling individuals to optimize themselves comprehensively and wisely [1], [2]. This is linked to the primary goal of national education, which is to create an education system capable of strengthening influential and robust social structures, thus empowering Indonesian citizens who are quality-oriented and proactive in facing various changes of the times [3]. One crucial aspect in education that often escapes attention is the curriculum. This curriculum, so complex and multidimensional, serves as the foundation from the beginning to the end of the learning experience and constitutes the core of education that needs to be evaluated innovatively, dynamically, and periodically by the changing times [4]. The current technological advancements demand that society continually enhance skills and knowledge related to science and technology. Therefore, the education sector must be prepared to confront changes and evolutions to prepare skills for the next generation to face competition in an increasingly advanced era [5]. Educational institutions can strive by continually refining existing curricula.

The curriculum is a series of learning plans that the students must follow through a series of subjects to achieve specific goals [6]. As an educational program designed to provide learning to students, this curriculum contains various activities that support the students' learning process, ultimately resulting in changes and developments in both behavior and skills by the set learning and educational objectives. The education curriculum is a constantly evolving system. This change process is necessary because the curriculum must align with and meet the needs and characteristics of learners in a particular era. The creation and development of the education curriculum should consider the needs, opinions, learning experiences, and interests of learners as the primary focus, making learners the center of education itself [7].

In Indonesia, the education curriculum has undergone several evolutions, starting from 1947 with what was known as the 1947 Learning Plan Curriculum, which later evolved into the Merdeka Curriculum [8]. Since then, there have been 10 curriculum changes in Indonesia, occurring in 1947, 1952, 1964, 1968, 1975, 1984, 1994, 2004, 2006, 2013, and 2022. Developing the education curriculum in Indonesia has reached the phase of developing the Merdeka Curriculum. This curriculum results from the refinement and implementation of an emergency curriculum designed in response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The principle underlying this latest curriculum is an orientation towards learner-centered learning, embodying the concept of *Merdeka Belajar* [9]. This concept refers to an approach that grants learners the freedom to choose subjects they are interested in. Schools have the

right and responsibility to develop curricula that align with the needs and characteristics of each learner [10], [11]. The policy of selecting curricula is expected to accelerate the process of national curriculum reform [12]. Overall, providing curriculum options for schools can be considered one of the strategies in managing changes [13].

Changes in the curriculum are related to government policies regarding education in each country. Each country has its policies regarding education, which will undoubtedly affect the quality and process of education in that country. Including in Indonesia, Indonesia has its education policy, which is regulated in Law No. 20 of 2003, which states that the primary function of the National Education System is an effort to develop the capacity and shape the character and culture of the nation to advance their lives, to explore the potential of learners to become individuals who are religious, morally upright, healthy, skilled in science, creative, independent, and become democratic and responsible citizens. However, the implementation of national education policies in primary schools is currently not given maximum attention, even though this is very important because primary schools are considered a crucial educational foundation that determines the direction of the nation's future success.

In Indonesia, there are many educational problems, ranging from curriculum problems, quality, competence, and even leadership abilities at both the top and bottom levels [14], [15]. In the field, there are several complaints from educators and school leaders who are dissatisfied with aspects of leadership such as management, discipline, bureaucracy, and administration. Furthermore, and equally significantly, school leadership also contributes to shaping the image of the education industry and widening internal divisions and conflicts among educators [16]. Along with implementing regional autonomy, the national education system is faced with demands to change and adapt to create a democratic education process, considering diversity, the needs of each region, and increasing community involvement. After 78 years of Indonesian independence, individuals fully authorized the government to manage the country with all the needs and levels of ethical responsibility given to the government in preparing, providing, and maintaining the world of education. This unique condition poses unforeseen challenges, significantly influencing the characteristics of schools.

When we compare it with other countries whose education quality rankings are among the best in the world, far above Indonesia, like Finland, many factors have contributed to the success of Finland's education system. These include a nine-year comprehensive school system that is open to all children, a modern curriculum focused on learning, continuous attention to the diverse needs of students, and local autonomy and shared responsibility [17]. However, the key to Finland's education system's success is teachers' significant contribution [18], [19]. During the nine years of basic education, students no longer prioritize achieving grades or rankings but instead focus on understanding and applying knowledge according to the national

basic education curriculum. Ranking systems, both for students and schools (considered favorite or not), and national exam evaluations for progression to the nine-year national basic education level, have been eliminated. Basic education focuses on shaping character and enhancing each student's capacity.

The Finnish government made these efforts to balance the abilities of all students at the compulsory basic education level. This requires closer cooperation between the government, education providers, the community, and parents in monitoring children's educational progress and learning. The aim is to ensure that every student can follow and understand the subjects taught at the basic education level [20].

