Journal of English Language and Education
ISSN 2597- 6850 (Online), 2502-4132 (Print)
Journal Homepage: https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/index

OPEN ACCESS Article

From Policy to Pedagogy: A conceptual Comparative Analysis of EFL Curriculum Policies in Indonesia, China, and South Korea

https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i3.2587

*Tari Agustin, Karina Septiani, Sukarno[abc]
[123]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: tariagustin.2025@student.uny.ac.id

A B S T R A C T

This study examined English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum policy in Indonesia, China, and South Korea through a qualitative comparative analysis of official curriculum documents and relevant scholarly literature. Drawing on Language Policy Theory, Curriculum Development Theory, and Educational Change Theory, the study explored how each country conceptualized English language education through curriculum orientation, pedagogical direction, and assessment practices. The findings revealed both similarities and differences across the three contexts. Indonesia adopted a relatively flexible and learner-cantered curriculum emphasizing communicative competence, learner autonomy, differentiated instruction, and contextualized learning through Kurikulum Merdeka. In contrast, China maintained a centralized and examination-oriented curriculum structure characterized by strong governmental regulation, curriculum standardization, and high-stakes assessment despite recent communicative reforms. Meanwhile, South Korea demonstrated a hybrid curriculum orientation that combined communicative language education, globalization agendas, and strong academic competitiveness. The study further found that EFL curriculum policy in Asia reflects ongoing negotiations among globalization, educational modernization, sociocultural priorities, and national educational goals. Moreover, curriculum reform did not automatically result in uniform classroom implementation because educational practices continued to be influenced by institutional support, teacher readiness, governance structures, and assessment culture. The study contributes to comparative education and language policy scholarship by providing a conceptual understanding of how different Asian governments construct English education through curriculum policy.

Keywords: *Comparative Education, Curriculum Reform, EFL Curriculum Policy, English Education In Asia, Language Policy*

Article History:
Received 17th May 2026
Accepted 04th June 2026
Published 05th June 2026

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of English as a global language has significantly transformed educational systems across the world, particularly within Asian countries where English primarily functions as a Foreign Language (EFL). In the contemporary era of globalization, English is strongly associated with international communication, technological advancement, academic mobility, and economic competitiveness, encouraging governments to strengthen English education through national curriculum reform and language policy initiatives (Spolsky, 2004; Sun & Rong, 2021). Across Asia, English education has increasingly become an important component of educational modernization and human capital development strategies, reflecting broader efforts to prepare learners for participation in global society and transnational communication networks (Kirkpatrick, 2017). Consequently, curriculum policy has emerged as an important instrument through which governments regulate, organize, and conceptualize English language education within national educational systems. Moreover, English education policy in Asia has become increasingly significant because it not only supports international competitiveness and economic development but also reflects ongoing

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

negotiations between global communication demands and local linguistic and cultural identities (Kirkpatrick, 2017; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007).

Recent scholarship suggests that many Asian countries have gradually shifted from traditional grammar-oriented English instruction toward communicative and competency-based curriculum models emphasizing learner-centered pedagogy, communicative competence, critical thinking, and intercultural communication (Butler, 2011; Richards, 2013). This transformation is strongly influenced by globalization and the increasing recognition of English as an international lingua franca within multilingual contexts (Galloway & Rose, 2015). Furthermore, curriculum reforms in Asian EFL contexts increasingly incorporate global citizenship, intercultural awareness, digital literacy, and twenty-first-century skills into English education as part of broader educational transformation agendas (Li et al., 2022; Nguyen & Hamid, 2024; Rose et al., 2021). Nevertheless, despite these shared global trends, the orientation and implementation of EFL curriculum policy continue to vary considerably across countries because educational reform is closely connected to local sociopolitical priorities, governance structures, educational traditions, and assessment cultures (Macalister, 2023; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007).

Indonesia, China, and South Korea represent three influential EFL contexts in Asia that demonstrate distinct approaches toward English curriculum policy and educational reform. In Indonesia, recent reforms through Kurikulum Merdeka emphasize learner autonomy, differentiated instruction, communicative competence, and contextualized learning as part of broader competency-based educational transformation (Kemendikbudristek, 2022; Permana, 2024). In contrast, China's EFL curriculum policy remains strongly characterized by centralized governance, curriculum standardization, and examination-oriented educational culture despite recent communicative curriculum reforms (Hu, 2005; Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022). Meanwhile, South Korea positions English education as an essential component of globalization and international competitiveness strategies while simultaneously maintaining highly competitive academic and assessment cultures (Ministry of Education of Korea, 2022; Park, 2009). These differing orientations demonstrate that EFL curriculum policy in Asia is shaped not only by pedagogical considerations but also by broader ideological, political, and socioeconomic priorities.

Problem Statement

Although many Asian countries have integrated English into their national education systems, the approaches adopted toward EFL education vary significantly across contexts. Differences can be observed in curriculum orientation, pedagogical direction, governance structures, and assessment systems implemented within different educational settings (Richards, 2013; Spolsky, 2004). Some countries prioritize learner autonomy, curriculum flexibility, and communicative pedagogy, whereas others maintain centralized governance, standardized curriculum structures, and examination-oriented educational cultures (Butler, 2011). These differences indicate that EFL curriculum policy reflects broader educational ideologies and national priorities rather than purely pedagogical concerns.

