



Senior Lecturers' Narrative Experience in Traversing the Transformations of Curriculum: 1994 Curriculum to Merdeka Curriculum

Armelia Nungki Nurbani¹, Rahmat Setiawan²

^{1,2}Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Indonesia

E-mail: armelianungki@unipasby.ac.id, rahmatsetiawan@unipasby.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: 2023-11-05 Revised: 2023-12-22 Published: 2024-01-17 Keywords: <i>Curriculum;</i> <i>Narrative;</i> <i>Teaching Experience.</i>	Curriculum transformations bring its own challenges for educators, especially at the university level, because universities become the main axis in curriculum testing and practice. The theoretical framework used in this research is the concepts of Curriculum, Narrative Inquiry, and also Teaching Experience. The approach in this research is narrative, the data in this research are fragmented statements taken from interviews. The interviewees are the data sources and they are 2 senior lecturers at a university in Surabaya. The 2 lecturers have been teaching for more than 25 years so they are valid to be used as sources because they have gone through various curriculum transformations since 1994 to 2024. The data collection technique in this research is interview and the type of the interview is nonstructured interview which serves to explore the experience of the interviewees. The type of analysis technique in this research is thematic analysis which serves to divide the results of the analysis into themes of findings. From the results of the research, it can be found that the challenges of the lecturers are 3 things: understanding, adjustment, and implementation. The senior lecturers see this change as a challenge that encourages them to learn and develop.
Artikel Info	Abstrak
Sejarah Artikel Diterima: 2023-11-05 Direvisi: 2023-12-22 Dipublikasi: 2024-01-17 Kata kunci: <i>Kurikulum;</i> <i>Naratif;</i> <i>Pengalaman Mengajar.</i>	Perubahan kurikulum membawa tantangan sendiri bagi para pendidik, terutama di level universitas, karena universitas menjadi poros utama dalam uji dan praktik kurikulum. Kerangka teoretis yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah konsep-konsep tentang Kurikulum, Narrative Inquiry, dan juga <i>Teaching Experience</i> . Pendekatan dalam penelitian ini adalah naratif, data dalam penelitian ini adalah fragmentasi kutipan yang diambil dari wawancara. Narasumber wawancara adalah sumber data dan mereka adalah 2 dosen senior di Universitas di Surabaya. 2 dosen tersebut telah mengajar selama 25 tahun lebih sehingga mereka valid untuk dijadikan narasumber karena telah melewati berbagai perubahan kurikulum sejak 1994 sampai 2024. Teknik pengumpulan data dalam penelitian ini adalah wawancara dan jenis wawancara yang digunakan adalah wawancara nonstruktural yang berfungsi untuk mengeksplorasi pengalaman narasumber. Jenis teknik analisis dalam penelitian ini adalah tematik analisis yang berfungsi untuk membagi hasil analisis ke dalam tema-tema temuan. Dari hasil penelitian, dapat ditemukan bahwa tantangan para dosen ada 3 hal: pemahaman, penyesuaian, dan implementasi. Para dosen senior melihat perubahan ini sebagai sebuah tantangan yang mendorong mereka untuk belajar dan berkembang.

I. INTRODUCTION

The curriculum is a set of plans and arrangements regarding the objectives, content, and learning materials and methods used as guidelines for implementing learning activities to achieve educational goals. However, the curriculum will definitely undergo transformations because it must adapt to the transformation of culture and the existing environment. In other words, in every curriculum transformation, educators, especially lecturers, who are academics determining education policy, must adjust themselves. In the process of adjustment, there must be challenges faced. The experience of

senior lecturers who experienced transformations, from 1994 Curriculum to Merdeka Curriculum, is the basis of this research problem. The challenges obtained from this narrative experience are very pivotal to explore, thus the creation of a new curriculum can be balanced with the conditions and competencies of existing teaching resources. It does not merely adapt from transformations in society which are totally implemented without proper adjustment.

The concepts used are 1994 Curriculum, 2004 Curriculum (Competency-Based Curriculum/ *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi* (KBK)), 2006 Curriculum (Education Unit Level Curriculum/

Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)), 2013 Curriculum, and 2020 Curriculum (Merdeka Curriculum). The purpose of this study is to look at the challenges faced by educators, especially in the University, in this context, lecturers of the English Education study programme. Knowledge of what senior lecturers experience in facing these challenges is crucial to learn so that curriculum transformations do not focus on the curriculum, but adjustments to the competencies of the lecturers. Because a good curriculum is a curriculum that can be implemented, not just magnificent in decoration and scheme but difficult to implement.

The curriculum is the heart of the overall educational plan that is used as a guide for organising study programmes in the education system, especially higher education. The curriculum is not only a set of plans and arrangements regarding the objectives, content, and learning materials and methods used as guidelines for implementing learning activities to achieve certain educational goals (Tuju et al., 2022). Of course, the curriculum is not a fixed scheme, but it fluctuates according to the rapid changes in technology and progress, so education and its curriculum must also adapt. The essence of education is to offer what the generation needs to the needs of the world.