The Finnish National Board of Education routinely conducts annual national education evaluations by randomly sampling scores from schools representing various regions. These sample scores are then processed to create a national evaluation report, individual reports, and feedback for each school. However, individual school reports and feedback are not widely publicized. The Finnish National Board of Education will not specifically disclose education performance data from each local government or school. This approach is adopted to avoid the formation of school and student rankings that can have negative impacts, such as naming and shaming. The Finnish education system aims to provide everyone with a high-level education.

This aims to ensure that every Finnish citizen has equal access to education up to the highest level, focusing on their best abilities, skills, and competencies [21]. Finland has developed an education system based on consistent principles, including free education, free school meals, and special education for special needs, all while adhering to the principle of inclusivity [22], [23]. All residents of Finland have a fundamental right to receive education free of charge. The government is responsible for ensuring equal opportunities for all citizens to access education services free of charge at every level, tailored to their abilities and needs, regardless of their economic status [24], [25]. This aims for personal development and enhancing all country residents' skills, competencies, and capacities. This right is guaranteed and recognized in the Finnish Constitution.

Let us also look at the country with the world’s top education ranking, Denmark. Denmark heavily relies on the knowledge economy and fully recognizes that only people with a good education can sustain and succeed in the global competition [26], [27]. Although some may wonder whether this comfort makes them feel too comfortable and less motivated due to the lack of competition, Danish students confidently assert that they do not see any problem like that. With a bit of humor, they state that Danish citizens living in a cold country cannot afford to be lazy because of the risk of the cold. In Denmark, children must receive education from seven to sixteen. Preschool education is also available before children reach the age of

six. About 60% of teenagers there choose alternative types of education, which are often taken by those who have not decided on their career plans or further higher education.

If we shift our focus slightly to Germany, the education process begins with the preschool stage called kindergarten, which is intended for children aged 3-6. Kindergarten is included in the "Vorschulische Einrichtungen" concept, which translates to "Preparatory before Education." This concept originated in Germany and has been widely adopted by other countries, so the preschool education level often still uses the German term "Kindergarten." Many kindergartens in Germany are run by churches, social organizations, communities, and sometimes by companies or other associations. After kindergarten, primary education begins at 7 to 10 years old. This level of education is known as "Grundschule" or "Primary School." After completing Grundschule, there are four options to choose from for further education: Hauptschule (grades 5 to 9/10), Realschule (grades 5 to 10), Gesamtschule (grades 5 to 13), and Gymnasium (grades 5 to 13) [28].

To enter Hauptschule, Realschule, or Gymnasium, individuals must pass the "Orientierungsstufe" or Orientation Stage [29]. At this stage, the talents and skills of the child are assessed, which determines their further education direction. Hauptschule and Realschule focus more on students who want to work immediately after school, especially after attending "Berufsfachschule" or "Fachoberschule" education. For those who wish to continue to university, the fastest route is usually through the Gymnasium. Other educational paths allow for university studies, but these paths require more time, such as doing work placements for several years beforehand. Here are some education systems and policies in several countries that, compared to the systems and policies in Indonesia, may present specific problems that could be factors in why Indonesian education has not yet broken into the top 10 rankings.

Methods

This study employs a qualitative library-based research design, systematically analyzing existing literature [30], [31] (books, peer-reviewed journal articles, policy documents, and reports) to examine Indonesia's education policy challenges, particularly curriculum changes, and explore potential solutions from international best practices.

A. Data Selection and Inclusion Criteria

To ensure methodological rigor, the following selection criteria were applied: 1) Relevance: Sources must directly address education policy, curriculum reform, or funding oversight in Indonesia or comparator countries (Finland, Germany, Australia); 2) Time Frame: Preference was given to publications from 2010–2024 to ensure contemporary relevance; 3) Source Type: Prioritized peer-reviewed journals, government reports, and policy analyses over informal commentaries; 4) Geographical Focus: Included comparative studies of high-performing

education systems (e.g., Finland, Germany, Australia). Excluded sources included non-academic blogs, outdated materials (pre-2010), and unrelated policy domains.

B. Data Extraction and Coding Framework

A structured coding matrix (Table 1) was developed to categorize and analyze themes systematically.

Table 1. Coding Framework for Content Analysis

Theme	Sub-Categories	Example Codes
Comparative Models	Finland, Germany, Australia	"Decentralized oversight in Finland, Germany, Australia"
Governance & Funding Corruption	Misallocation, Oversight mechanisms	"Dana BOS leakage cases"
Curriculum Reform, Equity & Inclusion	Policy changes, Implementation barriers	"Merdeka Curriculum challenges"
Teacher Autonomy, Teacher Training & Professionalism	Pedagogical freedom, Standardization	"Finish teacher curriculum control"

C. Data Analysis Process Initial Coding

Sources were categorized using a thematic coding matrix. First, axial coding was applied to identify relationships between key themes (e.g., "funding corruption → policy failure"). Second, a comparative analysis was conducted by contrasting Indonesia's system with those of Finland, Germany, and Australia, using systems theory to evaluate structural interdependencies [32], [33].

