IJIET, e-ISSN 2548-8430, p-ISSN 2548-8422, Vol. 7, No. 2, July 2023, pp. 234-248

International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/IJIET
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

EXPLORING EDUCATIONAL PATHS: UNVEILING CONTRASTS BETWEEN INDONESIA'S CURRICULUM AND HONG KONG'S CURRICULUM

Hendri Yawan[1*], Al-Furqan[2], Karman[3], Sarmadan[4], and Bimas Reskiawan[5]
[1,3,4,5]Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia
hendriyawan@usn.ac.id[1], alfurqan8475@gmail.com[2],
karmansultani@gmail.com[3], sarmadan.usnkolaka@gmail.com[4],
and bimasreskiawan@gmail.com[5]
[*]correspondence: hendriyawan@usn.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v7i2.6443
received 27 May 2023; accepted 7 July 2023

Abstract
This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of the development of Indonesia's curriculum and Hong Kong's curriculum, with a focus on identifying the underlying philosophical values and influences embedded in both educational systems. The research also explores the implications of these curricula on various stakeholders involved in their development and implementation. To achieve these objectives, a synthesis research approach was employed, analyzing a combination of empirical and conceptual papers to draw robust conclusions. The study yielded four key findings that shed light on public opinions, philosophy, goals, and implications of the curricula. Firstly, both the Indonesian curriculum and the Hong Kong curriculum received predominantly positive responses from stakeholders, with minor complaints reported through official surveys. Secondly, the philosophical foundation of the Indonesian curriculum centers around social justice, while the Hong Kong curriculum places a strong emphasis on diversity and inclusivity. Furthermore, both curricula have implicit purposes that can be inferred from the range of topics covered in the respective curriculum guidebooks. Finally, the implementation of these curricula has led stakeholders in each country to issue policies aimed at consolidating their influence. In Hongkong, the promotion of the Chinese-based course serves to strengthen China's power in the field of English education. Conversely, in Indonesia, efforts have been made to preserve the Indonesian language by removing the English subject at the primary level and reducing the time allocation for English in secondary education. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the development and influences of curricula in Indonesia and Hong Kong, providing valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and researchers.

Keywords: comparative analysis, curriculum, Indonesia, Hongkong

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Introduction

In mid-2012, the proposal for Indonesia's 2013 curriculum emerged following prior curriculum development endeavors. The basic constitution governs and oversees the reconstruction of the curriculum, with detailed explanations provided in government regulations. The eight standards that are covered by these regulations include graduate, content, process, assessment, teacher, infrastructure, management, and funding competence standards (Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan [National Education Standard Board], 2017). It is worth noting that recent curriculum reconstruction efforts have resulted in significant changes in four competencies: achievement, content, process (pedagogy), and assessment competence standards, while the other standards have remained unaltered (Mansur, 2015).

Act No. 20 of 2003, Chapter Ten, establishes a clear framework for amending the curriculum, ensuring its alignment with the basic constitution. The Ministry of Education, as the representative of the government, bears the responsibility of structuring the fundamental framework for the new curriculum. In this process, teachers play essential roles as developers and evaluators within schools (Kementerian Riset Teknologi dan Pendidikan Indonesia [Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of Indonesia], 2003). However, it is important to note that other stakeholders, including parents, social groups, organizations, business groups, and students, do not directly participate in official curriculum development. Instead, they function as recipients of education (Kemenristekdikti, 2003). When the 2013 curriculum was introduced into the education system, the government opted for a gradual implementation spanning the years 2013, 2014, and 2015. This implementation process was reinforced by teacher education programs, guidebooks designed for both teachers and students, administrative measures, and rigorous monitoring and evaluation procedures (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan [Ministry of Education and Culture], 2012).

Renowned for its exceptional education system, Hong Kong holds a unique status as a special administrative territory within China. It has consistently ranked among the top countries in the OECD education rankings. Influenced by its history as a former colony, Hong Kong's education system exhibits resemblances to the British system. Since its reunification with China in 1997, the education system has undergone significant transformation, blending elements from both the Chinese and British systems (OECD, 2010). Responding to challenges arising from the previous curriculum framework, the education commission implemented a comprehensive reform in 1999, marking a turning point in the educational landscape (OECD, 2010). Over time, the curriculum underwent multiple revisions, progressing from the Learning to Learn curriculum in 2001 to the Key Learning Area curriculum guide introduced in 2017 (Education Bureau, 2017).