Historically, in 1994 the government updated the curriculum in an effort to integrate several previous curricula (Curriculum 1974 and 1984). In 2004, KBK was born as a replacement for 1994 Curriculum, which changed material-based teaching to competency-based curriculum. Then, 2006 Curriculum or Education Unit Level Curriculum (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* (KTSP) was enacted since Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the national education system which was then elaborated in Government Regulation No. 10 of 2003. Then, 2013 Curriculum comes to emphasise character education which is integrated in all learning in each subject area, as well as the formation of spiritual attitudes in Core Competency 1 (*Kompetensi Inti* (KI 1)) and social attitudes in Core Competency 2 (KI 2). (Rahmadhani et al., 2022; Saraswati et al., 2022). This was followed by the Merdeka Curriculum, which was introduced in 2020 and will take effect in 2022, emphasising flexibility and focusing on essential content, so that teachers have time for character and competency development. The challenge is clear, educators are encouraged to produce graduates who have data literacy, technology, and moral literacy (Fauzi, 2022; Hattarina et al.,

2022; Rahmadhani et al., 2022; Suhandi & Robi'ah, 2022; Vhalery et al., 2022).

On the other hand, most of the reasons for transforming the curricula come from internal university problems, not because of mistakes, however, in the current global situation, changes are accelerating in all sectors, so academics in the University, through the research sector and also scientific forums with the government, reflect on shortcomings and explore the future. Conceptually, the curriculum we have is very good. However, the weakness of our current curriculum is in the implementation aspect and overlooking the role of educators in curriculum change, we are more concerned with the content aspect of the curriculum itself. The success of curriculum implementation is determined by the readiness of resources. Good resources will be able to deal with infrastructure problems, teaching-learning strategies, external factors, and so on. In this case, the education unit must be able and endeavour to observe these various dimensions (Martin & Simanjorang, 2022).

Curriculum transformations must involve transformations in the behaviour and thinking style of educators (both lecturers and teachers). A transformation that must be understood by all components involved in education, so that the transformations made can be implemented properly. The position and role of educators as implementers and their conceptual understanding can determine the failure and success of the curriculum (Alsubaie, 2016). This is not only a suggestion to the government that they should facilitate educators to better understand the basic considerations of developing a new curriculum, but also their experience in dealing with the challenges of each edition of curriculum change. When the curriculum is finalised and formulated, it seems beautiful and visionary, but when it comes into contact with reality, the new formulation will be a meaningful experience for educators (Afgani, 2019).

This research specifically explores English education, where English literacy in Indonesia is still very low. Therefore, the problems described above will be adjusted in the realm of English education. The experience of senior lecturers in dealing with curriculum changes from time to time becomes the main axis of research. The challenges they face are pulses that must be examined so that when there are cultural changes, the curriculum is prepared by reflecting the problems faced by educators. That way, the new curriculum does not necessarily ignore the situation experienced by educators in every

change. To find out the elementary problems of curriculum transformations is to trace the experiences of senior educators (here lecturers) through narrative-based interviews, so that things come directly from the sources who experience these challenges.

The novelty of this research can be seen from its comparison with research that explores the same field. There is a study written by Alsubaie (2016), entitled *Teacher Involvement in Curriculum Development*. This research sees that effective curriculum development and successful faculties always involve teachers in the development process. An effective curriculum should reflect the philosophy, goals, objectives, learning experiences, instructional resources, and assessments that comprise a particular educational programme. Another study is research written by Handi Wahyudi (2019) entitled *Penanggulangan Permasalahan Kurikulum 2013 dalam Dunia Pendidikan Indonesia* which find out a fact that most of schools have problems in implementing 2013 Curriculum. Facilities and infrastructure are also the major problem, plus, the mindset of teachers who only focus on teaching material, while 2013 curriculum must be able to direct students to be more creative, active, productive, and think critically. Because, mindset is what makes teachers less aware of it.

Another relevant research is an article written by Hamka (2021), entitled *Persepsi Mahasiswa Tentang Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka*. From 82 students of the Indonesian Language and Literature Education who were surveyed, it was seen that most students approved of the implementation of MBKM (Merdeka Belajar, Kampus Merdeka) curriculum with four recognitions: lectures in other department in university, lectures in other universities with same department in different universities, lectures in different department in different universities, and practice in non-university institutions.

From these three studies, it can be seen that this research explores the narrative experiences of English Education lecturers in dealing with curriculum transformations from 1994 Curriculum to Merdeka Curriculum. This means that the interviewees have more than 30 years of teaching experience, so issues related to curriculum and its transformation and how lecturers see this as a challenge are things that have never been discussed.

II. METHOD

The type of this research is qualitative and the approach in this research is narrative because this research explores the experience of teaching. The data in this research are fragmented statements taken from interviews. The interviewees are the data sources and they are 2 senior lecturers at a university in Surabaya. They have been teaching for more than 25 years, so they are valid to be used as sources because they have gone through various curriculum transformations since 1994. The data collection technique in this research is interview and the type of the interview is nonstructured interview which serves to explore the experience of the interviewees. The steps are:

1. Preparation: It is a step to define the research goals, selecting the sources, developing interview questions that encourage detailed responses of the participants (the main questions are: 1) Describe a significant curriculum transformation you experienced during your teaching career? 2) What were the biggest challenges you faced in adapting your teaching to the new curriculum? and 3) What strategies did you find most effective in engaging students with the new curriculum?
2. Conducting the Interview: It is a step to **create** a comfortable and open atmosphere (putting participants at ease by introducing and explaining the interview process friendly, respectfully, and attentively), **lead** interview guide with a prepared set of questions is helpful but open to following interesting tangents or probing deeper into unexpected insights that arise during the conversation, actively **listen** and ask follow-up questions (paying close attention to the participants' experiences and perspectives and asking clarification to understand the responses fully), **take** detailed notes (capturing key points, quotes, and non-verbal cues by having the participants' consent and following ethical recording practices, and to **express** gratitude for their time and contribution to the research.
3. Transcribing and Classifying: It is a step to transcribe the interviews accurately and classify the full transcript of the interview into tabulation of data. It means that there are some several quotes to use and eliminate. This way of reduction purposes to specify the statements which are relevant to the process of analysis and the analysis purposes to reach the goal of the research.