Recent scholarship further suggests that curriculum reforms across Asian EFL contexts demonstrate substantial variation in implementation and educational expectations due to differences in sociopolitical agendas, institutional structures, and globalization strategies (Nguyen & Hamid, 2024). In Indonesia, Kurikulum Merdeka promotes communicative competence, differentiated instruction, and learner-centered learning as part of competency-based educational reform (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). However, implementation challenges continue to emerge due to teacher readiness, institutional support, and unequal educational resources (Azizah, 2025; Zein, 2017). Conversely, China's EFL curriculum policy remains strongly influenced by centralized curriculum control and examination-oriented educational culture despite the incorporation of communicative learning goals (Hu, 2005; Wen & Zhang, 2020). Similarly, South Korea combines communicative curriculum reform with highly competitive academic culture and high-stakes assessment systems, producing tensions

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

between communicative pedagogy and examination-focused instructional practice (Chang, 2009; Park, 2009).

Research Gap

Research on EFL education in Asia has expanded considerably over the past decades, particularly regarding communicative language teaching, curriculum reform, globalization, and language policy implementation (Butler, 2011; Sun & Rong, 2021). Numerous studies have examined English education within individual national contexts such as Indonesia, China, and South Korea, focusing on classroom pedagogy, curriculum implementation, teacher perceptions, and examination-oriented educational culture (Hu, 2005; Park, 2009; Widodo, 2016). However, much of the existing scholarship remains context-specific and implementation-oriented rather than conceptually comparative. Although comparative discussions of language policy and English education in Asia have emerged (Kirkpatrick, 2017; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007), comparative conceptual analyses examining how different governments construct English education through curriculum policy remain relatively limited. Existing studies have generally emphasized classroom practices, language teaching approaches, policy implementation, and educational outcomes within individual contexts rather than systematically comparing curriculum policy frameworks across Asian EFL settings (Butler, 2011; Hu, 2005; Park, 2009; Widodo, 2016). Therefore, this study addresses this gap by providing a comparative conceptual analysis of EFL curriculum policies in Indonesia, China, and South Korea through the lenses of language policy, curriculum development, and educational change.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to conceptually compare EFL curriculum policies in Indonesia, China, and South Korea through the analysis of official government curriculum documents and relevant scholarly literature. Specifically, the study seeks to examine how each country conceptualizes English language education through ideological orientation, curriculum design, pedagogical direction, and assessment culture within their respective educational contexts.

Furthermore, the study aims to explore how broader factors such as globalization, educational modernization, national competitiveness, and sociocultural identity influence curriculum policy and English language education across the three countries. Through comparative analysis, the paper intends to provide deeper conceptual understanding of how governments construct English education within contemporary Asian EFL settings.

Literature and Theoretical Perspectives

This study is informed by several theoretical perspectives related to language policy, curriculum development, educational change, and English in Asian contexts. Language Policy Theory proposed by Spolsky (2004) provides an important framework for understanding how governments regulate and institutionalize English education within national educational systems. According to Spolsky (2004), language policy consists of language beliefs, language practices, and language management, all of which influence curriculum orientation, pedagogical expectations, and educational governance. In Asian EFL contexts, English education is frequently associated with globalization, economic competitiveness, and international communication, leading governments to strengthen curriculum reform and policy regulation (Kirkpatrick, 2017).

The study also adopts Curriculum Development Theory proposed by Richards (2013), which conceptualizes curriculum as an interconnected system involving curriculum goals, learning content, teaching methods, and assessment systems. Within Asian EFL education, curriculum reforms increasingly emphasize communicative competence, competency-based learning, intercultural communication, and learner-centered pedagogy as responses to global educational transformation (Butler, 2011; Rose et al., 2021). Nevertheless, curriculum

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

orientation continues to differ substantially according to local educational priorities and governance systems.

Educational Change Theory proposed by Fullan (2007) further supports the analysis by explaining how curriculum reform is implemented and negotiated within educational contexts. According to Fullan (2007), curriculum reform does not automatically produce pedagogical transformation because implementation is influenced by teacher readiness, institutional support, educational culture, and assessment systems. Consequently, implementation gaps frequently emerge between official curriculum policy and classroom practice within Asian EFL settings (Wedell & Grassick, 2018).

