

Curriculum Development in Indonesia from a Historical Perspective

Dindin Abidin^{1✉}, Elly Retnaningrum², Jolanda Dessye Parinussa³, Dewi Sri Kuning⁴, Yance Manoppo⁵, I Made Kartika⁶

(1) Pendidikan Jasmani, Kesehatan dan Rekreasi Universitas Islam 45 Bekasi

(2) Pendidikan Matematika, Universitas Langlangbuana Bandung

(3) Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Pattimura Ambon

(4) Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi

(5) Pendidikan Profesi Guru, Universitas Pattimura Ambon

(6) Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan, Universitas Dwijendra

✉ Corresponding author

(dindin_abidin@unismabekasi.ac.id)

Abstrak

Kurikulum memiliki kedudukan yang strategis dan fundamental dalam menunjang kemajuan pendidikan suatu negara. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui perkembangan kurikulum yang telah diterapkan di Indonesia dalam perspektif sejarah. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah kualitatif. Pengumpulan data penelitian menggunakan teknik dokumentasi dan kepustakaan. Hasil pengumpulan data kemudian dianalisis dengan menggunakan teknik analisis deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa perjalanan sejarah kurikulum yang pernah berlaku di Indonesia dalam perspektif studi komparatif dapat ditelusuri dari Kurikulum 1947, Kurikulum 1952, Kurikulum 1964, Kurikulum 1968, Kurikulum 1975, Kurikulum 1984, Kurikulum 1994, Kurikulum 2004, Kurikulum 2004, Kurikulum 2013, dan Kurikulum Merdeka. Tinjauan ini diharapkan dapat memberikan manfaat bagi penggunaan kurikulum pada Lembaga Pendidikan.

Kata Kunci: *Pengembangan, Kurikulum, Sejarah*

Abstract

The curriculum has a strategic and fundamental position in supporting the progress of a country's education. The purpose of this research is to find out the development of the curriculum that has been implemented in Indonesia in a historical perspective. The method used in this research is qualitative. The research data collection used documentation and literature techniques. The results of data collection were then analyzed using qualitative descriptive analysis techniques. The results of this study indicate that the historical journey of the curriculum that has been applied in Indonesia in the perspective of comparative studies can be traced from the 1947 Curriculum, 1952 Curriculum, 1964 Curriculum, 1968 Curriculum, 1975 Curriculum, 1984 Curriculum, 1994 Curriculum, 2004 Curriculum, 2013 Curriculum, and Merdeka Curriculum. This review is expected to provide benefits for the use of the curriculum in educational institutions.

Keyword: *Development; Curriculum; Historical;*

INTRODUCTION

Education, as an effort and activity of adult humans towards immature humans, aims to explore these potentials so that they become actual and can be developed (Santika et al., 2022). That way, education is a tool to provide stimulation so that human potential develops according to what is expected. With the development of these potentials, humans will become humans in the truest sense. This is where education is often interpreted as a human effort to humanize humans (Ahid, 2006). Curriculum is an important component in implementing education to achieve educational goals. Curriculum is a plan that is used as a guideline or handle in teaching and learning

activities (Martin & Simanjorang, 2022). The curriculum is also an educational plan providing guidelines and guidance on the type, scope and sequence of content, as well as the educational process. Curriculum as an educational design has a very central position in all learning activities, which determines the process and learning outcomes. The curriculum has a central position in the entire educational process (Rosni, 2017). Curriculum is the most important part in the completeness of the educational process. Curriculum is the core of the educational process (Zahid Zufar At Thaariq & Agus Wedi, 2020). Curriculum is the heart of education. This opinion shows how important the existence of the curriculum is in the realm of national education, because the curriculum really colors the construction and face of education in a society (Hidayat, 2011).