The type of analysis technique in this research is thematic analysis which serves to divide the results of the analysis into themes of findings. It involves in identifying common themes, patterns, and insights across the interviews by looking for both positive and negative experiences, as well as diverse perspectives on curriculum transformations. Thematic analysis is an iterative process and it requires revisiting and refining the analysis as it gains deeper understanding of the data. The steps of thematic analysis are:

1. Data Preparation: Transcript Collection (gathering interview transcripts or other qualitative data from senior lecturers) and familiarization (immersing the data by reading the transcripts, taking notes, and highlighting key points holistically and repetitively).
2. Initial Coding: Opening Codes (breaking down the data into smaller units of meaning, identifying and labelling relevant segments related to curriculum transformations) and making memo about relevant answers (the challenges).
3. Theme Development: Organizing Codes (grouping related codes into broader categories or themes that capture the essence of the data by looking for patterns, repetitions, and contradictions, theme refinement by ensuring they are internally coherent, distinct from each other, and relevant to your research question, and hierarchical organization by considering the organized themes into sub-themes to represent different aspects of a larger theme).
4. Review and Revision: Revisiting codes (reviewing the initial coding in light of the developed themes and recoding or refining any codes that do not clearly fit within the thematic structure), negative case analysis (seeking out data that contradicts the themes to ensure they are not biased or overly simplistic), and theme saturation where no new themes are emerging.

Reporting and Interpretation: Theme Narrative (writing a clear and concise narrative that describes each theme, supported by relevant data excerpts and quotes from the lecturers), interpretation and discussion (analysing the themes in relation to your research question and existing literature on curriculum transformations and teaching experiences), implications and recommendations (discussing the implications of your findings for curriculum development, teaching practices, and support for senior

lecturers navigating future transformations. Of course, to reach the depth, it requires collaborations with other researchers to discuss the analysis and refine the interpretations and it leads to a clear audit trail of how the analysis arrives at the conclusions.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The interviews that have been conducted provide many perspectives that can be discussed, but in this research contextually, it can be crystallised into a main answer axe. The axis refers to the challenges of lecturers when facing curriculum transformation from 1994 to Merdeka curriculum.

A. Understanding

Understanding is one of the crucial aspects narrated by senior lecturers. The first lecturer, call her Magnolia, she said that, "... student learning activities tend to be in the classroom. The learning process is classical with the aim that students master the subject matter well. The teacher is considered the centre of learning, because the teacher delivers the material using only one method, namely the lecture method. Therefore, the teacher is considered the centre of learning. And teachers teach in class only pursuing targets in the form of material that must be mastered and cognitively oriented [trans. Magnolia, 2023]. Another lecturer, Azalea, shared a similar sentiment. She admitted that, "... everything is teacher-centred, so we have to learn with the latest knowledge ... of course the process of understanding is not easy, we also have the worry that what we understand is not right. There is a moral burden [of worrying that the material is not correct] [trans. Azalea, 2023]. Here, the context of the curriculum transformation in question is the transformation from the 1975 Curriculum to Curriculum 1994.

The researcher then asked Azalea, why is it not easy to learn something new? Azalea replied, "... of course it is difficult, here, being a lecturer has more burden in teaching, but also administrative affairs and other matters. We have the burden of Tri Dharma [Education, Research, and Public Service]." This is also similar to what Magnolia said, at that time there was no internet. We had to go to the library, shop for books, whereas now, everything is on Google." From these answers, two main points can be drawn that understanding something new is a challenge,

due to the workload and accessibility of the era.

In the context of curriculum transformation from Curriculum 1994 to Curriculum 2004 (KBK – *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi*). This Curriculum is a concept developed by the Indonesian Ministry of National Education to replace Curriculum 1994. Magnolia said, “KBK focuses on the mastery of certain competencies by students. Therefore, this curriculum includes a number of competencies and a set of learning objectives that are stated in such a way that their achievement can be observed in the form of behaviour or skills as a criterion of success.” Azalea added that, “This curriculum [KBK], as I recall, carries the tradition of standardisation. Students are required to achieve certain competency standards.”

With a question, is there a problem with standardisation? Azalea continued that, “... there is no problem, it makes it easier. At that time, we didn’t realise that it was something that was not good for students or learners.” This was also affirmed by Magnolia who said, “the standardised system is too normative and ignores external factors. The learner has several factors, one of the factors is psychological, it could be that the child is afraid or anxious when learning, this should be sought. Their grades could be influenced by these factors ... I also feel that this competency standard is a double-edged knife, it can be bad for those who have a lot of problems, and can be beneficial for those who have high motivation to learn.” From their responses, they took issue with the standardisation of competencies. In other words, a substantial understanding of standardisation is a challenge for educators.