In 2015, the Curriculum Development Council (CDC) released the KLA curriculum guide for Primary 1 to Secondary 6 (P1-S6), incorporating updates from the previous framework. The CDC is a diverse body that includes principals, teachers, parents, employers, higher education experts, field specialists, HKEAA commissioners, and representatives from the Education Bureau (CDC, 2017). The Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA) conducts public assessments across all educational levels, comprising representatives from the school sector, higher education sector, government delegations, and business

groups. The previous curriculum framework, developed by the CDC, gathered recommendations from KLA committees. These committees conducted extensive surveys and sought feedback from various stakeholders, including principals, teachers, students, and the general public, in order to propose reforms for the previous curriculum. To facilitate the smooth integration of the new curriculum framework into the education system, the Hong Kong government provides a wealth of curriculum guides and downloadable booklets on its official websites, ensuring easy access for teachers and schools (CDC, 2017).

Based on the discussion above, it is interesting to compare the two curricula and understand the underlying principles, educational philosophies, objectives, and approaches in their development. Thus, the research questions are provided below to guide this study:

1. How do the curricula development of Indonesia's curriculum and Hong Kong's curriculum differ in terms of public opinions, educational philosophies, goals, and approaches?
2. To what extent do the two curricula have implications for different stakeholders involved in the educational systems of Indonesia and Hong Kong?

This study provides a starting point for investigating the similarities and differences between the curricula of Indonesia's Curriculum 2013 and Hong Kong's curriculum. Further research and analysis can delve into specific aspects of the curricula, implementation practices, and their impacts on student outcomes and educational effectiveness.

Method

To address the primary inquiries, this study employs the synthesis research methodology. The decision to utilize this methodology is based on factors such as the research questions, availability of relevant literature, limited scholarly works specifically focused on the subject as a literature review and time constraints. Synthesis research involves integrating and analyzing existing conceptual and empirical studies related to curriculum and its implementation in Indonesia and Hong Kong. This methodology is influenced by the pioneering work of Onwuegbuzie, Leach, and Collins (2011), who propose synthesis research as a way to draw conclusions by combining data from multiple related empirical studies. As this study relies solely on existing literature, issues of validity, reliability, and ethical concerns are not applicable since it involves non-reactive data that does not harm human participants (Gray, 2004; Pole & Morrison, 2003).

For the practical implementation of this methodology, the Monash education library is selected as the primary online database to initiate the search for relevant conceptual and empirical studies. The selection of the Monash Library is based on its reliability, wide range of journal providers, and researchers' accessibility to its database. To refine the search within the Education Monash library, three prominent journal providers—ERIC (Education Resources Information Centre), A+, and Google Scholar—are chosen. These providers are known for their credibility and reputable sources on educational topics. The search process involves using specific keywords such as curriculum, education system, implication, Indonesia, and Hong Kong in each journal provider's search columns. Boolean operators (e.g., OR, AND, and NOT) are used to further narrow down the search results to include the most

relevant materials. Additionally, the quality of the identified journals is carefully evaluated. Once the search for relevant literature is complete, the identified journals are examined, analyzed, and synthesized to draw conclusions, generate new insights, and apply the findings within the context of Indonesia and Hong Kong.

Findings and Discussion

Public opinion on the curricula

The Research and Development Board of the Ministry of Education and Culture conducted surveys in 2014 to gather feedback on the implementation of the curriculum in various provinces. The official report published by the board indicated that the response received from school committees, parents, social figures, lecturers, and heads of foundations was predominantly positive (Sugianto, Sutopo & Nuryanto, 2014). The survey encompassed a wide range of aspects, consisting of nineteen distinct categories. These categories examined various elements such as the background of curriculum 2013, social quality, teacher readiness, principal preparedness, school readiness, curriculum purpose, organizational aspects, ease of learning for students, student emotions, curriculum effectiveness, impact of instructional approaches, student adaptability, influence of teaching methods on teachers, impact on schools, availability of books, infrastructure, teacher ability, student motivation, and the role of school committees (Sugianto, Sutopo & Nuryanto, 2014)

The responses from various stakeholders regarding the items mentioned above can be categorized into five groups: "do not know," "bad," "quite bad," "good," and "very good." The proportion of respondents indicating "do not know" is minimal, while the number of respondents indicating "bad" is moderately significant. Responses indicating "quite bad" are relatively high, while those indicating "good" are substantial. However, responses indicating "very good" are relatively low. Overall, it can be concluded that the public response, from the government's perspective, is generally positive. However, contrasting views exist, such as those expressed by the head of the Child Protection Commission Commissioner of Indonesia, who argues that Curriculum 2013 exhibits bias in its implementation towards teachers (Detik, 2014). Additionally, there are concerns about the complexity of assessment practices, which encompass three dimensions and pose challenges for teachers (Tempo, 2014).