Results

Table 2 presents the studies' metadata, including key information such as title, author, publication year, journal name, country of study, and research focus. This overview provides context for understanding the scope and diversity of the research included in the analysis.

Table 2. Metadata of the Studies Analyzed

Title	Author	Year of Publication	Journal Name	Country of Study
Focus: Governance & Funding Corruption				
The German vocational education and training system: gender challenges, academisation and the integration of low-achieving youth.	Finland [34]	2022	Finland's Right to Learn Programme: Achieving equity and quality in education	Finland
The German vocational education and training system: gender challenges, academisation and the integration of low-achieving youth.	Haasler [35]	2020	Transfer	Germany
NAPLAN, myschool and accountability: Teacher perceptions of the effects of testing.	Thompson [36]	2013	International Education Journal	Australia
Focus: Curriculum Reform, Equity & Inclusion				
Between-School Variation in Students' Achievement, Motivation, Affect, and	Brunner et al. [37]	2018	Journal of Research on Educational	Finland

Title	Author	Year of Publication	Journal Name	Country of Study
Learning Strategies: Results from 81 Countries for Planning Group-Randomized Trials in Education.			Effectiveness	
Standardized Testing, Use of Assessment Data, and Low Reading Performance of Immigrant and Non-immigrant Students in OECD Countries.	Teltemann and Schunck [38]	2020	Frontiers in Sociology	Germany
Access to and equity in the Australian government secondary school system curriculum.	Dean et al. [39]	2023	SN Social Sciences	Australia
Focus: Teacher Autonomy, Teacher Training & Professionalism				
Research-informed teacher education, teacher autonomy and teacher agency: the example of Finland.	Chung [40]	2023	London Review of Education	Finland
Vocational Teacher Training in Germany from the Governance Perspective.	Deissinger and Melnyk [41]	2024	Partnership-based governance and standardization of vocational teacher education in Ukraine	Germany
Lines of school-university partnerships: Perception, sensation, and meshwork reshaping of pre-service teachers' experiences.	Lemon et al. [42]	2018	Australian Journal of Teacher Education	Australia

Discussion

A. Comparative Models

The first education problems in Indonesia are central to curriculum problems [43]. In curriculum development, Indonesia tends to follow government directives. In other words, changes in government leadership in Indonesia lead to changes in the curriculum, which complicates matters for educators and students. Curriculum policymaking is entirely within the government's jurisdiction. Therefore, when the government establishes a curriculum, Indonesia must follow it without considering remote regions. Consequently, the instructional process for remote areas must adhere to the same pattern as urban areas, complicating education in Indonesia. Perhaps we can look into other countries' curriculum policies as potential references for change.

The first country is Finland. In Finland, the school curriculum is developed tripartite by representatives from schools, education experts, and representatives from the industrial sector in the Scandinavian country [44]. Within educational learning, they employ a humanistic curriculum approach that focuses on students as its centerpiece (student-centered). Students are afforded extensive freedom in learning without the imposition of homework assignments. The education evaluation system in the country is minimal, with no involvement of national final exams whatsoever. Finland delegates the authority to set educational curricula to local governments, allowing them to design curricula according to regional conditions and urgencies specific to each area.

The second country is Germany. In Germany, curriculum guidelines are centrally formulated, yet schools have the flexibility to adapt them to meet local demands and needs [45]. In other states, relevant officials at the central level set general objectives, which schools then elaborate into detailed curriculum formats while remaining within the framework of the established general goals. A somewhat significant exception occurs in the curriculum for the final years of secondary school; curriculum details are centrally devised for the sake of external examinations. In both territories, the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). ACT and the Northern Territory schools relatively enjoy broader autonomy and can develop their curriculum based on the general objectives determined at the school level.

The third country is Australia. Australia employs a curriculum known as the Curriculum Framework, which was developed in anticipation of the 21st century under the motto Educating our Children to Succeed in the 21st Century [46]. Professor Lesley Parker, Chair of the Curriculum Council, expressed her pride, stating, "The Curriculum Framework was developed through a unique consultative process that involved almost 10,000 teachers, parents, academics, curriculum officers, students, and other community members.

In other words, curriculum development in Australia has involved all stakeholders in education. Table 3 summarizes key elements of the Australian Curriculum Framework. Curriculum development in Australia emphasizes inclusivity, actively involving all stakeholders within the education ecosystem. It is grounded in eight contextual conditions that reflect contemporary societal and global challenges, such as cultural diversity, rapid technological change, and global interdependence.

