

## **Analysis of the 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum**

**Bambang Wasminto<sup>1)</sup> Ngasbun Egar<sup>2)</sup> Rowi Jayanti<sup>3)</sup> Tri Yulastuti Tungga Dewi<sup>4)</sup>  
Vena Verdiana<sup>5)</sup>**

---

### **Keywords**

1994 Curriculum, 1997 Curriculum, Curriculum Analysis, CBSA, Curriculum Flexibility

### **Abstract**

This research aims to analyze the comparison between the 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum in the education system in Indonesia. The 1994 curriculum was designed with a uniform approach to learning materials throughout Indonesia and emphasized Active Student Learning Methods (CBSA). However, its implementation faces various challenges, especially in remote areas. The 1997 curriculum was presented as an improvement, providing greater flexibility to adapt the curriculum based on local conditions. This article discusses the similarities and differences between the two curricula, including changes in learning structure, flexibility of implementation, and evaluation systems. The results of the analysis show that although the 1997 Curriculum introduced a number of improvements, major challenges in its implementation remain, especially regarding resources and implementation gaps in various regions.

---

e-ISSN 2549-0338

## INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the fundamental aspects in human resource development in a country. In Indonesia, the education curriculum has undergone various changes aimed at adapting to current developments, community needs and global challenges. The curriculum is an important instrument that determines the direction and quality of learning, as well as being a guide in achieving student competencies at various levels of education.

The 1994 curriculum was introduced as an effort to respond to social, cultural and economic developments in Indonesia in the early 1990s. This curriculum emphasizes national uniformity, where every school throughout Indonesia is required to apply the same standards in terms of learning materials and teaching methods. This approach is based on the belief that uniformity of teaching materials will facilitate the management of the national education system and strengthen national integration. One of the aspects prioritized in the 1994 Curriculum is the implementation of Active Student Learning Methods (CBSA), which aims to activate the role of students in the learning process, so that they are not only passive recipients of information, but also become active subjects in the learning process.

However, after several years of implementation, various criticisms emerged of the 1994 Curriculum. These criticisms were mainly related to the difficulty of implementation in areas that had limited infrastructure and resources. The expected uniformity is not always relevant to the diversity of social and cultural conditions in Indonesia. Apart from that, evaluation of the learning system also shows that the implementation of CBSA has not been completely successful in increasing student engagement.

In response to this evaluation, the 1997 Curriculum was introduced with a number of changes and improvements. The 1997 Curriculum retains some elements of the 1994 Curriculum, but provides more flexibility in its implementation, especially in areas that have different local conditions. This curriculum also provides room for schools to adapt learning materials and methods according to local needs, without having to be tied to strict national uniformity.

With these changes, it is important to carry out a comparative analysis between the 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum, especially in terms of learning structure, teaching approach, and evaluation system. This research aims to understand more deeply the differences and similarities between the two curricula, as well as their implications for the education process in Indonesia. This research will also explore the challenges faced in implementing these two curricula and how future education policies can learn from this experience.

## METHODS

This research uses an approach **comparative descriptive** to analyze the differences and similarities between **Curriculum 1994** and **Curriculum 1997** in the context of education in Indonesia. This method aims to explore the structure, implementation and impact of the two curricula based on policy documents and empirical data from implementation in the field. This research was carried out through the following stages:

### 1. Data Collection

This research uses two types of data sources: **data first** and **data seconds**.

**Data Primer:** Primary data was collected through interviews with educational experts, teachers and school principals who are experienced in implementing the 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum. These interviews were conducted in depth to get direct views on the challenges and advantages of implementing the two curricula.

**Data Seconds:** Secondary data was obtained from official government documents, including guidebooks **curriculum** published by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture, curriculum evaluation reports, as well as previous studies related to the 1994 and 1997 Curriculum. In addition, journal articles, textbooks and relevant literature were also used as references in the analysis.

### 2. Data Analysis Techniques

The data that has been collected is analyzed using the method **analisis isi (content analysis)** to evaluate the content of policy and curriculum documents. This analysis involves the following steps:

**Document Analysis:** Official curriculum documents (1994 Curriculum and 1997 Curriculum) were analyzed to identify important components such as subject structure, learning approaches, evaluation, and flexibility of application in various regions of Indonesia.