In contrast, an annual survey conducted by the Education Bureau and HKEAA in 2012, 2013, and 2014 aimed to assess public sentiment specifically regarding the implementation of KLACG and ELEKLACH (Legislative Council Panel on Education, 2015). The survey findings revealed predominantly positive responses from various stakeholders, with minimal grievances reported. Notably, approximately 99% of school principals expressed a positive outlook, while around 90% of employers expressed satisfaction with the quality of graduates. Furthermore, over 85% of students' achievements, particularly in English, received favorable recognition. However, feedback was also collected from teachers, students, entire schools, and public assessment authorities. Teachers and students expressed concerns regarding excessive workloads, schools raised issues regarding the extensive range of subjects offered, which complicated catering to diverse learners, and public assessment institutions highlighted concerns regarding the alignment

between subject content and standardized tests (Legislative Council Panel on Education, 2015).

Stated purposes of curricula

It is stated in government regulation number 20 year 2003 that the aim of Curriculum 2013 is to

> *''obtain the purpose of national education, that is national education aims to develop the ability to form character and a national civilization that is dignified and to cultivate the potential of students to be a faithful man to the Almighty God, to be noble, knowledgeable, healthy, skillful, independent, and to be a democratic and responsible citizen''* (BNSP, 2016a, p.1).

To ensure the effectiveness of the national education system, it is crucial to establish a comprehensive framework that encompasses graduate competence, as emphasized by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud, 2012). This framework consists of three primary objectives: attitude, knowledge, and skills, which lay the groundwork for the development of content competence, process competence, and assessment for competence standards (BNSP, 2016d, p.3). Within these competence standards, there are defined criteria and coverage, further categorized into core and basic competencies (BSNP, 2016b). These core and basic competencies represent specific desired outcomes tailored to individual subjects and educational levels. In the case of English education, there is no singular aim or goal; instead, the intended outcomes are presented as a predetermined set of core and basic competencies outlined in government regulation number 24 for both junior and high schools. These competencies serve as a guide to delineate the desired achievements and skills to be developed through English instruction.

In comparison to the curriculum 2013, the English Language Education key learning area curriculum guide (ELEKLACG) provides a clear articulation of the aims, objectives, goals, and intended outcomes. This guide, issued by the Curriculum Development Council (CDC), is designed for primary 1 to secondary 6 (p1-s6). The guide outlines the aims of English education, which include the following objectives: Offering students of English the chance to expand their understanding and familiarity with different cultures, while also providing opportunities for personal and intellectual growth, further education, enjoyment, and employment in an English-speaking environment. Equipping every student with the necessary skills to adapt to the evolving socio-economic requirements driven by advancements in information usage and the creation of materials for purposes such as pleasure, study, and work in the English language (CDC, 2017).

In terms of the learning objectives, the KLACG (Key Learning Area Curriculum Guide) provides a comprehensive breakdown of these objectives across three distinct categories: "language forms and communicative function," "language skills and language development strategies," and "attitudes specific to English language learning" (CDC, 2017, p.18). Each category encompasses specific desired outcomes, ensuring a well-rounded English language education. Under the division of "language forms and communicative functions," the curriculum aims to develop students' proficiency in various text types, expand their vocabulary, and enhance their grasp of language structures and usage. In the realm of language skills, the curriculum emphasizes the cultivation of listening, speaking, reading, and writing

abilities, enabling students to effectively engage with and comprehend the English language. Additionally, the curriculum places significant emphasis on fostering positive attitudes towards English language learning, instilling in students an appreciation for the importance of English as a global language. By delineating these specific objectives within each division, the KLACG ensures a comprehensive and focused approach to English language education, facilitating the holistic development of students' linguistic competence and fostering their enthusiasm for English learning.

When comparing the national aims of Curriculum 2013 and the aim of ELEKLACG, it is more evident to focus on their purposes rather than comparing numerous basic competencies of English with the aim of ELEKLACG. There are similarities between the two curricula in terms of enhancing cultural transfer, promoting intellectual development, and preparing students for adaptability in changing economic conditions. However, there are also differences between the curricula in other aspects. Curriculum 2013 aims to strengthen religious beliefs (in Almighty God), promote a healthy lifestyle, and cultivate democratic citizens. On the other hand, ELEKLACG emphasizes the use of English for work and pleasure, without specifically addressing religious values.

Educational philosophies, cultural norms, and values of curricula

Curriculum development is heavily influenced by educational philosophies, cultural norms, and values, as they form the basis for determining what should be included, what should be achieved, and how the curriculum should be structured. Generally, prevalent educational philosophies worldwide, such as social justice, diversity, and inclusivity, serve as the foundation for curricula (Tedesco & Amadio, 2013). Cultural norms and values, on the other hand, contribute to the hidden curriculum, playing a crucial role in interpersonal communication within the social sphere of education (Çubukçu, 2012).

