Curriculum Development Strategies in Five Countries: The United States, Finland, Japan, Singapore, and Indonesia

Marhamah[1*], Dizza Awwana[2], Gadis Ayu Safitri[3], Nurhafiza Dzikrina Salma[4], Puan Nayla Khairani[5]

[1-5] Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Pendidikan dan Keguruan, Universitas Islam Riau, Indonesia
marhamah@fkip.uir.ac.id[1], dizzaawwana@student.uir.ac.id[2], gadisayusafitri@student.uir.ac.id[3],
nurhafizadzikrinasalma@student.uir.ac.id[4], puannaylakhairani@student.uir.ac.id[5]
*Penulis Korespondensi: marhamah@fkip.uir.ac.id

Abstract. The curriculum is a key component of the education system, serving as a guideline for the learning process. Every nation has a unique approach to curriculum development that is based on cultural values, national needs, and objectives for human resource development. The United States, Finland, Singapore, Japan, and Indonesia are the five nations whose curriculum development approaches are examined and contrasted in this article. Library research and the analysis of numerous pertinent literature sources are the methods employed. The study's findings show that while every nation takes a different approach, they all aim to strike a balance between students' character development, academic mastery, and 21st-century skills. This article aims to examine and compare curriculum development strategies in five countries: the United States, Finland, Singapore, Japan, and Indonesia. The method used is library research, analyzing various relevant literature sources. The results of the study indicate that although each country has a different approach, all strive to balance academic mastery, 21st-century skills, and student character development.

Keywords: Comparative Education; Curriculum; Curriculum Development Strategy; Education System; International Education.

1. INTRODUCTION

Curriculum plays a central role in shaping the direction, quality, and outcomes of a nation's education system. It is commonly understood as a structured plan that encompasses educational objectives, learning content, instructional processes, and assessment strategies that guide teaching and learning activities (Tyler, 1949; UNESCO, as cited in Deng & Gopinathan, 2016). As a core instrument of education policy, the curriculum reflects a country's philosophical foundations, socio-cultural values, economic priorities, and responses to global challenges.

In the context of the 21st century, curriculum development has increasingly been influenced by globalization, technological advancement, and the demand for competencies such as critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and adaptability (Fullan, 2016; OECD, 2018). As a result, many countries have reformed their curricula to better prepare students for uncertain futures while maintaining national identity and social cohesion. However, curriculum reform is not a uniform process; it varies significantly across countries depending on governance structures, teacher professionalism, assessment systems, and policy implementation mechanisms (Apple, 2019; Cuban, 2018).

This study focuses on five countries the United States, Finland, Japan, Singapore, and Indonesia due to their distinctive curriculum development strategies and international recognition in education reform. The United States adopts a decentralized curriculum system in which the federal government provides general guidelines, while states and local school districts possess substantial autonomy in curriculum design and implementation (Ravitch, 2016; U.S. Department of Education, 2018). Finland, widely regarded for its high-performing education system, emphasizes trust in teachers, learner autonomy, equity, and student well-being within its national core curriculum framework (Halinen, 2018; Sahlberg, 2015). Japan integrates strong academic standards with moral and character education, aiming to foster holistic development and social responsibility among students (Bjork, 2016; Tsuneyoshi, 2014). Singapore implements a highly structured and future-oriented curriculum that prioritizes competency-based learning, assessment reform, and the development of 21st-century skills to support national competitiveness (Gopinathan, 2015; Tan, 2018). Meanwhile, Indonesia applies a nationally standardized curriculum that is designed to accommodate regional diversity, local wisdom, and evolving national development goals, as reflected in recent reforms such as the Kurikulum Merdeka (Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, 2022; Mulyasa, 2018).

Despite contextual differences, these countries share a common objective: improving educational quality and relevance. Similarities can be observed in the increasing adoption of competency-based curricula, learner-centered approaches, and character education. However, notable differences exist in terms of curriculum complexity, the degree of centralization, the role of teachers in curriculum decision-making, and the emphasis placed on academic achievement versus holistic development (Darling-Hammond, 2017; Schmidt et al., 2015).

Curriculum development also faces persistent challenges, including disparities in educational quality, teacher preparedness, alignment between policy and classroom practice, and the need to adapt to rapid global changes (Au, 2011; OECD, 2021). These challenges highlight the importance of comparative studies that examine curriculum strategies across different national contexts to identify best practices and policy lessons.