**Systematic Comparison:** After **analyzing** the documents, a systematic comparison is carried out to highlight the similarities and differences between the two curricula. This comparison includes aspects such as:

1. **Curriculum structure** (subjects and time allocation).
2. **Learning methods** implemented, including differences in the Active Student Learning Method (CBSA) approach.
3. **Evaluation system** which is used to measure student learning outcomes.
4. **Deployment flexibility** at regional level.

**Member Interview:** Data from interviews with educational practitioners and teachers are used to confirm and complement the results of the document analysis. Views from educational actors in the field provide richer insight into the challenges and opportunities of implementing the two curricula.

### 3. Data Validation

To ensure the validity and reliability of the data, researchers conducted **data triangulation** by comparing the results of document analysis, interviews and literature studies. In addition, a review of the interview results was carried out by other researchers to reduce interpretation bias.

### 4. Presentation of Results

The results of this research are presented in descriptive and comparative form, prioritizing in-depth analysis of:

- Differences and similarities in the structure and objectives of the 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum.
- Evaluation of the effectiveness of the two curricula in the context of student competency development.
- The impact of implementing the two curricula in various regions, especially regions with limited educational infrastructure conditions.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Curriculum Structure

The 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum are similar in terms of basic structure, but there are several important differences that affect implementation in the field.

**Curriculum 1994** stressed **standardization** in learning throughout Indonesia. Every school, regardless of location and socio-cultural conditions, is required to follow the same national standards, both in terms of subjects, time allocation and teaching materials. The main focus is to deliver **educational uniformity** to maintain the integrity of the national education system.

**Curriculum 1997** give more **flexibility** to local governments and schools to adapt teaching materials to local needs and conditions. This is especially important for regions that have limited infrastructure and resources. Apart from that, the 1997 Curriculum tries to overcome the challenges faced by the 1994 Curriculum in terms of implementing uniformity that is not in accordance with local characteristics in remote or inland areas.

### 2. Learning Approach

One of the main characteristics of the 1994 Curriculum is implementation **Active Student Learning Method (CBSA)**, which aims to increase student involvement in the teaching and learning process. In the 1994 Curriculum, CBSA is implemented through group activities, discussions, experiments and project-

based learning. This approach was very progressive for its time, because it aimed to shift learning patterns which previously focused more on the teacher as the center of information.

However, based on data from interviews with teachers and school principals, the implementation of CBSA in the 1994 Curriculum in various regions faces many challenges, such as:

- **Limited facilities and resources:** Many schools in remote areas do not have access to adequate learning aids to support CBSA, such as books, laboratories or supporting technology.
- **Lack of teacher training:** Many teachers do not have sufficient understanding of how to apply CBSA effectively, which causes this method to not be optimized in the learning process.

As a refinement, **Curriculum 1997** still maintains CBSA principles, but provides more flexibility in the application of learning methods. This approach provides room for teachers to adapt teaching methods to the conditions of each school, especially in areas with limited facilities and infrastructure. Results from this approach are better in some areas, although implementation gaps remain.

### 3. Evaluation System

The 1994 curriculum uses an evaluation system that focuses on **assessment of cognitive learning outcomes**. The emphasis on written exams and scores as a measure of success is often recognized as too narrow because it does not pay enough attention to the development of students' affective and psychomotor aspects. This evaluation tends to lead to **memorize** and put aside critical thinking abilities, practical skills, and creativity.

The 1997 curriculum introduced **more comprehensive assessment**, covering aspects **cognitive, affective, and psychomotor**. This evaluation system is more flexible and is expected to provide a more holistic picture of student development. Some significant changes in the 1997 Curriculum are:

- Emphasis on **assessment of the learning process**, not just the end result. This means teachers also assess student involvement in the learning process, creativity and ability to collaborate.
- Use of various evaluation methods, incl **portfolio, observation, and group project**, in addition to the written exam.

However, the implementation of this evaluation system also encounters obstacles in the field, especially related to **limited teacher training** in conducting a holistic assessment. Many teachers are still getting used to the system **evaluation** based on numbers, so that the assessment of affective and psychomotor aspects is not optimal.

### 4. Flexibility in Implementation

The 1994 curriculum is known as the curriculum **uniform** throughout Indonesia, with little room for schools or regions to make adjustments. This uniformity on the one hand ensures the same educational standards, but on the other hand creates great challenges for regions that have very different cultures, social conditions and infrastructure.

On the contrary, **Curriculum 1997** give **greater flexibility** to regions and schools. Schools are permitted to adapt teaching materials and learning methods based on local conditions. It is designed to address specific problems faced by schools in remote or less developed areas. In some cases, this flexibility is possible **contextual learning**, where students can learn material that is more relevant to their daily lives.