In its journey, Indonesia has changed the curriculum several times. Curriculum changes that occur in Indonesia are learning designs that have a very strategic position in all learning activities that will determine the process and results of an education carried out. (Iramdan & Manurung, 2019). The importance of changing the curriculum cannot be separated from the history of its journey. Considering that Indonesia is already more than seven decades old. So that the applicable curriculum is of course different, because it has undergone several changes. Of course the curriculum changes implemented have become part of history which this nation should make as a guide in navigating life in the future (Santika & Sudiana, 2021). Without knowing the history of the current curriculum, Indonesia will never understand the strengths and weaknesses of the previous curriculum. Through the history of the curriculum, it will be known the holistic reasons why the curriculum in Indonesia often changes. That way, at least they are able to ward off negative statements that appear in society, such as changing the minister to changing the curriculum.

Another reason why it is necessary to conduct a historical study of the curriculum is because in the history of the curriculum there will be differences and comparisons between one curriculum and another that has been in effect in Indonesia (Khatimah et al., 2022). Unfortunately, this nation often underestimates the name of history. It is not surprising that the curriculum that was once in effect was just a memory that was documented without being material for reflection or evaluation in improving education in the future. Therefore it is deemed necessary to conduct a search of the history of the curriculum that was once in force in Indonesia. Based on the background of these problems, in this research was describe the development of the curriculum that has been applied in Indonesia from a historical perspective.

RESEARCH METHOD

The method used in this research was qualitative method. Qualitative research methods emphasize more on observing phenomena and examining the substance of the meaning of these phenomena. The phenomenon referred to in this research was the curriculum changes that occur in Indonesia from time to time. Data collection techniques used in this research were documentation and literature studies. In the documentation study, researchers seek to view and analyze documents related to the curriculum resulting from changes made by the government. Of course the document in question is either made by the subject himself or by someone else about the subject. Literature study was conducted by searching for information and references in the form of text books, literature, journals, ebooks, information and internet searching as well as other sources deemed relevant to support this research (Swarniti, 2021b). The data obtained was then studied and analyzed accurately and critically to produce a new, rational and logical synthesis as well as a conclusion that can be tested in the field. The results of the analysis were then presented and described again descriptive qualitative.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The curriculum in Indonesia after Indonesia's independence in 1945 has undergone 9 changes including in 1947, 1952, 1964, 1968, 1975, 1984, 1994, 2004, 2006 and 2013 (Prasetyo & Hamami, 2020) (Selamet et al., 2022) (Insani, 2019). Then in 2020 the Freedom Curriculum was initiated by the Minister Mr. Nadiem Anwar Makarim (Baro'ah, 2020). The following is a brief historical explanation of the curriculum that was in force in Indonesia.

A. 1947 Curriculum

The first curriculum used in Indonesia occurred in 1947 which became known as the 1947 curriculum or better known as the 1947 lesson plan. (Sadewa, 2022). The established educational principle is Pancasila (Masyhud, 2014). Because it was still in turmoil due to the revolutionary war, the 1947 Lesson Plan was only implemented in 1950. Therefore the 1947 Lesson Plan is often also called the 1950 curriculum. The 1947 Lesson Plan was very simple, only containing two main things, namely a list of subjects and hours of teaching, as well as the outline of the lesson.

The 1947 Lesson Plan prioritized character education, awareness of the state and society, rather than education of the mind. At that time, students were more directed on how to socialize with the community (Machali, 1970). The subject matter is related to everyday events. Natural Sciences teaches how to process everyday events, how to use various simple tools (pumps, scales), and investigates various daily events, for example why locomotives are filled with water and wood, why fishermen go out to sea at night, and how to connect electric cables (Kadenun, 2015). The outlines of teaching at that time emphasized the teacher's teaching strategy and the way students learned the material being taught. For example, in language lessons teach how to communicate, read, and write.

B. 1952 Curriculum

Historically the 1952 curriculum was the result of refinement of the previous curriculum which was named the 1952 Unraveled Lesson Plan. The birth of the 1952 curriculum was inseparable from the history of the birth of the 1947 curriculum. It could even be said that the 1952 curriculum was a renewal of the 1947 curriculum. It was said that because when the 1947 curriculum was in force there was no education law that applied as its operational basis. This happened until 1949. It was only after 1950 that the education law, known as Law no. 4 of 1950 can be completed. Furthermore, the law was passed in 1954 as Law no. 12 of 1954. It was from there that the first education law was known, namely No. 4 of 1950 and No. 12 of 1954. However, this law does not enforce the implementation of the 1947 curriculum (Santika, 2021).