In the context of Indonesia, social justice is the underlying educational philosophy of the curriculum 2013. It is explicitly stated in the introductory section of the graduate standard competence, emphasizing that national education is built upon five principles and the 1945 Constitution (BSNP, 2016a). One of these principles emphasizes social justice for all Indonesian citizens. However, the reality shows that this principle has yet to be fully realized due to various reasons, including student demographics, limited infrastructure, unqualified teachers, and poverty (Rahman, 2015). Furthermore, the values embedded in curriculum 2013 are outlined in the attitude and skills objectives of the graduate competence standard, encompassing eighteen values (BSNP, 2016a).

Religiosity, honesty, tolerance, discipline, tenacity, creativity, independence, democracy, curiosity, nationalism, patriotic spirit, appreciation of achievement, effective communication and friendliness, peace-loving attitude, social concern, and responsibility are among the values incorporated in the curriculum (BSNP, 2016a). Mahsun (2017) notes that these implicit cultural norms in Curriculum 2013 are reflected in social interactions through the topics covered in the guidebooks. The inclusion of local cultural norms and wisdom in the curriculum has been acknowledged by Tcipto Sumadi, the head of the curriculum and library (Widyanto, 2016). Notably, "honesty" holds particular significance as a fundamental principle

guiding the development of Curriculum 2013, responding to the prevailing cases of corruption and manipulation in Indonesia (Kemendikbud, 2013).

Exploring the updated features within the English Language Key Learning Area (KLA) curriculum provides valuable insights into educational philosophies in Hong Kong. The ELEKLACG curriculum, comprising eight recently updated distinctive features, offers a comprehensive approach. These features include the integration of E-learning, the emphasis on generic skills, the incorporation of educational values, the integration of STEM education and reading across the curriculum, the focused learning and teaching of text grammar, the adoption of assessment as a learning approach, and the provision of inclusive English education for gifted students (Education Bureau, 2017). The pedagogical practices implemented within the curriculum exemplify a strong commitment to embracing learner diversity, with specific support for students with special educational needs (SEN) and a focus on maximizing the potential of gifted students within mainstream English learning environments (CDC, 2017). These features collectively establish the philosophical foundation of ELEKLACG in Hong Kong, emphasizing diversity and inclusivity, setting it apart from the curriculum 2013.

Within the ELEKLACG curriculum, there is a notable focus on fostering positive attitudes and values in English language instruction. The curriculum aims to instill seven core values, including perseverance, respect for others, responsibility, national identity, commitment, integrity, and care for others (CDC, 2017, p.24). Additionally, the ELEKLACG curriculum encompasses implicit cultural norms that reflect a harmonious blend of Chinese culture and influences from Western countries. These cultural norms have emerged as a response to curriculum reforms in Hong Kong following its return to Chinese governance in 2001 (Ho, 2006).

Unstated purposes of curricula

The curriculum 2013 is structured around eight fundamental competence standards, with the graduate competence standard serving as the foundation for the others. The graduate standard encompasses three dimensions: attitude, knowledge, and skills, and encompasses a wide range of intended outcomes across all subjects and levels. While the specific objectives for individual subjects, including English, are not explicitly outlined, we can infer them by examining the graduate standard. For instance, within the first objective of the knowledge section, the intended objective is for students to possess factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive knowledge. This knowledge should be developed to a level that encompasses techniques, specific details, and complex concepts in various areas such as science, technology, art, and literature. Furthermore, students should be able to relate this knowledge to their personal context, including themselves, family, school, society, environment, nation, region, and the international sphere (BSNP, 2016a). By analyzing the graduate standard, we can infer that the curriculum 2013 aims to cultivate a broad and comprehensive knowledge base in English that encompasses various disciplines and their application to real-world contexts. The integration of English within these contexts allows students to develop a deeper understanding and connection to the subject matter, fostering a holistic and meaningful learning experience.

Another objective pertaining to English is focused on skills, where students are expected to demonstrate creative, productive, critical, independent, collaborative, and communicative thinking and actions (BSNP, 2016a, p.8). Although the curriculum 2013 does not explicitly state the importance of teaching English, the use of words like "international" and "communicative" suggests that one of the underlying purposes of the curriculum is to equip students with English language proficiency for international and communicative competitiveness. To uncover more specific unstated purposes of the curriculum 2013 in relation to English lessons, it is possible to examine the core competencies outlined for secondary education. The core competencies serve as the foundation for the range of topics covered in guidebooks. By analyzing the recurring outcomes mentioned in the core competencies for secondary students, certain themes emerge. For instance, the phrase "the use of English in family, schools, daily life, and work environments" is repeatedly emphasized. This implies that the curriculum aims to prepare students to possess strong oral and written English skills in various contexts, indirectly positioning them as agents of economic change through English proficiency.