However, the interview results show that this flexibility also presents challenges. Schools with limited resources often find it difficult to design curricula that suit local conditions. In addition, the lack of clear guidance from the central government regarding how to make curriculum adjustments has caused confusion for some teachers and school principals.

### 5. Impact on Learning and Students

These two curricula have different impacts on the student learning process:

**Curriculum 1994** gives students the opportunity to learn within a structured and uniform framework, but leaves little room for creativity and individual adaptation.

**Curriculum 1997**, although more flexible, often depends on local resources and teacher skills in adapting the curriculum.

Some of the teachers interviewed stated that students who studied with the 1997 Curriculum tended to be more involved in learning, especially because the assessment methods were more diverse. However, in areas that do not have adequate resources, students often have difficulty participating in learning effectively.

## DISCUSSIONS

From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that the 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum have their respective advantages and disadvantages. The 1994 curriculum provides a strong basis in terms of national uniformity and quality control, but fails to provide the necessary flexibility in regions with different conditions. The 1997 curriculum, on the other hand, introduced necessary flexibility, but often had difficulty implementing it consistently due to limited resources and teacher training.

**The implications of this comparison** suggests that future education policies need to accommodate differences in local conditions while ensuring national standards are maintained. In addition, increasing teacher capacity and educational infrastructure in remote areas needs to be a priority to ensure the successful implementation of a more flexible curriculum.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis of the 1994 Curriculum and the 1997 Curriculum, it can be concluded that these two curricula are important stages in the development of the Indonesian education system, each with its own advantages and challenges. The 1994 curriculum emphasizes national uniformity with the aim of establishing a standardized education system throughout Indonesia. However, this approach faces significant obstacles, especially in areas with limited infrastructure and resources. The Active Student Learning Approach (CBSA) introduced in the 1994 Curriculum provides innovation in the learning process, but its implementation is often not optimal due to a lack of technical support and teacher training.

In response to these challenges, the 1997 Curriculum came with greater flexibility, providing room for schools to adapt learning materials and methods to suit local conditions. The 1997 curriculum provides improvements in terms of evaluating the learning process, not only focusing on cognitive aspects, but also involving affective and psychomotor aspects. However, this flexibility presents new challenges, especially for schools in areas with limited resources who experience difficulties in adapting the curriculum optimally.

In the context of developing the education system in Indonesia, the results of this research emphasize the importance of considering local conditions and resources in implementing the curriculum. In addition, it is necessary to increase teacher capacity, including better training in implementing holistic learning methods and evaluation systems. The government also needs to provide clearer guidance to help schools implement the flexibility provided by the curriculum.

Recommendations from this research include the need for a combination of uniformity and flexibility in designing future curricula, as well as increased investment in educational infrastructure, especially in disadvantaged areas. With more targeted reforms and careful adjustments, the education system in Indonesia can be more inclusive and responsive to the needs of a diverse society.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express his deepest gratitude to all parties who have contributed to the completion of this research. Thank you to the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture for access to official documents related to the 1994 Curriculum and 1997 Curriculum, as well as to the teachers and school principals who were willing to take the time to share their experiences through interviews.

Thanks are also expressed to academic colleagues who have provided valuable input during the research process, and to the research team who have assisted in data collection and analysis. Support and guidance from research supervisors is very meaningful in maintaining the quality and direction of this research.

Finally, the author would like to thank his family for their continuous moral support and encouragement during the process of preparing this journal.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, G., Egar, N., Soegeng, A.Y. (2022). Curriculum Development Management. Yogyakarta: Mahata.
- Department of Education and Culture. (1994). 1994 Basic Education Curriculum. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Department of Education and Culture. (1997). 1997 Basic Education Curriculum. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Hasbullah, H. (2006). Basics of Education. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Muchtar, H., & Nurlaelawati, I. (2016). Implementation of the 1994 and 1997 Curriculum in the Indonesian education system. *Indonesian Journal of Education and Research*, 3(2), 45-59.
- Mustafa, Y., & Lubis, F. (2002). Education Reform in Indonesia: Between Hope and Reality. Jakarta: Indonesian Library.
- Sanjaya, W. (2011). Learning Strategies Oriented to Educational Process Standards. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Suryadi, A., & Siregar, T. (2000). Evaluation of the Education Curriculum in Indonesia. Bandung: Alfabeta.