Along with the enactment of Education Law No. 4 of 1950 which was only implemented in 1954, the applicable curriculum was no longer the 1947 curriculum, but the 1952 curriculum. In other words, the 1952 curriculum was the first curriculum to have an operational legal basis. The juridical basis of the 1952 curriculum was not much different from the 1947 curriculum. The ideal basis was Pancasila which was listed in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution, while the constitutional basis was the 1945 Constitution. The operational basis of the 1952 curriculum was Law no. 4 of 1950. The law was drafted before 1950 (Santika, 2022). This curriculum has led to a national education system. Even though this curriculum does not yet have coverage in all regions of Indonesia, because the new curriculum pattern leads to a national system. The most prominent and at the same time characteristic of the 1952 curriculum is that each lesson plan must pay attention to the content of lessons related to everyday life. So that the focus of the curriculum is more towards the needs of life in its time and is not oriented towards the vision of the future (Santika et al., 2018).

C. 1964 Curriculum

After 1952, before 1964, the government again perfected the curriculum system in Indonesia. This time it was named the Education Plan 1964. The main ideas of the 1964 curriculum which were characteristic of this curriculum were that the government wanted the people to receive academic knowledge for provision at the elementary level, so that learning was centered on the Pancawardhana program, namely moral, intelligence, emotional/ artistic, skilled, and physical (Sari, 2022).

Pancawardhana education forms humans who are physically and spiritually harmonious. Educating is not only to train the body but also to train the ability to think, expand experience and train the will, maintain feelings and develop and shape the child's character, in other words to form the child's personality as a whole. Education also means developing dexterity, skills, so that children as human beings have certain potentials to appreciate and be skilled at using their hands. The dexterity needed to gain awareness of work must be cultivated from an early age. By producing human works so that they can have diligent, thorough, diligent and so on that are of value to a

child's life. In addition, education also means developing dexterity and skills in harmony because these aspects complement each other, complement each other and perfect each other (Santika et al., 2021). The aim of education at that time was to form Pancasila people and Manipol/Usdek who were responsible, among other things, for the establishment of a just and prosperous society, materially and spiritually (Sari, 2022). As a corrective measure from the curriculum that had been in effect since 1952, the Directorate of Elementary/Preschool Education of the PP and K Department in 1964 issued a new curriculum manual called Lesson Plans for Kindergarten and Elementary Schools, including those for secondary schools (Wahyuni et al., 2022).

D. 1968 Curriculum

The birth of the 1968 Curriculum was political: it replaced the 1964 Education Plan which was imaged as a product of the Old Order. In terms of educational objectives, the 1968 Curriculum aims that education is emphasized in efforts to form a true, strong, and physically healthy Pancasila man, enhancing intelligence and physical skills, morals, character, and religious beliefs (Mawaddah, 2019). The content of education is directed at activities that enhance intelligence and skills, as well as develop a healthy and strong physique. The 1968 curriculum as a round curriculum. "It only contains the main subjects," he said. The content of the subject matter is theoretical, not related to factual problems in the field (Santika, 2020). The focus is on what materials are appropriate for students at every level of education. The material content of each subject is still theoretical and not yet closely tied to the real situation in the surrounding environment (Santika, 2018). The correlational organization of subjects gradually led to a separate learning approach based on disciplines in higher schools (Al-asyhi, 2014). The 1968 curriculum includes three main groups, namely Pancasila development, basic knowledge, and special skills (Fatimah, 2021).

E. 1975 Curriculum

The curriculum renewal that gave birth to the 1975 Curriculum was motivated by national development. This curriculum is centralized and schools only have to implement the form of the curriculum prepared by the central government. The 1975 curriculum leads to an effective and efficient education. Methods and teaching materials are detailed in the Instructional System Development Procedure (PPSI) or known as lesson units. This is what later gave rise to a number of criticisms from implementers in the field. Methods, materials, and teaching objectives are detailed in the Instructional System Development Procedure (PPSI), known as "lesson units", namely lesson plans for each subject unit. Each unit of study is broken down into: general instructional objectives (TIU), specific instructional objectives (ICT), subject matter, learning tools, teaching and learning activities, and evaluation (Raharjo, 2020).