Table 3. Curriculum Framework Components in Australia

Aspect	Details
Stakeholder Involvement	Curriculum development involves all educational stakeholders.
Underlying Conditions	1. Cultural diversity 2. Changes in family structure 3. Rapid pace of technological change 4. Global environmental problems 5. Changing nature of social conditions 6. Change in the workplace 7. Interdependence in the global economy 8. Uncertain standards of living
Core Values Promoted	1. Pursuit of knowledge and commitment to potential achievement 2. Self-acceptance and respect for oneself 3. Respect and concern for others and their rights 4. Social and civic responsibility 5. Environmental responsibility

B. Governance & Funding Corruption

Additionally, the curriculum aims to foster five essential values in students, ranging from personal development and civic responsibility to environmental stewardship. These foundations ensure the curriculum responds to current needs and supports long-term societal

progress. It cannot be denied that the cost of education in Indonesia is relatively high, which is the main reason why many Indonesian children cannot access schooling or higher education. Quoting data from the Education Financing Service Center, the government allocates an Rp budget to realize outstanding human resources. 660.8 trillion, or 20% of the national budget. This figure is significantly higher than Finland's, which allocates only Rp. 3.64 trillion per year, and even smaller than Germany's allocation of only 241.9 million per year.

Indonesia distributes education funds through programs such as the School Operational Assistance, Procurement of Goods, and others, which are vulnerable to corruption [47]. With such a significant education budget, Indonesia should ideally rank among the top 10 countries with the best education systems. However, this is not the case in reality, as the funds do not fully reach education stakeholders in the regions due to corruption in education funds. According to the Indonesia Corruption Watch, from 2016 to 2021, authorities have addressed 240 corruption cases in education funds in the past 6 years, resulting in significant losses. Corruption in education funds encompasses various sectors, such as improper procurement of goods, School Operational Assistance funds, etc. Hence, let us observe the oversight system for education expenses in other countries with well-established management of education funds. This issue can be analyzed through decentralization theory, which examines how fiscal and administrative responsibilities are distributed across governance levels [48]. In Indonesia, decentralization has led to fragmented oversight, allowing corruption to persist due to weak accountability mechanisms. Additionally, systems theory in the curriculum [49], [50] suggests that inefficiencies in fund allocation disrupt the entire education ecosystem, affecting teacher quality, infrastructure, and student performance. To address these challenges, Indonesia can learn from countries with robust education fund oversight systems, such as Finland, Germany, and Australia.

C. Curriculum Reform, Equity & Inclusion

The first country for comparison is Finland. Finland oversees education funds with an approach that greatly emphasizes equity and the quality of educational services [37]. In Finland, education funds are overseen through various methods. The first method is Central Government Oversight. The central government holds primary authority in monitoring the use of education funds. They establish budgets and monitor the allocation of funds for various levels of education. The second method is Commitment to Quality. There is a strong focus on education quality and transparency in fund usage. Regular evaluations are conducted to ensure that funds are used appropriately and effectively. The third method is Local Education Authorities. Local education authorities are also responsible for managing funds and implementing the national curriculum and education standards. The fourth method is Education Oversight Bodies. Independent bodies are tasked with monitoring and evaluating

the efficiency and effectiveness of education fund usage. They provide reports and recommendations to the government for improvement. The fifth method is Community Participation. Transparency in education fund usage encourages community participation in overseeing and monitoring fund management, thus creating mechanisms for external control.

Through collaboration between the central government, local education authorities, independent oversight bodies, and community participation, Finland strives to ensure that education funds are utilized efficiently, effectively, and to the high standards of education quality that characterize its education system [37].

Finland's education system is renowned for its equity and high performance, supported by a multi-layered oversight framework:

- Ensures budget alignment with national education goals;
- Implement curriculum while managing funds efficiently;
- Monitor fund utilization and recommend policy improvements; and
- Enhances transparency through public engagement.

Finland's success aligns with decentralization theory, where local autonomy is balanced with national standards [51], [52]. This model ensures accountability while allowing flexibility in fund allocation [34].

The second country for comparison is Germany. In Germany, oversight of education funds is carried out through several mechanisms. The first mechanism is Government Oversight. The central government and local education authorities monitor the allocation of education funds. They are responsible for overseeing and establishing budgets for various levels of education. The second mechanism is Evaluation and Accountability [41].

A stringent evaluation system is in place to ensure that education funds are utilized appropriately. Schools and educational institutions must adhere to established guidelines and standards. The third mechanism is Financial Reporting and Transparency. Regular financial reports are generated to demonstrate the use of education funds. This transparency allows the government and the public to monitor and evaluate fund utilization. The fourth mechanism is Education Oversight Bodies. Independent bodies are tasked with monitoring and assessing the use of education funds. They oversee various educational institutions' policies, programs, and fund management practices. The fifth mechanism is Collaboration with External Parties. Several independent institutions and organizations are also involved in overseeing education funds, collaborating with the government and educational institutions to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of fund utilization [35].