On the other hand, when it comes to the KLA curriculum, particularly in the realm of English, identifying the underlying intentions of the curriculum is comparatively more straightforward. This is primarily due to the presence of a dedicated curriculum framework guide, along with accompanying booklets and modules specifically designed for English. Within the ELEKLACG, the goals, objectives, desired outcomes, curriculum planning, pedagogical practices, assessment methods, and valuable resources are clearly defined and provided. The English language curriculum aims to achieve two overarching goals. Firstly, it seeks to offer students of English the chance to expand their understanding and familiarity with diverse cultures. Additionally, it provides opportunities for personal and intellectual growth, as well as further studies, enjoyment, and employment in an English-speaking environment. Secondly, the curriculum aims to equip every student with the necessary skills to adapt to evolving socio-economic demands arising from advancements in information usage and the creation of materials for personal enjoyment, study, and professional purposes in the English language (CDC, 2017).

By delving into the appendix and conducting a comparative analysis with the overarching aim, we can uncover the implicit objectives embedded within the ELEKLACG curriculum. Notably, certain topics, such as sports and games, let's go shopping, shapes and numbers, and wonders of nature, are not explicitly stated in the curriculum's aim. However, their inclusion provides valuable insights into the curriculum's underlying intentions. The incorporation of sports and games indicates the purpose of promoting a healthy lifestyle through English education. Likewise, the topic of let's go shopping signifies an aim to introduce English in the context of recreational activities. Furthermore, the inclusion of shapes and numbers implies that the KLA curriculum incorporates basic mathematics education, fostering a well-rounded learning experience. Lastly, the presence of the wonders of nature topic suggests a specific emphasis on environmental education within the KLA curriculum, highlighting the importance of ecological awareness and appreciation.

Broad influences of curricula

It is evident that various factors have influenced the development of Curriculum 2013, including political, economic, and cultural considerations (Nasir, Yawan, & Saifullah, 2022). Political influence can manifest through power dynamics, ideological perspectives, and government policies. An updated government regulation regarding process competence standards exemplifies the impact of politics on the curriculum. This regulation resulted in the removal of English instruction in primary education and a reduction of allocated time for English in secondary education, from four hours to two hours per week (Jpnn, 2017). This policy reflects how political decisions shape the content and emphasis of the curriculum. The Ministry of Education aims to preserve the Indonesian language as a valuable cultural heritage by minimizing the prominence of English in primary education and allocating more time for it in secondary education (Fransiscus, 2015. This policy can be seen as reasonable to some extent, considering the experiences of certain African nations where English has significantly displaced indigenous languages (Tamtam, Gallakher, Olabi, & Naher, 2012). For instance, in Namibia, the introduction of English as a second language led to the loss of ten official languages within a few decades, despite the country initially having hundreds of official languages (Tamtam et al., 2012). Such evidence supports the Ministry of Education's decision to limit the prominence of English as a subject in schools.

When examining the development of the Key Learning Area (KLA) curriculum, particularly the English Language Education Key Learning Area Curriculum Guide (ELEKLACG) in Hong Kong, it is crucial to take into account the historical context of the region. As previously mentioned, Hong Kong's history as a former British colony has had a profound influence on various aspects of life, including education. However, a significant political transition occurred between 1997 and 1999 when Hong Kong was returned to China under the leadership of Prime Minister Deng Xiaoping (OECD, 2010). This political shift had far-reaching implications for both the political and educational landscape of Hong Kong.

The integration of Chinese-based courses into the local curriculum in Hong Kong during this period aimed to strengthen mainland China's influence (Yeung, 2017). This influence is evident in the consistent emphasis on Chinese-based courses in the updated seven goals of learning and the major renewed emphasis (MRE). The first objective among the updated seven learning goals focuses on cultivating informed and responsible citizens with a strong sense of national and global identity. This includes promoting positive values and attitudes, fostering an understanding of Chinese culture, and encouraging respect for societal pluralism (Education Bureau, 2017).

Within the Key Learning Area Curriculum Guide (KLACG), the major renewed emphasis (MRE) specifically highlights three aspects related to Chinese-based courses. These aspects encompass strengthening values of education, such as Moral and Civic Education and Basic Law education, reinforcing the learning of Chinese history and Chinese culture, and enhancing the teaching of Chinese as a second language (Education Bureau, 2017, p.9). It is important to note that these updated features have been integrated into all subjects, including English (CDC, 2000). These facts clearly demonstrate the significant influence exerted by mainland Chinese political power on the development of the 2017 KLACG.