The 1975 curriculum was structured as a substitute for the 1968 curriculum, where changes were made using the following approach. Goal-oriented adheres to an integrative approach in the sense that each lesson has a meaning and role that supports the achievement of more integrative goals. Emphasizes efficiency and effectiveness in terms of power and time. Adhering to an instructional system approach known as the Instructional System Development Procedure (PPSI) (Nurhalim, 2018). Systems that always lead to the achievement of specific goals can be measured and formulated in the form of student behavior. Influenced by the psychology of behavior by emphasizing the stimulus response (stimulus-answer) and practice (drill). The assessment system in the 1975 curriculum is carried out at the end of each lesson or at the end of a learning unit. This is what distinguishes this curriculum from previous years (Mahrani, Siti Meutia Sari, 2022).

F. 1984 Curriculum

The 1975 curriculum until 1983 was considered no longer relevant in meeting the needs of society and the demands of science and technology. In the 1983 Broad Outlines of the Nation's Direction the results of the 1983 People's Consultative Assembly general session implied a political decision that required a change in curriculum, namely from the 1975 curriculum to the 1984 curriculum. (Wardhana, 2021). The 1984 curriculum was heavily influenced by the Humanistic school, which views students as individuals who can and want to actively search for themselves, explore and research their environment. In this curriculum the position of students is placed as a subject of study. Carrying out the skill approach process. Although prioritizing the process approach, the goal factor is important. From observing something, grouping, to discuss, to report. This model is called Student Active Learning (SAL). This curriculum is based on the view that

providing learning experiences to students in a very limited study time at school must be truly functional and effective (Aisyah & Laili, 2018). Models like this are called active learning because students are always active in learning. From observing something, grouping, to discuss, to report. However, many schools implement it properly and as a result students do not carry out learning properly and are only noisy in class (Insani, 2019).

G. 1994 Curriculum

The 1994 curriculum was basically created as a refinement of the 1984 curriculum and was implemented in accordance with Act no. 2 of 1989 concerning the National Education System. Based on Act no. 2 of 1989 concerning national education and the needs of that era which was the trigger for the birth of the 1994 curriculum. The characteristics of the 1994 curriculum were as follows (a) the nature of the curriculum was Objective Based Curriculum, (b) the names of vocational junior high and junior high schools were changed to SLTP (junior high school), (c) National Struggle History Education subjects and skills were abolished, elementary school teaching programs and SLTP is structured into 13 subjects, the name of SMA is changed to SMU (General High School, (d) teaching programs in SMA are arranged into 10 subjects, (e) Science, Social Studies and Language majors, (g) SMK introduces Dual System Education program (PSG) (Abdullah, 2007).

H. 2004 Curriculum

The 1994 curriculum that has been in effect so far is considered to be less appropriate to meet the demands of the times. The 1994 curriculum, which has been implemented for more than five years in the world of Indonesian education, in reality has not had an impact on progress (Swarniti, 2019). Even though the concept of the 1994 Curriculum based on Active Student Learning Methods (CBSA) is a stepping stone formulation towards a more modern and democratic learning. However, the reality on the ground in this case educational institutions (schools), school principals and teachers have not been able to maximize learning according to the concept of Active Student Learning Methods (CBSA). (Suryawan & Romadi, 2018). This curriculum is structured more complexly as the previous curriculum development goals directed at the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects of students. Development is in the teacher and the school. All processes are standardized starting from the learning process to student learning outcomes.