Therefore, this study employs a library research approach to analyze and compare curriculum development strategies in the United States, Finland, Japan, Singapore, and Indonesia. By examining official policy documents, scholarly literature, and international education reports, this research aims to provide insights that may inform curriculum development and reform efforts, particularly in the Indonesian context..

2. RESEARCH METODS

Research Objectives

The purpose of this research is to analyze and compare curriculum development strategies implemented in the United States, Finland, Japan, Singapore, and Indonesia through a literature review. This research aims to identify the main characteristics, similarities, and differences in curriculum development approaches in each country, and to understand how these strategies respond to academic demands, 21st-century skills, and student character development. Furthermore, this research aims to provide insights and conceptual references that can be used as considerations in developing and refining national curricula, particularly in Indonesia

Research Challenges

The challenges of this research refer to the various limitations and obstacles encountered in the process of analyzing and comparing curriculum development strategies across countries. These difficulties include variations in the social, cultural, political, and educational system backgrounds that impact curriculum policies in each nation, making it challenging to extrapolate results. Methodological issues in literature-based research are further complicated by restricted access to the most recent policy papers and disparities in how international literature sources are interpreted. Document-based research is unable to adequately reveal the discrepancy between written curriculum policies and field execution.

Research Method

This research uses the library research method or literature research. Data was obtained from various written sources, such as national and international journal articles, books, and official documents on education policies from each country.

Data collection techniques are carried out by identifying, classifying, and reviewing sources that are relevant to the topic of curriculum preparation strategies. The data that has been collected is then analyzed using content analysis and comparative analysis to compare curriculum strategies in five countries.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSION

Research Findings

Table 1. Aspect Curriculum Approach.

Aspect	US	Finlandia	Jepang	Singapura	Indonesia
Curriculum Approach	Based on standards and competencies	Based on competence and student welfare	Based on academic and character	Based on 21st century competence	Competency and character based
Centralisation Level	Decentralisation (state & school)	Semi-decentralisation	Centralisation	Strong centralisation	National centralisation with local adaptation
Government Role	Setting a common standard	Organising the core framework	Organise nationally	Full control	Organise the national curriculum
School Flexibility	Very high	high	Limited	Limited	Medium
Teacher's Role	Implementer and developer	The main developer of the curriculum	Policy implementer	Curriculum organiser	Executor and adaptor
Learning Focus	Academic and work readiness	Meaningful learning	Discipline and moral	Achievement and innovation	Competence and national values
Character Education	Integrated	Naturally integrated	Very emphasised	Integrated	Very emphasised
Evaluation & Assessment	National standards and tests	Formative Assessment	National exam	Standardised evaluation	National assessment
Global Orientation	High	High	Medium	Very high	Medium-high
Local Cultural Context	Moderate	High	Very High	High	Very High

Aspects of Data Collection Strategies in Education Systems in Five Countries.

This study analyzes data collection strategies in education in five countries with different education systems: Singapore, Indonesia, the United States, Japan, and Finland. Data collection strategies include data collection methods, types of data collected, actors involved, and data utilization in education policymaking.

Singapore

The education system in Singapore emphasizes a balance between mastering science, practical skills, and moral development of students. The Singapore curriculum applies a very structured and holistic approach. This approach system not only focuses on students' academic achievements, but also on the development of student character, and student skills.

The educational curriculum in Singapore applies a strong emphasis on Mathematics and Science, namely using the "Concrete-Pictorial-Abstract" (CPA) learning model. Then the integration of technology in education, where the Ministry of Education (MOE) of the

government has full authority over the collection, handling, and implementation of educational data.

Indonesia

Indonesia implements a mixed centralized and decentralized education data collection strategy. The central government manages national systems such as the Basic Education Data (Dapodik) and the National Assessment (AN), while local governments and schools serve as the primary data collectors.

The information gathered pertains not just to student learning outcomes but also to student character, instructor competency, and the quality of the learning environment. However, challenges such disparities in technology infrastructure, the capacity of school operators, and consistency in data reporting continue to impede the deployment of data gathering. According to research, Indonesia has a thorough system for gathering data, but its efficacy still depends on how prepared local governments and educational institutions are.

United States

The United States implements an autonomous approach strategy in calculating data where education is by giving the main authority to the state and school districts. In this system, the federal government acts as a provider of accountability as well as a national-scale survey to monitor the development of all education.

Various data were collected through various instruments such as state standard test, National Education Progress Assessment (NAEP), school survey, to teacher performance evaluation which is used as the main means in collecting education data. The variety of collection methods and instruments used is a direct reflection of the diversity of education policies in each country.