It is crucial to acknowledge that the implementation of the Chinese-based course in Hong Kong is driven by political interests and objectives. The Chinese government seeks to foster a sense of national identity, promote cultural and linguistic transmission, and cultivate a strong national awareness and belonging among the youth of Hong Kong (Yeung, 2017). However, this policy shift has had unintended consequences, diverting the focus of Hong Kong students and creating a distraction from core elective subjects such as science or math. The resulting course overload in Hong Kong has raised concerns among educational experts, as students are compelled to prioritize core subjects at the expense of elective subjects, potentially impacting their readiness for higher education (Yeung, 2017).

Beneficiaries and loses sides of the curriculum changes

This study asserts that the government, certain teachers, and some students are the beneficiaries of curriculum changes. Firstly, the introduction of a new curriculum has become a matter of pride and an annual agenda for administrations. While revising the curriculum is considered necessary to align education with the current needs, it cannot be ignored that the implementation of a new curriculum is seen as a significant achievement for the administration, regardless of the potential disadvantages it may pose for teachers, students, and the general public (Nasir et al., 2022). The process of curriculum reform involves substantial costs, including curriculum development, teacher training, socialization, and procurement of books. Nevertheless, driven by institutional pride and political motivations, curriculum reform is often carried out despite these challenges (Yawan, 2022). Secondly, the Curriculum 2013 provides assistance to some teachers through the provision of related books that offer a variety of activities, instructional guidance, assessment guidelines, and resources, which facilitate classroom instruction. Thirdly, the revised Curriculum 2013 benefits some students as the books are now freely downloadable from the internet, allowing them to save on expenses related to purchasing textbooks.

On the other hand, the Curriculum 2013 can also pose disadvantages for certain parties. Firstly, in terms of assessment practices, teachers face challenges in evaluating students' attitudes, knowledge, and skills simultaneously, which can be problematic for them. Additionally, teachers need to adapt to a new curriculum framework, requiring a shift in their pedagogical approach from the previous curriculum. Secondly, considering the varying levels of prosperity among students based on the island they reside in, the absence of internet access, laptops, and other technology-related factors hinder their access to online resources. This means that the lack of physical books can impede their ability to obtain necessary materials (Yawan, 2022). Lastly, the availability of free online books for the Curriculum 2013 has negative implications for publishers and bookstores, as they lose their market share (Wijaya, 2017).

In contrast to the Curriculum 2013, the English Language KLACG appears to be more comprehensive in terms of curriculum elements, pedagogical practices, assessment methods, and resources. ELEKLACG is a new framework curriculum that encompasses various aspects such as curriculum planning, diverse pedagogical approaches, clear assessment practices, and a wide range of resources (CDC, 2017). However, one aspect that can be criticized in the ELEKLACG is its assessment practices. The Hong Kong government continues to implement standardized tests,

including the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education examination, for all subjects, including English (Baile, 2015). The presence of this high-stakes assessment poses a significant challenge for students and parents, as it heavily influences their future prospects. Moreover, the high suicide rates among students in Hong Kong have been attributed to the pressures of the high-stakes testing system (Erikson, 2016). While this high testing regime may benefit the government in terms of international benchmarks like PISA, it is not a desirable educational system if it comes at the expense of students' well-being.

Future implications

This study argues that the Curriculum 2013 incorporates three pedagogical practices: scientific approach, discovery learning, and project-based learning. These practices serve as the foundation for developing syllabi that teachers use to create their classroom lesson plans. In the context of English teaching, teachers rely on guidebooks that contain teaching instructions and basic competencies to formulate their lesson plans. The guidebooks also offer additional approaches, known as enrichment, which include pre-reading activities, post-reading activities, and personal journal writing (Kemendikbud, 2017). In terms of assessment, the Curriculum 2013 emphasizes authentic assessment, primarily focusing on formative assessment methods such as self-assessment, observation checklists, and project-based assessments. Additionally, internal summative assessments are conducted within schools, often comprising multiple-choice and short-response questions. As for external assessment, the government administers national examinations that consist of both paper-based and computer-based assessments. It is worth noting that approximately 20%-25% of the test items in these examinations are created by teacher organizations (Kemendikbud, 2017). Regarding the assessment of English language skills, the Curriculum 2013 primarily evaluates receptive skills, namely listening and reading comprehension.