The total change is clear when compared between the 1994 curriculum and the 2004 curriculum for reasons of relevance. This curriculum is popularly known as KBK (Competence-Based Curriculum). In 2005, KBK will be implemented simultaneously so that KBK can run well. It is hoped that teachers will have a good attitude towards KBK because attitude is the main factor in achieving teacher professionalism in teaching, especially in implementing KBK. This curriculum is called Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK). KBK has the following characteristics: (a) focusing on achieving individual and classical student competencies, (b) oriented towards learning outcomes and diversity, (c) using varied approaches and methods in teaching and learning process, (d) teachers as learning resources supported by learning resources others that fulfill the educative element, (e) the success of achieving competence which refers to evaluation indicators (Kristiawan et al., 2017).

I. 2006 Curriculum

KBK has not been in effect for too long and has not been fully implemented in schools, especially in inland, border and coastal areas, there are even schools that have not had the opportunity to carry out socialization on KBK, then the Government replaces it again with the Education Unit Level Curriculum (Ritonga, 2018). KTSP is an Education Unit Level Curriculum that is developed according to the educational unit, school/regional potential, school/regional characteristics, socio-cultural local community and student characteristics. Schools and school or madrasah committees and madrasah committees develop the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) and Syllabus based on the basic curriculum framework and graduate competency standards (Swarniti, 2021a).

KTSP compiled and developed by each educational unit can vary from one school to another, because it is adapted to the characteristics, conditions and potential of the school, as well as each student. However, this does not mean that educational units can compile and develop curriculum without using references. In order to guarantee that the curriculum compiled and developed by each educational unit must still meet national standards, it is necessary that the preparation and

development of the curriculum refer to the National Education Standards, including (1) Content Standards; (2) Process Standards; (3) Competency Standards; (4) Standards for Educators and Education Personnel; (5) Facilities and Infrastructure Standards; (6) Management Standards; (7) Financing Standards; (8) Educational Assessment Standards (Baedhowi, 2016).

J. 2013 Curriculum

The 2006 curriculum, or what is more commonly called the KTSP (Educational Unit Level Curriculum), does not fully describe the standards of national education goals. Almost 7 (seven) years since the 2013 Curriculum has become the education curriculum in Indonesia (Effendi et al., 2021). The 2013 curriculum is an integrated competency and character-based curriculum which is a refinement of the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) (Rahmawati, 2018). In other words, the implementation of the 2013 curriculum is part of continuing the development of the Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK) which includes attitudes, knowledge and skills competencies. (Ramdhani, 2018). The 2013 curriculum is a character-based curriculum with the aim of improving the quality of educational processes and outcomes that are directed at the character and noble character of students in accordance with Graduate Competency Standards (SKL) in educational units. Through the 2013 curriculum, the government expects students to be able to increase knowledge, apply ethical values and noble character, so that they can be realized in everyday life (Yati & Sustianingsih, 2021).

The implementation of the preparation of the 2013 curriculum is part of continuing the development of the Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK) which was initiated in 2004 by covering attitude, knowledge and skills competencies in an integrated manner, as mandated by Act No 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System in the elucidation of article 35, where graduate competence is a qualification of graduate abilities that includes attitudes, knowledge, and skills in accordance with agreed national standards (Iramdan & Manurung, 2019). The competence of graduates of this curriculum is an increase and balance between soft skills and hard skills which includes aspects of competency, attitudes, skills, and knowledge (Hadiansyah et al., 2019).

K. Merdeka Curriculum

Merdeka Belajar is part of a new policy established by the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. According to Nadiem, curriculum policies related to independent learning must be made an initial breakthrough to educators before this is conveyed or applied to students (Marisa, 2021). The Merdeka curriculum is one of the curriculum concepts that demands independence for students. Independence in the sense that each learner is given the freedom to access knowledge obtained from formal and non-formal education. In this curriculum, it does not limit the concept of learning that takes place at school or outside of school and also requires the creativity of teachers and students (Manalu et al., 2022). Viewed at a glance based on the rules set, it can be concluded temporarily that the Merdeka Curriculum has several advantages compared to the 2013 Curriculum. These include providing wider space for teachers and students to be creative and decide on learning priorities (essential material); education units and teachers have the authority to carry out curriculum development and its completeness according to the needs and context of the school at this stage enabling schools to develop curriculum according to the potential of the surrounding environment so that links and matches for graduates will emerge; and administratively there is no coercion in its implementation so the education unit can decide to apply or not in accordance with the capabilities and readiness they have. The implementation stages are categorized into three, namely independent learning, independent change, and independent sharing (Ayundasari, 2022)