They also experienced other challenges when they faced the K13 curriculum change. Magnolia recalls, “...there was the KTSP [*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*—Education Unit Level Curriculum] and K13 [Curriculum 2013], both have the same preference, starting to disseminate ... the point is, the centre of learning is no longer the educator.” This was also affirmed by Azalea who recalled, “... it seems that KTSP and K13 seem to focus on differentiation. This is a challenge for us who are worried that students are not maximised.” In addition, Azalea also discussed the Merdeka Curriculum. She said, “but now we are actually very familiar with the Merdeka Curriculum.

We understand that the Minister wants learners to be more in touch with reality and the world of work.” This statement is a complaint and it is supported by Magnolia who mentioned that “...the Merdeka Curriculum seems to make us have to learn about what the learners need because we have to offer many options for them.”

It can be concluded that comprehension at each curriculum transformation presents its own challenges for teachers or educators. Comprehension is a fundamental challenge that must be faced because the majority of comprehension requires effort and they get overloaded in that part. Of course, besides understanding, they also have to adapt to the transformation.

B. Adaptation

Adaptation here refers to the process of adjusting to the transformations that have occurred. Of course, the educators experienced a kind of culture shock; a situation that made them have to be able to understand as well as adapt. Adaptation was a challenge for Magnolia, who said that “... at that time we were still easy, we still liked new things. In the 90s, there was Curriculum 1994, we saw this as something good. But somehow, we felt that the transformation made us have to adjust. As I recall, previously, we had *Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif* (CBSA) or Student Active Learning (SAL), which encourages students to be active, but the practice is difficult, and then the teacher becomes the centre [in Curriculum 1994].” Here, Azalea also sees that, “... at that time the transformation [CBSA to Curriculum 1994] made us go the extra mile.” This explains that the transformation from student activism to the teacher as the centre becomes an effort of adaptation and it is the challenge.

In addition, the changes from Curriculum 1994 to KBK, KBK to KTSP, KTSP to K13, also provide adaptation challenges. Magnolia said that “... as I recall Curriculum 1994 focused on the teacher as the centre of the class and then shifted to competencies and students. Of course, we have to adapt because before we totally organised the students, but now we have to give them space.” Similarly, Azalea said that significant changes occurred between 1994 and 2013, “... from students to teachers, from teachers to students again but with some changes. This change has put more or less burden on us. Imagine, before, we were the ones organising, then suddenly we have to

adapt that everything is focused on competence and students." This explains that the change from 1994 to 2013 was a transformation from teacher-centric to student-centric. This transformation made educators adapt.

In addition, the change from K13 to Merdeka Curriculum also provides adaptation challenges for educators. Magnolia said, "... I was quite surprised by the Merdeka Curriculum because it is oriented towards student freedom. We, who are used to teaching structurally, are in a dilemma. This adaptation requires a change in habits that have long been embedded." This was also conveyed by Azalea who saw that, "... so far [during decades of teaching], I have only experienced ideas that are so revolutionary. How our role has changed, the teacher has become a motivator, an enabler, and a mediator for students' competencies that vary greatly. It's great because we have to see that the goal of education is the learner, but as educators, it's a hard thing for us to change our habits and think about what they [the students] need."

In conclusion, adaptation is a difficult part for educators because educators have habits or traditions in the teaching and learning process, so these transformations definitely make them learn to adapt to the main substance of the curriculum transformation. This adaptation is also influenced by the implementation of the transformed curriculum.

C. Implementation

The biggest challenge from the educators was the implementation of the transformed curriculum. Magnolia said, "...the 1994 curriculum, there was so much preparation. The teacher at the centre overwhelmed us and implementing this curriculum took a lot of energy." This complaint was also shared by Azalea, "... the curriculum transformation definitely changed a lot of things. It's not just about the arrangement of subjects or courses, but also the teaching instruments, teaching modules. Imagine going from student-centred to teacher-centred. Of course, this is not an easy thing."

The KBK and KTSP curricula become heavy in the implementation part, because the modules containing teacher-focused material are now student-focused. Magnolia said, "... things have changed in the learning process in

the classroom, it's no longer asking students to do something, it's giving instructions that induce or stimulate them." Azalea also adds, "...improving student engagement requires a strong implementation of the curriculum [KBK and KTSP]." This means that implementation requires a process and this process is a challenge for educators in dealing with the transformation of these curricula.

Implementation problems also occur in the Merdeka Curriculum. The Merdeka Curriculum has problems at the implementation level. Magnolia said that, "... The Merdeka Curriculum is unique. This curriculum is present to liberate, but in my opinion, it even looks very difficult to adjust, arrange, let alone implement. Moreover, there are MBKM [Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Merdeka] programmes that make them leave [to join the programme. Is there a guarantee that they fulfil their competencies? We as lecturers also think about our graduates [having competence or not]. This was also conveyed by Azalea, "... we have difficulty in compiling the latest Curriculum [Merdeka Curriculum], because we have to determine the courses that are converted to programmes and not all programmes support the established graduate profile."

It can be concluded that curriculum implementation and transformation is a challenge for educators. Implementing means having to understand, understand both the advantages and disadvantages. Each transformation provides a process of understanding that can be implemented according to the situation, field facts, and even the context of student habits in the institution. This means that implementing something new is a burden for every educator, especially educators who do not want to take risks or are full of judgement because of the fear of failure in achieving the expectations set out.