Research findings shows that the approach produces very comprehensive and diverse data, but this system is constrained by a lack of consistency at the national level. Due to the difference in data collection standards, comparing achievements between regions is quite difficult to do.

Japan

Japan has developed an educational data networking strategy that emphasizes direct oblevation, continuous evaluation and discipline at the institutional level. Information data was obtained from various channels, namely from the implementation of school exams, reports of educators, and observation activities in the classroom as well as evaluations held by the local government.

This approach not only focuses on academic achievement, but also on the formation of character, attitude patterns and social values of students. In this practice, teachers play a crucial role as a process in data collection, especially in formative evaluation.

The research results revealed that the approach applied in Japan provides a very comprehensive picture of student development, although on the other hand it requires high dedication from teachers and schools in handling the administrative and reporting process.

Finlandia

Finland implements an educational data collection strategy based on full confidence in the professionalism of educators and formative evaluation. This system enuls national-scale exams, except at the final stage at certain levels of education to maintain the self-study process.

Information is obtained through teacher assessment, student reflection, and school evaluation by education authorities and data is collected through the assessment. Then the government uses this data to monitor the macro level system, instead of using it to control strict schools.

The findings of this study indicate that the quality of the collected data is much more prioritized than quantity. This system has proven effective in building inclusive learning and is fully oriented to student development

Discusion

The research reported in this document indicates that the way countries in the world develop their education system has much to do with how a country collects data and how it views education within its society. Singapore, Japan, Indonesia, and Finland each have very different methods for developing their education systems, but all five countries have similar goals in developing an educational system that meets the needs of students and provides them with the skills necessary to succeed in the 21st century.

Japan and Singapore have very regulated education systems that require careful coordination and consistency. Finland and the United States have less regulated, decentralized systems that allow for more autonomy and trust in teachers and schools to make educational decisions. In the case of Indonesia, there is a national curriculum framework that allows for local adaptation, creating additional complexity due to variations in Indonesia's cultural and geographical regions. Nonetheless, implementing the curriculum framework in Indonesia remains a challenge due to the lack of access to technology and an inadequate pool of qualified teachers.

This study finds no one superior curriculum system; rather that successful curriculum development is contingent upon teacher expertise, relevance to the context, and a close alignment between educational policy and practice. Through examining the experience of countries in the world, this research has established the fundamental importance of professionalizing teachers and maintaining a level of flexibility in achieving nationally based curriculum development.Introduction

The research reported in this document indicates that the way countries in the world develop their education system has much to do with how a country collects data and how it views education within its society. Singapore, Japan, Indonesia, and Finland each have very different methods for developing their education systems, but all five countries have similar goals in developing an educational system that meets the needs of students and provides them with the skills necessary to succeed in the 21st century.

Japan and Singapore have very regulated education systems that require careful coordination and consistency. Finland and the United States have less regulated, decentralized systems that allow for more autonomy and trust in teachers and schools to make educational decisions. In the case of Indonesia, there is a national curriculum framework that allows for local adaptation, creating additional complexity due to variations in Indonesia's cultural and geographical regions. Nonetheless, implementing the curriculum framework in Indonesia remains a challenge due to the lack of access to technology and an inadequate pool of qualified teachers.

This study finds no one superior curriculum system; rather that successful curriculum development is contingent upon teacher expertise, relevance to the context, and a close alignment between educational policy and practice. Through examining the experience of countries in the world, this research has established the fundamental importance of professionalizing teachers and maintaining a level of flexibility in achieving nationally based curriculum development.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this comparative study demonstrates that there is no single superior model of curriculum development applicable to all countries, as each education system is shaped by its social context, governance structure, and policy priorities. While Japan and Singapore emphasize centralized regulation and consistency, and Finland and the United States prioritize decentralization, autonomy, and trust in educators, Indonesia adopts a hybrid approach through a national curriculum framework with local adaptation. Despite these differences, all countries

share a common commitment to equipping students with competencies required for the 21st century. The findings highlight that effective curriculum development depends not solely on the degree of regulation, but on the professionalism and preparedness of teachers, the relevance of the curriculum to local and national contexts, and the alignment between educational policy and classroom practice. Therefore, strengthening teacher capacity and maintaining curricular flexibility emerge as key factors in achieving sustainable and context-responsive national curriculum development.

REFERENCES

Aho, E., Pitkänen, K., & Sahlberg, P. (2016). Policy development and reform principles. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 24*(61), 1–24.