CONCLUSION

Based on this discussion, it can be concluded that the development of the curriculum that was once in force in Indonesia in a historical perspective can be traced from the 1947 Curriculum, 1952 Curriculum, 1964 Curriculum, 1968 Curriculum, 1975 Curriculum, 1984 Curriculum, 1994 Curriculum, 2004 Curriculum, 2013 Curriculum and Merdeka Curriculum. These various curricula are adapted to the conditions of technological, scientific, and cultural and economic development

in Indonesia. this is also inseparable from the sovereign government policy at the time the curriculum was used

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Abdullah, A. (2007). Kurikulum Pendidikan di Indonesia Sepanjang Sejarah. *Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, 13, 343. <file:///C:/Users/ACER/Downloads/354-Article Text-1134-1-10-20160929.pdf>
- Ahid, N. (2006). Konsep Dan Teori Kurikulum Dalam Dunia Pendidikan. *Islamica*, 1(1), 13.
- Aisyah, J., & Laili, M. I. (2018). KURIKULUM CBSA dan KURIKULUM 1994/KBI. *NTAJUNA: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian Studi Kepustakaan, Penilaian, Penerapan Teori Dan Kajian Analisis Di Bidang Pendidikan Bahasa Arab*, 1(2), 41–47.
- Al-asyhi, S. (2014). Perspektif Historis Transformasi Kurikulum di Indonesia. *Islamic Studies Journal*, 2(1), 140–147. Dicky Wirianto Perspektif Historis Transformasi Kurikulum di Indonesia.pdf
- Ayundasari, L. (2022). Implementasi Pendekatan Multidimensional Dalam Pembelajaran Sejarah Kurikulum Merdeka. *Sejarah Dan Budaya: Jurnal Sejarah, Budaya Dan Pengajarannya*, 16(1), 225–234. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um020v13i22019p>
- Baedhowi, B. (2016). Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (Ktsp): Kebijakan Dan Harapan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, 13(65), 171–181. <https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v13i65.323>
- Baro'ah, S. (2020). Kebijakan Merdeka Belajar Sebagai Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan. *Jurnal Tawadhu*, 4(1), 1063–1073.
- Effendi, I., Prawitasari, M., & Susanto, H. (2021). Implementasi Penilaian Pembelajaran Pada Kurikulum 2013. *Prabayaksa : Journal of History Education*, 1(1), 21–25. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20527/prb.v1i1.3081>
- Fatimah, I. F. (2021). Strategi Inovasi Kurikulum. *EduTeach : Jurnal Edukasi Dan Teknologi Pembelajaran*, 2(1), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.37859/eduteach.v2i1.2412>
- Hadiansyah, R. R., Pradana, R. Y., & Mustiningsih. (2019). Dinamika Perubahan Kurikulum di Indonesia. *Seminar Nasional - Jurusan Administrasi Pendidikan Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Malang*, 259–264.
- Hidayat, R. (2011). Perspektif Sosiologi tentang Kurikulum. *Urnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, 17(2), 178–188. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v17i2.16>
- Insani, F. D. (2019). Sejarah Perkembangan Kurikulum Di Indonesia Sejak Awal Kemerdekaan Hingga Saat Ini. *As-Salam*, VII(1), 43–64. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.51226/assalam.v8i1.132>
- Iramdan, I., & Manurung, L. (2019). Sejarah Kurikulum di Indonesia Iramdan1,. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 5(2), 57–58. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2678137>
- Khatimah, H., Kartika, I. M., & Santika, I. G. N. (2022). Pengaruh Implementasi Pendidikan Karakter Terhadap Sikap Sosial Pada Siswa. *Widya Accarya*, 13(2), 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.46650/wa.13.2.1266.127-132>
- Kristiawan, M., Safitri, D., & Rena Lestari. (2017). *Manajemen Pendidikan*. In Deepublish (Issue December). Sada Kurnia Pustaka.
- Machali, I. (1970). Dimensi Kecerdasan Majemuk Dalam Kurikulum 2013. *INSANIA : Jurnal Pemikiran Alternatif Kependidikan*, 19(1), 21–45. <https://doi.org/10.24090/insania.v19i1.462>
- Mahrani, Siti Meutia Sari, S. D. (2022). Students' Difficulties at Elementary School in Increasing Literacy Ability. *Attractive : Innovative Education Journal*, 4(1), 1–12.
- Manalu, J. B., Sitohang, P., Heriwati, N., & Turnip, H. (2022). Prosiding Pendidikan Dasar Pengembangan Perangkat Pembelajaran Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar. *Maheha Centre Research*, 1(1), 80–86. <https://doi.org/10.34007/ppd.v1i1.174>
- Marisa, M. (2021). Curriculum Innovation " Independent Learning " In The Era Of Society 5 . 0. *Jurnal Sejarah, Pendidikan Dan Humaniora*, 5(1), 66–78. <https://doi.org/10.36526/js.v3i2> .e-ISSN
- Martin, R., & Simanjorang, M. (2022). Pentingnya Peranan Kurikulum yang Sesuai dalam Pendidikan di Indonesia. *PROSIDING PENDIDIKAN DASAR*, 1, 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.34007/ppd.v1i1.180>
- Masyhud. (2014). Perubahan kurikulum di indonesia : studi kritis tentang upaya menemukan kurikulum pendidikan islam yang ideal. *Raudhah*, IV(1), 49–70.
- Mawaddah, I. (2019). Trend Kurikulum Dalam Pendidikan Sekolah Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan*, 3(3), 293–296.
- Nurhalim, M. (2018). Analisis Perkembangan Kurikulum di Indonesia (Sebuah Tinjauan Desain Dan Pendekatan). *INSANIA : Jurnal Pemikiran Alternatif Kependidikan*, 16(3), 339–356. <https://doi.org/10.24090/insania.v16i3.1597>