All interviewees implied that the curriculum transformation poses challenges, starting from the process of understanding, adjustment and implementation. All three are things that researchers captured from the results of interviews with sources that were not conveyed indirectly.

D. Discussion

From the previously revealed outcome, it is evident that senior lecturers encounter three problems when confronting curriculum alterations between 1994 and 2024. The

rights and obligations of teachers/educators are inseparable and must be utilised together, much like the two sides of a coin. A right is any entitlement that is justly deserved, while an obligation is any imperative activity that must be fulfilled. Typically, rights are acquired by the fulfilment of a set of responsibilities. According to Article 40 paragraph 2 of Law Number 20 of 2003 on the National Education System, teachers are required to have a professional commitment to enhance the standard of education. Additionally, as stated in Article 20 of Law Number 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, teachers are obligated to engage in lesson planning, execute a high-quality teaching process, and assess and evaluate learning outcomes. Furthermore, it is crucial to continuously enhance and cultivate academic credentials and skills in accordance with the advancements in science, technology, and art. The law indirectly promotes educators, such as teachers or lecturers, to actively pursue information or comprehension regarding current phenomena that result in modifications to the curriculum (Azhar, 2020; Hudaidah & Ananda, 2021; Insani, 2019).

The initial topic of discussion is the Curriculum 1984. This curriculum is strongly influenced by the Humanistic school of thought, which regards pupils as autonomous individuals who possess the capacity and desire to actively engage in self-discovery, exploration, and investigation of their surroundings. Students are positioned as active learners in this curriculum. From the act of observing, categorising, engaging in discourse, to documenting. This model is called Student Active Learning (CBSA) or Student Active Learning (SAL). An important figure behind the birth of the 1984 curriculum was Professor Dr Conny R. Semiawan, Head of the Curriculum Centre of the Ministry of National Education for the period 1980-1986 who was also the Rector of IKIP Jakarta (Universitas Negeri Jakarta). The concept of CBSA, which was theoretically beautiful and had good results in the schools where it was tested, experienced many deviations and reductions when it was implemented nationally.

Conversely, the CBSA model prioritises student engagement, which is the central aspect of learning activities demonstrated by various forms of participation, such as listening and debating. The packaging of

teaching materials is determined by the extent and comprehensiveness of the subject matter, taking into account the degree and type of instruction. Prioritise the cultivation of comprehension before engaging in practical exercises. The material is organised according to the pupils' level of preparedness or development. by employing a range of methods, including concrete, semi-concrete, semi-abstract, and abstract ways, utilising an inductive approach. This programme employs a process-oriented approach while maintaining a goal-oriented focus. The curriculum of 1984 adopts a process-oriented approach to skill development. The learning technique employs the notion of CBSA, which stands for student-centered learning. This approach allows students to actively engage in physical, mental, intellectual, and emotional activities, making them the focal point of the learning process. Student learning activities typically occur within the confines of the classroom. The learning process is traditional, with the objective of ensuring that students achieve a high level of mastery in the subject area. The instructor is seen as the focal point of education, as they employ a singular approach, specifically the lecture technique, to convey the subject. Thus, the teacher is seen as the focal point of education. Teachers solely focus on achieving cognitive objectives by instructing students in the classroom (A. P. Ananda & Hudaidah, 2021; Nurhalim, 2018).

The previous curriculum, known as Curriculum 1984, prioritised the instruction of teaching and learning theory patterns, with less focus on the actual substance of the classes. This occurred due to the prevailing educational environment in LPTK, where there was a predominant emphasis on the theoretical aspects of the teaching and learning process. As a result, at that time a *Basic Science Team* was formed, one of whose tasks was to help develop the curriculum in schools. This team views that the material (content) of the lesson should be given enough to students, so that students finish following the lessons in a certain period will get a lot of subject matter.

Curriculum 1994 was developed as an improvement of Curriculum 1984 and was put into effect in compliance with Law no. 2 of 1989 about the National Education System. This had an effect on the allocation of class time, specifically by transitioning from the semester system to the quarter system. The

Caturwulan system, which partitions a year into three phases, aims to provide students ample opportunities to acquire a sufficient amount of subject matter. The Curriculum 1994 is characterised by populism, as it uniformly applies a single curriculum system to all students across Indonesia. This curriculum is designed to serve as a foundational framework, allowing specialised sections to create their own customised teaching methods that are suitable for the specific environment and the unique requirements of the local population. When carrying out activities, teachers should select and employ tactics that engage students actively in the learning process, encompassing their mental, physical, and social participation. Teachers can engage students by offering various types of questions that elicit convergent or divergent responses, allowing for open-ended exploration and discovery.

When teaching a subject, it is important to tailor the instruction to the unique characteristics of the concept or subject matter, as well as the cognitive growth of the students. This approach aims to achieve a balance between teaching that focuses on comprehension of concepts and teaching that emphasises the development of problem-solving abilities. Progressing from tangible objects to conceptual ideas, from straightforward concepts to challenging concepts, and from uncomplicated notions to intricate notions. Reiterating complex content is necessary to solidify students' comprehension. Several issues arose during the implementation of the 1994 curriculum. This prompted policymakers to enhance the curriculum. An initiative to enhance it was the implementation of the Curriculum 1994 Supplement. These enhancements were implemented with a focus on the notion of curriculum improvement, specifically the ongoing process of adapting the curriculum to advancements in science and technology, as well as the requirements of the community.