ELEKLACG, in terms of pedagogy, encompasses a range of teaching approaches, namely "four key tasks, life-wide learning, task-based, learning and teaching of text grammar, e-learning, learner independence, and meaningful homework" (CDC, 2017, p. 56). These approaches are thoroughly explained and supported with examples of how to implement them in the classroom, utilizing materials found in books, booklets, and modules. The assessment practices in ELEKLACG have undergone an upgrade, transitioning from solely assessing learning to incorporating comprehensive authentic assessment methods, including assessment for learning (formative assessment), assessment as learning (summative assessment), and assessment of learning (standardized tests) (CDC, 2017). This new assessment concept spans across different aspects of the education system. Formative assessment is utilized to support the learning process and encompasses various sources such as formative feedback, paper tests, projects, portfolios, and performance tasks. On the other hand, summative assessments, conducted both internally and publicly, are administered periodically to evaluate students' performance in both receptive knowledge (listening and reading) and productive knowledge (speaking and writing) (CDC, 2017).

Based on our analysis of the pedagogical and assessment practices in the respective curricula, we propose a set of actions that are likely to have implications for the Indonesian education system. Our primary contention is that the pedagogical

and assessment practices in Curriculum 2013 are comparatively simpler when compared to ELEKLACG. As a result, this curriculum tends to display a bias, as the principles, instructions, and examples of pedagogy and assessment are excessively general and simplified. This approach is an effort by the ministry to align the curriculum framework with the unique Indonesian context, considering the vastness of the country and the dispersed nature of teachers and students across different islands. Additionally, the outcomes of a teacher competency examination have revealed that 80% of teachers fail to meet the standard requirements (Franciscus, 2015).

This finding aligns with a 20-year research program in education, which highlighted that the major issues in education revolve not only around classroom size and homework but also pertain to pedagogical practices and the qualifications of teachers (Nasir et al., 2022). As a result, our first proposed reform in Indonesia is to enhance teacher competence standards by improving qualifications and implementing more rigorous teacher recruitment processes. This is crucial because teachers play a pivotal role as key stakeholders in implementing the curriculum within the classroom (Mars & Willits, 2003). Additionally, the cases of Mrs. Oublier described by Cohen (1990) and Brubaker (2010) illustrate the importance of challenging assessments in their respective contexts due to the teachers' high level of qualification. The subsequent step involves establishing institutions that involve multiple stakeholders responsible for curriculum development, student assessment, and soliciting public input. This action aligns with the notion of 21st-century curriculum development, wherein the involvement of numerous stakeholders is paramount.

Lastly, and most importantly, concerning the alignment of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment, it is crucial to ensure these three elements are harmonized. Standardized testing poses a core challenge in aligning the curriculum with assessment practices (Hammond, 2017). Moreover, standardized tests can hinder teachers from employing productive pedagogy and may inadvertently promote a pedagogy of indifference and poverty (Lingard, 2007). Therefore, to maximize productive pedagogy, pedagogy of difference, and effective teaching, and to create alignment between the curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment in an education system, standardized tests should be abolished in favor of comprehensive authentic assessments.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the adoption of the curriculum in Indonesia and Hong Kong has been met with positive feedback, although there have been some minor complaints identified through official surveys. The philosophical foundations underlying the curricula differ between the two regions. Indonesia emphasizes social justice as the guiding principle for its curriculum, while Hong Kong's curriculum is built upon the principles of diversity and inclusivity. Both curricula have implicit objectives that can be inferred from the topics covered in their respective textbooks. Additionally, the implementation of these curricula has prompted policymakers in each country to issue policies aimed at strengthening their influence. In China, the Chinese-based course is promoted to enhance China's control over English education. On the other hand, in Indonesia, the Indonesian language is prioritized by removing the English subject at the primary level and

reducing the amount of time devoted to English education in secondary schools. This study also suggests that reforming the teacher competence standard, including qualification upgrades and improved recruitment processes, along with establishing institutions involving multiple stakeholders, are essential steps to address the challenges faced by the shift of the curricula.

References

Baile, P. (2015). *What is wrong with our education system?* Retrieved from http://www.ejinsight.com/20151009-what-is-wrong-with-our-education-system/

Brubaker, N. D. (2010). Negotiating authority by designing individualized grading contracts. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*(3), 257-267. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2010.518667

Cohen, D. K. (1990). A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 12*(3), 311-329. https://doi.org/10.2307/1164355

Çubukçu, Z. (2012). The effect of hidden curriculum on character education process of primary school students. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *12*(2), 1526-1534. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ987859

Curriculum Development Council (CDC). (2000). *The way forward in curriculum development.* Retrieved from http://www.edb.gov.hk/attachment/en/curriculum-development/cs-curriculum-doc-report/learn-learn-1/overview-e.pdf

Curriculum Development Council (CDC). (2017). *English language education: Key learning area curriculum guide (Primary 1-Secondary 6)*. Curriculum Development Council.