- Prasetyo, A. R., & Hamami, T. (2020). Prinsip-prinsip dalam Pengembangan Kurikulum. *Palapa*, 8(1), 42–55. <https://doi.org/10.36088/palapa.v8i1.692>
- Raharjo. (2020). Analisis Perkembangan Kurikulum PPKn: Dari Rentjana Pelajaran 1947 sampai dengan Merdeka Belajar 2020. *PKn Progresif: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Kewarganegaraan*, 15(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.20961/pknp.v15i1.44901>
- Rahmawati, A. N. (2018). Identifikasi Masalah yang Dihadapi Guru dalam Penerapan Kurikulum 2013 Revisi di SD. *Indonesian Journal of Primary Education*, 2(1), 114. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijpe.v2i1.14227>
- Ramdhani, M. T. (2018). Manajemen Pengembangan Kurikulum 2013 Berbasis Komputer di SMPN 6 Palangka Raya. *Jurnal Sains Komputer Dan Teknologi Informasi*, 1(1), 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.33084/jsakti.v1i1.453>
- Ritonga, M. (2018). Politics and Policy Dynamics of Changing the Education Curriculum in Indonesia until the Reformation Period. *Bina Gogik*, 5(2), 1–15.
- Rosni, R. (2017). Landasan Sosial Budaya Dan Perkembangan Ilmu Pengetahuan Dalam Pengembangan Kurikulum. *Inspiratif Pendidikan*, 6(1), 128. <https://doi.org/10.24252/ip.v6i1.4922>
- Sadewa, M. A. (2022). Meninjau Kurikulum Prototipe Melalui Pendekatan Integrasi-Interkoneksi Prof M Amin Abdullah. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Konseling (JPDK)*, 4(1), 266–280. <https://journal.universitaspahlawan.ac.id/index.php/jpdk/article/view/3560>
- Santika, I. G. N. (2018). Strategi Meningkatkan Kualitas SDM Masyarakat Desa Padangsambian Kaja Melalui Pendidikan Karakter Berbasis Kepedulian Lingkungan Untuk Membebaskannya Dari Bencana Banjir. *Widya Accarya*, 9(1).
- Santika, I. G. N. (2020). *Menggali dan Menemukan Roh Pancasila Secara Kontekstual*. Lakeisha.
- Santika, I. G. N. (2021). Grand Desain Kebijakan Strategis Pemerintah Dalam Bidang Pendidikan Untuk Menghadapi Revolusi Industri 4.0. *Jurnal Education and Development*, 9(2), 369–377.
- Santika, I. G. N. (2022). *Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan: Problematika Hasil Perubahan UUD 1945 Secara Konseptual*. In CV. Global Aksara P ers (Issue 1). Global Aksara Pers.
- Santika, I. G. N., Kartika, I. M., Ayu, I. G., & Darwati, M. (2021). Reviewing The Handling Of Covid-19 In Indonesia In The Perspective Of The Pancasila Element Theory (TEP). *Jurnal Etika Demokrasi (JED)*, 6(2), 40–51. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26618/jed.v6i2.5272>