Curriculum refinement is conducted to establish an optimal balance between the desired objectives, the amount of learning required, the capabilities of the students, and the surrounding conditions and available resources. Curriculum enhancement is conducted to ensure the accuracy of the content and its appropriateness for the students' developmental stage. Curriculum

enhancements encompass a range of interconnected elements, including educational goals, instructional methods, assessment strategies, and educational resources, such as textbooks and facilities. Curriculum upgrades do not pose a challenge for instructors in terms of implementation and can be seamlessly integrated with the existing texts and educational infrastructure at school. The 1994 curriculum in elementary and secondary education had a phased implementation process, consisting of short-term refining and long-term refinement.

The period from 1994 to 2004, known as KBK, resulted in significant transformation. The KBK curriculum was developed in 2000 and put into practice in 2004. This curriculum is referred to as the KBK Curriculum or the 2004 Curriculum throughout its developmental phases. This curriculum focuses on cultivating the information, comprehension, skills, values, attitudes, and interests of learners in order to enable them to achieve competence, accuracy, and success while also being responsible. KBK additionally emphasises the acquisition of specific skills by learners. Hence, this curriculum encompasses many proficiencies and a collection of learning outcomes that are articulated in a manner that allows their attainment to be discerned through observable behaviour or abilities, serving as a measure of accomplishment. Learning activities should be guided to facilitate learners in attaining a minimum degree of proficiency, enabling them to accomplish the established objectives (Anarisa, 2020; Fitriani et al., 2021).

Adhering to the principle of comprehensive education and talent cultivation, it is imperative to provide every student with the chance to attain objectives based on their unique capabilities and pace of learning. Competency-based curriculum is a curriculum approach that focuses on developing the ability to perform tasks (competence) to certain performance standards, resulting in students mastering a specific set of competencies. The competency-based curriculum focuses on two main aspects: the desired outcomes and impacts those learners should achieve through meaningful learning experiences, and the diversity that can arise based on individual needs.

KTSP is a concept for developing curriculum that is implemented directly in schools and educational institutions, focusing

on the process of learning. Granting schools and education units increased autonomy not only demonstrates the government's response to community requests, but also serves as a method to enhance the quality, efficiency, and fairness of education. KTSP (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*), is an educational reform approach that grants schools and education units the freedom to design the curriculum based on their capabilities, requirements, and necessities. Autonomy in curriculum development and learning has the ability to enhance the effectiveness of teachers and school staff, facilitate direct involvement of relevant organisations, and enhance community comprehension of education, particularly the curriculum (Ananda, 2021; Mustika & Yana, 2022; Triono et al., 2020; Zahra, 2019).

Under the KTSP system, schools possess complete autonomy and accountability in designing the curriculum and educational process in alignment with their vision, mission, and objectives. Schools are mandated to formulate strategies, establish priorities, oversee the development of various school resources and the surrounding environment, and be answerable to both the community and the government. The KTSP entails the involvement of teachers, principals, and the School Committee and Board of Education in the process of curriculum creation (Aprilianti, 2018; Bashori, 2022; Chaira, 2015; Nur, 2021; Sayuti & Mujiarto, 2018; Yusnita et al., 2021). This body is an institution that is founded via the deliberation of local officials and the education commission of the local parliament (DPRD—*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah*), local education officials, school administrators, education professionals, representatives of parents, and community leaders. This entity establishes school policy in accordance with the current education regulations. In addition, the school committee must establish the vision, mission, and goals of the school, which will have diverse ramifications for the operational programs and activities aimed at achieving these goals.

The implementation of educational advancement in Indonesia is an imperative that cannot be avoided. The increasing awareness of all stakeholders regarding education in Indonesia has resulted in numerous positive outcomes, such as the nationwide implementation of the 2013 curriculum, which commenced in the academic year

2016/2017. The curriculum implemented nationwide in the academic year 2016/2017 is not the original 2013 curriculum, but rather a revised version by the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Ministry of Education and Culture has changed the 2013 curriculum, which was previously deemed demanding. The amended curriculum is now projected to be less burdensome, allowing all schools to use it in the 2016/2017 academic year (Maulan et al., 2021; Simanjuntak et al., 2022; Zahra, 2019).

The Merdeka Curriculum is an innovative approach in Indonesian education that seeks to fully fulfil students' learning potential and interests. The curriculum is tailored to allow students to pursue their interests and talents, while avoiding excessive academic pressure. The curriculum is designed to optimise the learning content, allowing learners the time to comprehend topics and cultivate competencies. Teachers possess the autonomy to select diverse educational resources, enabling them to customise the learning experience according to the unique requirements and interests of the learners. Projects that seek to enhance the attainment of the Pancasila learner profile are created using a theme-based approach determined by the government. This project does not have a special focus on reaching predetermined learning outcomes or being limited to specific subject content.

The development of the Merdeka Curriculum was prompted by the findings of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which revealed that 70% of 15-year-old students lacked the minimum level of proficiency in comprehending basic reading or applying fundamental arithmetic principles. The PISA score has shown no substantial improvement over the past 10-15 years. Moreover, there exist significant discrepancies among different regions and socio-economic classes regarding the standard of education, which have been further intensified by the COVID-19 epidemic (Hadi et al., 2023; Ndari et al., 2023).