Anwar, R. (2021). Kebijakan kurikulum dan tantangan implementasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 27*(1), 1–10.

Apple, M. W. (2019). *Ideology and curriculum* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Au, W. (2011). Teaching under the new Taylorism: High-stakes testing and the standardization of the 21st century curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry, 41*(1), 25–45.

Autio, T. (2017). Curriculum thinking in Finland. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 49*(3), 1–20.

Bjork, C. (2016). High-stakes testing and curriculum change in Japan. *Comparative Education Review, 60*(2), 1–21.

Cave, P. (2018). *Schooling and education in Japan*. Routledge.

Chia, L. S. (2020). Future-ready curriculum in Singapore. *International Journal of Educational Development, 72*, 1–9.

Cuban, L. (2018). Curriculum reform and classroom practice. *Harvard Educational Review, 88*(1), 1–24.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 291–309.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wilhoit, G., & Pittenger, L. (2014). Accountability for college and career readiness. *Educational Policy, 28*(2), 1–28.

Deng, Z., & Gopinathan, S. (2016). Curriculum reform in a global context. *The Curriculum Journal, 27*(4), 1–20.

Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press.

Gopinathan, S. (2015). Education reform in Singapore. *Journal of Education Policy, 30*(1), 1–16.

Halinen, I. (2018). The new Finnish national core curriculum. *Improving Schools, 21*(1), 1–15.

Hamalik, O. (2017). *Dasar-dasar pengembangan kurikulum*. Bumi Aksara.

Hood, C. (2015). Educational reform and globalization in Japan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 35*(2), 1–14.

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2020). *Kebijakan pengembangan kurikulum nasional*.

Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2022). *Kurikulum Merdeka*.

Koh, K. (2019). Assessment and curriculum reform. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 26*(2), 1–17.

Lavonen, J. (2018). Curriculum reform in Finland. *Education Inquiry, 9*(3), 1–17.

Lewis, C., & Takahashi, A. (2013). Curriculum and lesson study. *Educational Researcher, 42*(6), 1–10.

Low, E. L. (2018). Teacher education and curriculum policy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 69*, 1–10.

Ministry of Education Singapore. (2019). *Learn for life initiative*.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2017). *Course of study*.

Mulyasa, E. (2018). *Pengembangan dan implementasi kurikulum*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Ng, P. T. (2017). Learning from Singapore. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 16*(3), 1–15.

Niemi, H. (2016). Teacher professionalism in Finland. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 64*(4), 1–19.

Nurhadi. (2020). Evaluasi kurikulum nasional. *Cakrawala Pendidikan, 39*(2), 1–13.

OECD. (2018). *Education policy outlook: Japan*. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2019). *Education policy outlook: Singapore*. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2020). *Education policy outlook: Finland*. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2021). *Education policy outlook: Indonesia*. OECD Publishing.

Ravitch, D. (2016). *The death and life of the great American school system*. Basic Books.

Sahlberg, P. (2015). *Finnish lessons 2.0*. Teachers College Press.

Sahlberg, P. (2018). Educational reform for equity and excellence. *Journal of Education Policy, 33*(4), 1–15.

Sato, M. (2014). Curriculum standardization in Japan. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44*(2), 1–19.

Schmidt, W. H., Wang, H. C., & McKnight, C. C. (2015). Curriculum coherence. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 47*(2), 1–18.

Simola, H. (2015). The Finnish education mystery. *Educational Research, 57*(4), 1–16.

Suparno, P. (2016). Pendidikan karakter dalam kurikulum. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 21*(3), 1–14.

Suyanto, & Jihad, A. (2019). Reformasi kurikulum di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Nasional, 8*(2), 1–12.

Takayama, K. (2017). Japanese education reform discourse. *Journal of Education Policy, 32*(4), 1–18.

Tan, C. (2018). Curriculum reform in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 38*(1), 1–15.

Tan, O. S. (2014). Competency-based curriculum in Singapore. *Educational Research, 56*(3), 1–14.

Tirri, K., & Kuusisto, E. (2013). Holistic education in Finland. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 45*(3), 1–18.

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2014). The Japanese model of holistic education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 63*, 1–10.

U.S. Department of Education. (2018). *A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of ESEA*.

Yamamoto, Y. (2016). Moral education and curriculum reform in Japan. *Educational Studies, 42*(4), 1–15.

Zais, R. S. (2017). Curriculum principles and practices in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction, 10*(4), 1–16.

Zhao, Y. (2016). *World class learners*. Corwin Press.