Through various mechanisms, Germany endeavors to ensure that education funds are utilized efficiently, aligned with national educational objectives, and result in high-quality education for students [38]. Germany employs a strict accountability framework:

- Monitor fund distribution;
- Assess compliance with standards;
- Public reporting ensures accountability.

Germany's approach reflects systems theory, where each component (government, schools, auditors) functions interdependently to maintain efficiency [53].

The third country, by comparison, is Australia. In Australia, oversight of education funds involves several mechanisms. The first mechanism is the Government Regulation. The federal and state governments are responsible for regulating and overseeing the use of education funds [36]. They establish policies, budgets, and educational standards that educational institutions must adhere to. The second mechanism is the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) [39].

ACARA is responsible for developing the national curriculum, assessing education quality, and providing reports to the government regarding student achievement and school performance. The third mechanism is the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA): ASQA oversees and assesses vocational education and training providers to ensure that education and training quality is maintained. The fourth mechanism is Community Participation [42]. Community participation also plays a significant role in overseeing education funds. There is transparency in fund usage, and communities and parents of students are often involved in monitoring and decision-making related to education. The fifth mechanism is Regular Reporting and Evaluation. Various oversight bodies and assessment agencies conduct a regular reporting and evaluation system. This helps ensure that education funds are used to meet national educational objectives and established quality standards. Through collaboration among government agencies, independent oversight bodies, and community participation, Australia strives to ensure that education funds are used appropriately and efficiently to achieve high-quality educational goals. Australia's oversight includes

- ensures compliance with national standards;
- monitor curriculum and vocational training quality; and
- parents and stakeholders engage in fund monitoring.

Australia's collaborative governance model [54] demonstrates how multi-level coordination improves fund efficiency.

In Indonesia, the average teaching hours amount to 8 hours per day. In simpler terms, Indonesia's teaching-learning process spans from morning to evening, leaving teachers and students focused solely on school activities throughout the day. Consequently, there is no time

for teachers and students to develop talents and skills, exacerbated by the additional homework assignments given to students, which make it difficult for them to engage in hobbies or activities that foster creativity and abilities. One country worth considering is the Finnish Education System. In Finland's educational process, teachers only teach 4 hours daily, supplemented by 2 hours for self-development per week. Teachers in the OECD teach an average of 703 hours per year, whereas teachers in Finland only teach 592 hours per year. The extra time for teachers in Finland is mainly used to support students who require special attention. Students needing special attention are brought to separate classes and provided with individualized learning plans.

Through this approach, education in Finland ensures that no student is left behind in their learning process. This action is carried out with great elegance. In Finland, an expression states, "a special needs student is a student who has never received special attention during their education." This indicates that providing special attention to students in Finland is considered highly important.

D. Teacher Autonomy, Teacher Training & Professionalism

In Indonesia, some problems exist regarding teachers' freedom in designing learning. The first is the constraints of an overly prescriptive curriculum. At times, highly structured and rigid curricula can constrain the creativity and freedom of teachers in designing learning experiences that cater to the needs and interests of students. The second is pressure from standardized evaluation. Some schools may emphasize the implementation of specific teaching methods or focus on achieving standardized evaluation outcomes, which limits the freedom of teachers to utilize innovative and creative processes. The second is resource limitations, such as limited textbooks, inadequate technology, or insufficient facilities, which can constrain the variety in lesson planning. The third is an inconsistent understanding. Not all teachers consistently understand the limits of their freedom in designing learning. Unclear school policies or curriculum guidelines can lead to varying interpretations.

We find the following when we investigate Finland as a potential reference for improving teachers' freedom in designing learning. In Finland, teachers can choose lesson plans and textbooks according to their own considerations. Almost all teachers create enjoyable teaching methods in the learning process, where intrinsic motivation is the key to student success. In Finland, there is no class stratification in classroom arrangements. Private schools receive the same amount of funding as public schools. In Finland, teachers are educators and experts in curriculum development.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that there are several educational problems in Indonesia, namely curriculum problems, corruption problems in education funds, teaching and learning hour problems, and teacher freedom in designing learning problems. These problems find solutions from other countries such as Finland, Germany, and Australia, which may apply to education in Indonesia. Regarding curriculum problems, Finland has a policy where school curricula are developed tripartite by schools, educational experts, and representatives from the industrial sector in the Scandinavian region. In the context of academic learning, they implement a humanistic curriculum approach that focuses on students as the center. Students are given extensive freedom in learning without being burdened with homework. The education evaluation system in that country is minimal, and it does not even involve national final exams.