In response to this situation, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology (*Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan-Riset dan Teknologi*) implemented an *emergency curriculum* simplification, known as the Emergency Curriculum. This curriculum was introduced to mitigate the consequences of educational regression

experienced during the pandemic. Out of the total number of schools surveyed, students experienced a significant decrease in the effects of the pandemic, with a reduction of in reading and in numeracy. The efficacy of this *Emergency Curriculum* demonstrates the necessity for a more all-encompassing curriculum overhaul. Hence, the Merdeka Curriculum is formulated as a *novel* curriculum that surpasses the preceding curriculum in terms of comprehensiveness (Azzahra et al., 2022; Lestari, 2023; Nurmasyitah et al., 2023; Rohmah et al., 2023).

A curriculum is a comprehensive framework that encompasses the goals, content, learning materials, and instructional methods necessary for structuring educational activities and achieving certain educational objectives. Education is a deliberate and organised endeavour to establish an environment and process that facilitates active development of students' potential in terms of spiritual and religious fortitude, self-discipline, intellectual capacity, moral character, and practical skills required by both individuals and society (as stated in the National Education System Law No. 20 of 2023). Based on this comprehension, it may be inferred that education and curriculum are intricately interconnected. The curriculum is designed to facilitate the effective implementation of education in alignment with the intended objectives. In order to ensure the smooth and efficient functioning of education, it is imperative to provide a well-structured and comprehensive framework that enables students to receive instruction effectively and generate high-quality outcomes. The term used to refer to the strategy or design is known as the curriculum.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

The objective of modifying or altering the curriculum is to enhance the educational standards in Indonesia. Revisions or modifications to the curriculum are needed due to the ongoing evolution and transformation of current times. The personality and behaviors of persons will undergo changes indirectly. Therefore, education must be modified to equip the upcoming generation with the skills necessary to effectively compete and adapt in an era characterized by rapid advancements. Presently, technology and knowledge are advancing at a rapid pace,

and human cognition is also progressing. At this point, the curriculum must also adapt to keep up with the current era. With the readily available access to knowledge, it can give rise to various outcomes, both advantageous and disadvantageous.

The current curriculum should incorporate content pertaining to the responsible utilization of technology and information, while also ensuring safeguards against their exploitation. Teachers can also be affected by modifications to the curriculum. Teachers are required to acquire knowledge of the updated curriculum, create suitable educational resources, and devise pertinent instructional strategies. Teachers must to participate in training sessions or workshops in order to comprehend the modifications in the curriculum and effectively incorporate them into their everyday instructional practices. The implementation of curriculum changes may impose additional stress and burden on instructors, as not all teachers can readily adjust to the modifications.

Regarding this study, it is evident that educators face significant hurdles when it comes to curricular transformation. The case pertains to lecturers, who are educators in universities responsible for training teachers for their students. They encountered the changes in the curriculum from 1994 to Merdeka. Naturally, they have encountered numerous problems that have enhanced their teaching expertise. They must confront the problem of comprehending the most recent curriculum, followed by the process of adapting and adjusting.

B. Suggestion

The discussion regarding this research is still very limited and requires a lot of input. The suggestion for future authors is to study it more deeply and comprehensively about Senior Lecturers' Narrative Experience in Traversing the Transformations of Curriculum: 1994 Curriculum to Merdeka Curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Afgani, J. (2019). Kurikulum dan Pengembangannya. *Modul Pengembangan Kurikulum*.
- Alsubaie, M. A. (2016). Teacher Involvement in Curriculum Development. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(9).

- Ananda, A. P., & Hudaidah. (2021). Perkembangan Kurikulum Pendidikan Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah Dan Kajian Sejarah*, 3(2).
- Ananda, R. (2021). Evaluation of Learning Outcome: The Comparison Between the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) and the 2013 Curriculum. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v9i2.510>
- Anarisa, A. (2020). Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi (Konsep dan Implementasi). *ZAHRA: Research and Tought Elementary School of Islam Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.37812/zahra.v1i1.65>
- Aprillianti, L. (2018). Comparison between Concept of Evaluation on KTSP Curriculum and 2013 Curriculum. *UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and CALL (UNICELL)*.
- Azhar. (2020). Perkembangan Kurikulum di Indonesia dari Klasik ke Modern. *Fitrah: International Islamic Education Journal*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.22373/fitrah.v2i2.784>
- Azzahra, F., Permana, H., Fitriani, L., Putri, R. M., & Wulandari, S. (2022). Approaches and models development of 2013 Curriculum and Merdeka Curriculum. *Curricula: Journal of Curriculum Development*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.17509/curricula.v1i2.52034>
- Bashori. (2022). Manajemen Perubahan Kurikulum KTSP 2006 Ke-Kurikulum 2013 di SMA Negeri 1 Kediri. *Realita: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Kebudayaan Islam*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.30762/realita.v14i2.247>
- Chaira, S. (2015). Analyzing Indonesian Curriculum of KTSP. *Getsempena English Education Journal*, 2(2).
- Fauzi, A. (2022). Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka Di Sekolah Penggerak. *Pahlawan: Jurnal Pendidikan-Sosial-Budaya*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.57216/pah.v18i2.480>
- Fitriani, D., Rindiani, A., Zaqiah, Q. Y., & Erihadiana, M. (2021). Inovasi Kurikulum: Konsep, Karakteristik dan Implementasi Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi (KBK). *Jurnal Dirosah Islamiyah*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.47467/jdi.v4i1.666>
- Hadi, A., Marniati, M., Ngindana, R., Kurdi, M. S., Kurdi, M. S., & Fauziah, F. (2023). New Paradigm of Merdeka Belajar Curriculum in Schools. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i2.3126>
- Hattarina, S., Saila, N., Faradilla, A., Putri, D. R., & Putri, R. G. A. (2022). Implementasi Kurikulum Medeka Belajar Di Lembaga Pendidikan. *Seminar Nasional Sosial, Sains, Pendidikan, Humaniora (SENASSDRA)*, 1(1).
- Hudaidah, & Ananda, A. P. (2021). Perkembangan Kurikulum Pendidikan Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah Dan Kajian Sejarah*, 3(2).
- Insani, F. D. (2019). Sejarah Perkembangan Kurikulum di Indonesia Sejak Awal Kemerdekaan Hingga Saat Ini. *As-Salam: Jurnal Studi Hukum Islam & Pendidikan*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.51226/assalam.v8i1.132>
- Lestari, N. A. P. (2023). Analysis of 2013 curriculum problems so it is changed into a merdeka curriculum. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Nusantara*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.29407/jpdn.v8i2.19229>
- Martin, R., & Simanjorang, M. M. (2022). Pentingnya Peranan Kurikulum yang Sesuai dalam Pendidikan di Indonesia. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pendidikan Dasar*, 1(1).
- Maulan, S. R., Sa'jidah, H. C., & Wiyono, D. F. (2021). Peran Guru Pai Dalam Penerapan Kurikulum K13 Pada Pelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam Kelas X Di Sma Swasta Widya Dharma Kec.Turen Kab.Malang. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 6(5).
- Mustika, E., & Yana. (2022). Comparison between teacher's difficulties in teaching english related to the implementing ktsp curriculum and 2013 curriculum. *PROJECT(Professional Journal of English Education)*, 5(3).
- Ndari, W., Suyatno, Sukirman, & Mahmudah, F. N.