Detiknews. (2014). Curriculum 2013 makes teachers confused and students burdened. *detik.com*. Retrieved from https://news.detik.com/berita/2769476/kpai-kurikulum-2013-bikin-guru-bingung-dan-siswa-terbebani

Education Bureau. (2017). *Ongoing renewal of the school curriculum: Briefing session on updating of English language education key learning area curriculum guide*. Retrieved from https://www.edb.gov.hk/attachment/en/curriculum-development/kla/eng-edu/Curriculum%20Document/ELE%20KLACG%20briefing%20sessions_handout.pdf

Fransiscus. (2015). The result of teachers' competency tests is disappointing. Retrieved from http://www.jambi-independent.co.id/read/2015/11/20/3997/hasil-ukg-mengecewakan-nilai-guru-di-bawah-ratarata/

Gray, D. E. (2004). *Doing research in the real world* (pp. 15-34). London: Sage.

Hammond, D. L. (2017). Testing, testing, and testing [video]. Retrieved from http://moodle.vle.monash.edu/course/view.php?id=36863

Ho, W. C. (2006). Popular culture in mainland Chinese education. *International Education Journal*, *7*(3), 348-363.

Legislative Council Panel on Education. (2015). *New academic structure medium-term review progress: senior secondary curriculum and assessment.* Retrieved from http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr14-15/english/panels/ed/papers/ed20150715cb4-1287-2-e.pdf

Lingard, B. (2007). Pedagogies of indifference. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 11*(3), 245-266.

Mahsun, M. (2017). Textual lesson in curriculum 2013. Retrieved from http://lppks.kemdikbud.go.id/id/kabar/pembelajaran-teks-dalam-kurikulum-2013

Mansur, H. (2015). Implementasi penilaian autentik kurikulum 2013 di sekolah menengah atas (SMA). Retrieved from http://www.lpmpsulsel.net/v2/attachments/358_ImplementasiPenilaiaAutentikdlmK-13diSMA

Nasir, A., Yawan, H., & Saifullah, S. (2022). A comparative study: Similarities and differences between Indonesia's curriculum and Philippine's Curriculum. *International Journal of Education, Social Studies, and Management (IJESSM)*, *2*(3), 64-75.

National Education Standard Board. (2016a, October 13). Standar kompetemsi lulusan pendidikan dasar dan menengah. *National Education Standard Board of Indonesi.* Retrieved from http://bsnp-indonesia.org/standar-nasional-pendidikan/standar-kompetensi-lulusan/

National Education Standard Board. (2016b, October 13). Standar isi pendidikan dasar dan menengah. *National Education Standard Board of Indonesi.* Retrieved from http://bsnp-indonesia.org/standar-nasional-pendidikan/standar-kompetensi-lulusan/

OECD. (2010). Shanghai and Hong Kong: Two distinct examples of education reform in China, in *Lessons from PISA for the United States*. Paris: OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264096660-en

Pole, C., & Morrison, M. (2003). *Ethnography for education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Sugianto, S., Sutopo, S., & Nuryanto, A. (2014). Tanggapan terhadap implementasi kurikulum 2103. *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

Tamtam, A., Gallagher, F., Olabi, A., & Naher, S. (2012). A comparative study of the implementation of EMI in Europe, Asia, and Africa. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 47*, 1417-1425.

Tedesco, J. C., Opertti, R., & Amadio, M. (2013). The curriculum debate: Why it is important today. IBE Working Papers on Curriculum Issues No. 10. *UNESCO International Bureau of Education*.

Tempo, T. (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. *The Ministry of Education and Culture.* Retrieved from https://desyandri.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/dokumen-kurikulum-2013.pdf

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

Widyanto, W. (2016). *The socialisation of curriculum 2013 implementation, ministry of education and culture conducts an educational dialogue*. Retrieved from https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2016/06/sosialisasikan-implementasi-kurikulum-2013-kemendikbud-gelar-dialog-pendidikan

Wijaya, A. (2017). *Let's have a look at the condition of a subject matter bookseller from Solo*. Retrieved from https://jateng.merdeka.com/perdagangan/simak-yuk-nasib-penjual-buku-mata-pelajaran-busri-solo-170711k.html

Willis, G., & Marsh, C. (2003). Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing issues.

Yawan, H. (2022). Augmented reality application. *EDUTEC: 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, Indonesia. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*, *6*(1), 82-92.

Yeung, SC. (2017). How politics is tarnishing hong kong education. Retrieved from http://www.ejinsight.com/20170809-how-politics-is-tarnishing-hong-kong-education/