Finland also gives authority to local governments to determine educational curricula so that local governments can design curricula according to the conditions and urgencies of each region. In Germany, curriculum guidelines are centrally created, but schools can adapt them to meet local demands and needs. In other states, relevant officials at the center set general objectives, and schools elaborate them into detailed curricula while remaining within the framework of the established general objectives. There is a significant exception in the curriculum for upper secondary schools; detailed curricula are centrally developed for external examination purposes. In both territories, the ACT and the Northern Territory, schools have relatively greater autonomy and can build curricula based on general objectives determined at the school level. In Australia, the curriculum is known as the Curriculum Framework, which was developed in anticipation of the 21st century under the motto "Educating our Children to Succeed in the 21st Century." Prof. Lesley Parker, Chair of the Curriculum Council, expressed her pride: "The Curriculum Framework was developed through a unique consultative process that involved almost 10,000 teachers, parents, academics, curriculum officers, students, and other members of the community." In other words, curriculum development in Australia has involved all education stakeholders.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

[1] H. Yu, "Reflection on whether Chat GPT should be banned by academia from the perspective of education and teaching," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 14, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1181712.

[2] M. Huda and A. Hashim, "Towards professional and ethical balance: insights into application strategy on media literacy education," *Kybernetes*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 1280–1300, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1108/K-07-2017-0252.

[3] F. Mubin, "Pengembangan Model Perencanaan Pendidikan," Jun. 2020. doi: 10.31219/osf.io/5fk6n.
[4] Yumahendra and Maftuh, "The Development Strategy of Curriculum Merdeka Belajar as an Effort to Improve the Quality of Education," in *ICEE*, 2024, pp. 603–610.
[5] T. Ahmad, "Scenario based approach to re-imagining future of higher education which prepares students for the future of work," *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 217–238, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1108/HESWBL-12-2018-0136.
[6] I. Bråten, E. W. Brante, and H. I. Strømsø, "Teaching Sourcing in Upper Secondary School: A Comprehensive Sourcing Intervention With Follow-Up Data," *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 481–505, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1002/rrq.253.
[7] A. Dianto, A. Yanto, D. Bastian, M. E. Kurniawan, E. K. Harahap, and Hamengkubuwono, "Strategi Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Dalam Pengembangan Sekolah Smkn 2 Rejang Lebong," *Educational Leadership: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 277–290, 2023, doi: 10.24252/edu.v2i2.34636.
[8] R. Jannah, "Analysis of Educational Curriculum Evolution in Indonesia and Its Impact on Increasing Education Quality," *International Journal of Social Service and Research*, vol. 3, no. 8, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.46799/ijssr.v3i8.513.
[9] M. ibnu sholeh Sholeh, Habibur Rohman, Eko Agus Suwandi, Akhyak, Nur Efendi, and As'aril Muhajir, "Transformation Of Islamic Education: A Study Of Changes In The Transformation Of The Education Curriculum," *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 39–56, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.14421/jpai.v20i1.6770.
[10] J. Vreuls, M. Koeslag-Kreunen, M. van der Klink, L. Nieuwenhuis, and H. Boshuizen, "Responsive curriculum development for professional education: Different teams, different tales," *The Curriculum Journal*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 636–659, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1002/curj.155.
[11] K. Pak, M. S. Polikoff, L. M. Desimone, and E. Saldívar García, "The Adaptive Challenges of Curriculum Implementation: Insights for Educational Leaders Driving Standards-Based Reform," *AERA Open*, vol. 6, no. 2, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1177/2332858420932828.
[12] S. Bin Jang, "Legitimising the need for another curriculum reform and policy framing: the case of South Korea," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 247–269, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1080/00220272.2019.1657955.
[13] R. Langan, S. Cowley, and C. Nguyen, "The State of Digital Marketing in Academia: An Examination of Marketing Curriculum's Response to Digital Disruption," *Journal of Marketing Education*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 32–46, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0273475318823849.
[14] N. T. Lumban Gaol, "School leadership in Indonesia: A systematic literature review," *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 831–848, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1177/17411432211010811.
[15] V. Sukmayadi and A. Yahya, "Indonesian education landscape and the 21st century challenges," *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 219–234, 2020.
[16] E. Bros and C. Schechter, "The Coherence Challenge Between Policy Makers and School Leaders: Exploring a National Pedagogical Reform," *Journal of School Leadership*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 488–513, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1177/10526846211067641.
[17] M. Paananen, J. Kauko, and S. Volmari, "Education Policy in Finland: Varying Approaches for Addressing Injustices," 2023, pp. 231–248. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-34862-4_14.
[18] E. Andere, "Are Teachers Crucial for Academic Achievement? Finland Educational Success in a Comparative Perspective," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 23, p. 39, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.14507/epaa.v23.1752.
[19] T. Saloviita, "Attitudes of Teachers Towards Inclusive Education in Finland," *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 270–282, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1080/00313831.2018.1541819.
[20] M. Mikkilä-Erdmann, A. Warinowski, and T. Iiskala, "Teacher Education in Finland and Future Directions," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, Oxford University Press, 2019. doi: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.286.
[21] A. A. Ismail, "Immigrant Children, Educational Performance and Public Policy: a Capability Approach," *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 717–734, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s12134-018-0630-9.