- (2023). Implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum and Its Challenges. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2023.4.3.648>
- Nur, M. D. (2021). Analisis Kurikulum 2013. *Didaktik : Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD STKIP Subang*, 7(02). <https://doi.org/10.36989/didaktik.v7i02.239>
- Nurhalim, M. (2018). Analisis Perkembangan Kurikulum di Indonesia (Sebuah Tinjauan Desain Dan Pendekatan). *INSANIA : Jurnal Pemikiran Alternatif Kependidikan*, 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.24090/insania.v16i3.1597>
- Nurmasyitah, P., Amiruddin, A., Salim, A., Fransiska, I., Daris, K., & Suryani, K. (2023). Implementation Merdeka Curriculum of Learning to Students' Learning Activities. *Holistic Science*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.56495/hs.v3i1.331>
- Rahmadhani, P., Widya, D., & Setiawati, M. (2022). Dampak Transisi Kurikulum 2013 Ke Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar Terhadap Minat Belajar Siswa. *JUPEIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 1(4).
- Rohmah, A. N., Sari, I. J., Rohmah, N. L., Syafira, R., Fitriana, F., & Admoko, S. (2023). Implementation of the "Merdeka Belajar" Curriculum in the Industrial 4.0 Era. *International Journal of Research and Community Empowerment*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.58706/ijorce.v1n1.p22-28>
- Saraswati, S., Safitri, A., & Kabiba, K. (2022). Peran Guru dalam Implementasi Kurikulum 2013. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran (JPP)*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.51454/jpp.v1i3.56>
- Sayuti, M., & Mujiarto, M. (2018). Employability skills in vocational high school context: An analysis of the KTSP curriculum. *Journal of Vocational Education Studies*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.12928/joves.v1i2.707>
- Simanjuntak, M. B., Suseno, M., Setiadi, S., Lustyantje, N., & Barus, I. R. G. R. G. (2022). Integration of Curricula (Curriculum 2013 and Cambridge Curriculum for Junior High School Level in Three Subjects) in Pandemic Situation. *Ideas: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Budaya*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.32884/ideas.v8i1.615>
- Suhandi, A. M., & Robi'ah, F. (2022). Guru dan Tantangan Kurikulum Baru: Analisis Peran Guru dalam Kebijakan Kurikulum Baru. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i4.3172>
- Triono, E., Suwandi, S., & Andayani, A. (2020). Objectives, Function, and Teaching Material of Indonesian Literature in Curriculum KTSP and K13 at SMA Level. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 19(2). https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbs.v19i2.24784
- Tuju, R. S., Wahyudin, D., Sinaga, D. C., Saleky, N. L., & Ayok, M. (2022). Model Pengembangan Kurikulum KBK dan KKNI di Perguruan Tinggi. *Syntax Literate ; Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v7i1.5797>
- Vhalery, R., Setyastanto, A. M., & Leksono, A. W. (2022). Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka: Sebuah Kajian Literatur. *Research and Development Journal of Education*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v8i1.11718>
- Yusnita, A., Apriliani, S., Abbas, E. W., & Rochgiyanti, R. (2021). The Differences of Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) and The 2013 Curriculum in Social Studies Lessons. *The Innovation of Social Studies Journal*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.20527/iis.v3i1.3182>
- Zahra, D. N. (2019). Development of Islamic Education Curriculum Model Curriculum 2013 (K13). *AL-HAYAT: Journal of Islamic Education*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v3i1.50>