- Santika, I. G. N., Rindawan, I. K., & Sujana, I. G. (2018). Memperkuat Pancasila Melalui Pergub No. 79 Tahun 2018 Dalam Menanggulangi Pengikisan Budaya Di Era Revolusi Industri 4.0. *Seminar Nasional Inovasi Dalam Penelitian Sains, Teknologi Dan Humaniora-InoBali*, 79, 981–990.
- Santika, I. G. N., Suarni, N. K., & Lasmawan, I. W. (2022). Analisis Perubahan Kurikulum Ditinjau Dari Kurikulum Sebagai Suatu Ide. *Jurnal Education and Development*, 10(3), 694–700. <https://journal.ipts.ac.id/index.php/ED/article/view/3690>
- Santika, I. G. N., & Sudiana, I. N. (2021). Inseri Pendidikan Karakter Melalui Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Ditinjau dari Perspektif Teoretis. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha*, 11(4), 464–472. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.23887/jipbs.v11i4.42052>
- Sari, E. C. (2022). Kurikulum Di Indonesia : Tinjauan Perkembangan Kurikulum Pendidikan. *Inculco Journal of Christian Education*, 2(2), 93–109.
- Selamet, Spiana, & Qiqi, Y. Z. (2022). Al-Munadzomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam. *Jurnal Mahajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 1(2), 97–111. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.51192/almunadzomah.v1i2.320>
- Suryawan, M. J., & Romadi. (2018). Komparasi Pelaksanaan Kurikulum 1994 dan Kurikulum 2006 pada Mata Pelajaran Sejarah : Studi Kasus di Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA) di Magelang. *Indonesian Journal of History Education*, 6(1), 66–75.
- Swarniti, N. W. (2019). The Translation Procedures of Bible Translation. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 5(2), 187–196. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.5.2.1277.187-196>
- Swarniti, N. W. (2021a). Efektivitas Penggunaan Aplikasi Quizizz Dalam Proses Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris Bagi Mahasiswa. *Seminar Nasional Teknologi Pembelajaran*, 133–144.
- Swarniti, N. W. (2021b). The Analysis of Semantics Meaning Found In Comments of Instagram Account of Info Denpasar. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik Dan Sastra (SEMNALISA)*, 193–199.
- Wahyuni, N. P. S. W., Widiastuti, N. L. G. K., & Santika, I. G. N. (2022). IMPLEMENTASI METODE EXAMPLES NON EXAMPLES DALAM PEMBELAJARAN DARING UNTUK MENINGKATKAN KEMAMPUAN BERPIKIR KRITIS SISWA SD. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Citra Bakti*, 9(1), 50–61. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.38048/jipcb.v9i1.633>

Wardhana, I. P. (2021). Review Kurikulum Pendidikan Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif (CBSA) Tahun 1984 dalam Pendidikan Indonesia. *Keraton: Journal of History Education and Culture*, 3(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.32585/keraton.v3i1.1611>