[22] G. Al-Thani, "Comparative Analysis of Stakeholder Integration in Education Policy Making: Case Studies of Singapore and Finland," *Societies*, vol. 14, no. 7, p. 104, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.3390/soc14070104.
[23] S. Lakkala, A. Galkienė, J. Navaitienė, T. Cierpiałowska, S. Tomecek, and S. Uusiautti, "Teachers Supporting Students in Collaborative Ways—An Analysis of Collaborative Work Creating Supportive Learning Environments for Every Student in a School: Cases from Austria, Finland, Lithuania, and Poland," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 5, p. 2804, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13052804.
[24] J. F. Parella, "The Success of the Finnish Model: An Economic Analysis," *JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.15640/jmpp.v7n1a2.
[25] V. Ruutiainen, M. Alasuutari, and K. Karila, "Rationalising public support for private early childhood education and care: the case of Finland," *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 32–47, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1080/01425692.2019.1665497.
[26] P. Maskell, *Learning in the village economy of Denmark: the role of institutions and policy in sustaining competitiveness*. Routledge., 2024.
[27] A. Hajighasemi, P. Oghazi, S. Aliyari, and N. Pashkevich, "The impact of welfare state systems on innovation performance and competitiveness: European country clusters," *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 100236, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jik.2022.100236.
[28] M. S. Klein, *Two Worlds of Science Learning: A Look at the Germanies*. In Science Education In Global Perspective: Routledge., 2019.
[29] Ç. Çelik, "How tracking gets under the skin: German education system and social consciousness of Turkish descent students in basic secondary school tracks," *Ethnicities*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 904–921, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1177/14687968221083794.
[30] H. Mirzal, "Rural Library and Its Benefit on Socio-Economic Development: Bibliometrics and Systematic Literature Review Analysis Based on Scopus Database," *Library Philosophy and Practice*, no. January, pp. 1–17, 2021.
[31] J. Revez and L. Corujo, "Librarians against fake news: A systematic literature review of library practices (Jan. 2018–Sept. 2020)," *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 47, no. 2, p. 102304, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102304.
[32] S. Marmoah, R. Roslan, M. Chaeroh, M. D. Elita, and M. Fauziah, "The Comparison of Education System in Australia and Indonesia," *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, vol. 10, no. 4, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v10i4.33661.
[33] S. Bahri, Salut Muhidin, W. Warta, M. Abd. Rahman, and H. Hayaturrohman, "Comparative Study of Levels and Curriculum in Education Systems of Indonesia and Australia," *Journal of Instructional and Development Researches*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 455–466, 2024, doi: 10.53621/jider.v4i6.421.
[34] O. E. P. Perspectives, "Finland ' s Right to Learn Programme: Achieving equity and quality in education Table of contents," *Finland's Right to Learn Programme: Achieving equity and quality in education*, no. 61, 2022.
[35] S. R. Haasler, "The German system of vocational education and training: challenges of gender, academisation and the integration of low-achieving youth," *Transfer*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 57–71, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1024258919898115.
[36] G. Thompson, "NAPLAN, myschool and accountability: Teacher perceptions of the effects of testing," *International Education Journal*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 62–84, 2013.
[37] M. Brunner, U. Keller, M. Wenger, A. Fischbach, and O. Lüdtke, "Between-School Variation in Students' Achievement, Motivation, Affect, and Learning Strategies: Results from 81 Countries for Planning Group-Randomized Trials in Education," *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 452–478, 2018, doi: 10.1080/19345747.2017.1375584.
[38] J. Teltemann and R. Schunck, "Standardized Testing, Use of Assessment Data, and Low Reading Performance of Immigrant and Non-immigrant Students in OECD Countries," *Frontiers in Sociology*, vol. 5, no. November, pp. 1–12, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fsoc.2020.544628.
[39] J. Dean, N. Downes, and P. Roberts, "Access to and equity in the curriculum in the Australian government secondary school system," *SN Social Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1–23, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s43545-023-00641-7.
[40] J. Chung, "Research-informed teacher education, teacher autonomy and teacher agency: the example of Finland," *London Review of Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2023, doi: 10.14324/LRE.21.1.13.

[41] T. Deissinger and O. Melnyk, "Vocational Teacher Training in Germany from the Governance Perspective," *Partnership-based governance and standardization of vocational teacher education in Ukraine*, pp. 95–114, 2024.
[42] N. Lemon, A. Wilson, C. Oxworth, A. Zavros-Orr, and B. Wood, "Lines of school-university partnership: Perception, sensation and meshwork reshaping of pre- service teachers' experiences," *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 81–97, 2018, doi: 10.14221/ajte.v43.n10.5.
[43] Suharno, N. A. Pambudi, and B. Harjanto, "Vocational education in Indonesia: History, development, opportunities, and challenges," *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol. 115, p. 105092, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105092.
[44] J. Välimaa, "The Development of Finland's Higher Education System After the Second World War – Towards a Welfare State," 2019, pp. 209–260. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-20808-0_10.
[45] M. Pilz and K. Wiemann, "Does Dual Training Make the World Go Round? Training Models in German Companies in China, India and Mexico," *Vocations and Learning*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 95–114, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s12186-020-09255-z.
[46] S. Marmoah, R. Roslan, M. Chaeroh, M. D. Elita, and M. Fauziah, "The Comparison of Education System in Australia and Indonesia," *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, vol. 10, no. 4, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v10i4.33661.
[47] P. A. Wirandana and K. Khoirunurrofik, "Educational inequality in Indonesia: are intergovernmental fiscal transfers effective in reducing the gap?," *Educational Studies*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1424–1443, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1080/03055698.2022.2103647.
[48] F. H. Tunio and A. A. Nabi, "Political decentralization, fiscal centralization, and its consequences in case of Pakistan," *Cogent Social Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2021, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2021.1924949.
[49] A. A. Lawal and A. Lateef, "The Impact of Government Funding on Infrastructure Improvement and Educational Performance in Rural Schools," *International Journal of Progressive Research in Engineering Management and Science (IJPREMS)*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 593–599, 2025.
[50] O. M. Pederson, "Beyond the Exam Score: An Examination of the Kenyan Education System, Its Reforms, Inefficiencies, and Impact on Individuals and Society at Large," *Honors Projects*, p. 238, 2025.
[51] V. Renko, J. Johannisson, A. Kangas, and R. Blomgren, "Pursuing decentralisation: regional cultural policies in Finland and Sweden," *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 342–358, 2022, doi: 10.1080/10286632.2021.1941915.
[52] G. Al-Thani, "Comparative Analysis of Stakeholder Integration in Education Policy Making: Case Studies of Singapore and Finland," *Societies*, vol. 14, no. 7, p. 104, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.3390/soc14070104.
[53] I. Olha and L. Sike, "A Comparative Study on the Difference of Vocational Education between China and Germany," *Transactions on Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 54–58, 2024, doi: 10.62051/aez3qp81.
[54] S. Malekpour, S. Tawfik, and C. Chesterfield, "Designing collaborative governance for nature-based solutions," *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, vol. 62, no. February, p. 127177, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ufug.2021.127177.

Authors



Syaiful Bahri is a lecturer in Management of Islamic Education at IAIN Curup, Indonesia. He actively publishes scholarly articles on Islamic-based educational management, curriculum development, educational zoning, student admissions, and institutional problem-solving in Islamic educational settings. He has presented at international academic conferences, including a proceeding in Bengkulu, Indonesia, and regularly serves as a guest lecturer at various universities. His primary interest lies in the effective management and development of Islamic educational institutions. (email: syaiful@iaincurup.ac.id).



Murni Yanto was born in Musi Rawas, Indonesia, on December 12, 1965. He holds a Master's degree in Indonesian Language Education from the University of Bengkulu and has been pursuing a Doctorate in Education at the State University of Jakarta (UNJ) since 2017. He became a permanent lecturer at IAIN Curup and currently serves as the Head of the Amanah Halal Product Center, a position he has held since 2017. His academic and professional journey reflects a commitment to educational development and institutional leadership. (email: murni_yanto@iaincurup.ac.id).



Baryanto is a lecturer in management of Islamic education at IAIN Curup, Indonesia. His academic work focuses on educational management, curriculum management, and evaluation. He is particularly interested in developing effective curricula within Islamic educational institutions and has contributed several articles. (email: baryanto@iaincurup.ac.id).



Muhammad Mujtaba Asad is an Assistant Professor and Lead Researcher of the Educational Technologies and TVET Research Group at Sukkur IBA University, Pakistan. With over a decade of national and international experience in the educational and industrial sectors, his expertise includes educational technologies, work-based learning, product-based education, and technical and vocational education and training (TVET). He has published over 60 research papers indexed in ISI and Scopus-listed journals and conferences. His innovative work has earned him multiple accolades, including three Gold, one Silver, and one Bronze medal in global research competitions, along with seven best research awards from Malaysia, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and the UAE. (email: m.mujtaba@iba-suk.edu.pk).