Finally, perspectives on English in Asian contexts proposed by Kirkpatrick (2017) and Galloway & Rose (2015) emphasize that English in Asia should be understood within multilingual, intercultural, and localized educational realities rather than solely through traditional native-speaker frameworks. Recent scholarship further highlights that Asian English education increasingly reflects negotiations among globalization, national identity, educational modernization, and local sociocultural priorities (Nguyen & Hamid, 2024). Therefore, these theoretical perspectives collectively provide a conceptual foundation for examining how Indonesia, China, and South Korea differently construct EFL curriculum policy within contemporary Asian educational contexts.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative conceptual comparative design using document analysis as the primary research approach. Conceptual studies aim to critically interpret, synthesize, and analyse theoretical perspectives, policy frameworks, and scholarly discussions in order to generate deeper conceptual understanding rather than empirical findings derived from surveys or experimental investigation (Jaakkola, 2020). In educational and language policy research, conceptual approaches are particularly relevant for examining curriculum ideology, educational reform, and comparative educational issues across sociocultural contexts because they enable researchers to connect theoretical perspectives with policy interpretation and educational discourse (Gilson & Goldberg, 2015).

The study adopted a qualitative orientation because the analysis focused on interpreting meanings, policy orientation, pedagogical priorities, and educational assumptions embedded within official curriculum documents (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Qualitative inquiry is widely utilized in curriculum and language policy studies because it allows researchers to explore how educational reforms reflect broader sociopolitical, institutional, and cultural contexts (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Through this approach, the study comparatively examined how Indonesia, China, and South Korea conceptualized English language education through curriculum orientation, pedagogical direction, and assessment culture.

Data Sources

The study utilized both primary and secondary documentary sources to examine EFL curriculum policy in Indonesia, China, and South Korea. The primary data consisted of official curriculum documents, government regulations, and policy-related documents issued by national educational authorities. These sources were selected because they represent formal educational policies, curriculum priorities, pedagogical expectations, and assessment orientations established at the national level (Prior, 2003). In comparative education and language policy research, such documents are considered important policy artifacts that reflect educational ideology, institutional priorities, and state-directed reform agendas (Bray et al., 2014).

For Indonesia, the study examined official curriculum documents and government regulations issued by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, particularly Kurikulum Merdeka, *Capaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris*, and related curriculum reform regulations (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). For China, the study analyzed the English

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Curriculum Standards for Compulsory Education (2022 Edition) issued by China's Ministry of Education (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022). For South Korea, the study examined the 2022 Revised National Curriculum issued by the Ministry of Education of Korea (Ministry of Education of Korea, 2022).

In addition to official curriculum documents and government regulations, the study reviewed policy reports and policy-related publications discussing English language education, curriculum reform, educational modernization, and language policy implementation in Asian contexts. These sources were used to provide contextual understanding of curriculum development and educational reform across the three countries.

The secondary data consisted of peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and scholarly publications indexed in reputable academic databases. These sources addressed language policy, curriculum development, educational change, globalization, and English language education in Asia. The secondary literature was used to support conceptual interpretation, theoretical analysis, and cross-national comparison of curriculum policies within broader educational and sociocultural contexts.

Instruments

The primary instrument employed in this study was a document analysis framework developed from the theoretical perspectives adopted in the research, particularly Language Policy Theory, Curriculum Development Theory, Educational Change Theory, and perspectives on English in Asian contexts. The framework was used to systematically identify and compare curriculum orientation, pedagogical direction, ideological assumptions, and assessment culture reflected within official curriculum policy documents. Several analytical dimensions guided the document analysis process, including ideological orientation, curriculum orientation, pedagogical orientation, assessment culture, and policy-to-practice implications. These dimensions enabled the researcher to identify similarities and differences among EFL curriculum policies in Indonesia, China, and South Korea while maintaining analytical consistency throughout the comparative process.

Procedures

The study was conducted through several stages. First, official curriculum documents and relevant scholarly literature were identified, selected, and reviewed based on their relevance to EFL curriculum policy and English language education in Asian contexts. Second, the selected documents were carefully read and categorized according to the analytical dimensions employed in the study, including curriculum orientation, pedagogical direction, assessment systems, and ideological priorities. Third, comparative analysis was conducted by identifying similarities, differences, and recurring patterns across curriculum policies in Indonesia, China, and South Korea. The analysis focused on how each country conceptualized English education through curriculum frameworks, pedagogical expectations, and educational priorities. Finally, the findings were interpreted using the theoretical perspectives adopted in the study in order to generate broader conceptual understanding regarding EFL curriculum reform within contemporary Asian educational contexts.

Data Analysis

The study employed qualitative comparative document analysis as the primary analytical technique. Document analysis refers to a systematic procedure for reviewing, interpreting, organizing, and synthesizing written materials in order to identify patterns, meanings, and conceptual insights relevant to a research problem (Bowen, 2009). Within this study, curriculum documents and scholarly literature were analysed through thematic categorization and comparative interpretation.

The analysis process involved identifying key themes related to curriculum orientation, communicative competence, learner-cantered pedagogy, educational governance, assessment culture, and curriculum implementation. These themes were subsequently compared across Indonesia, China, and South Korea in order to examine how different

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

governments constructed EFL education according to their sociopolitical priorities, educational traditions, and globalization agendas. Finally, the findings were interpreted through comparative and conceptual analysis to explain broader relationships among curriculum reform, educational ideology, language policy, and pedagogical implementation within Asian EFL contexts.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Ideological Orientation Across Contexts

The findings demonstrated that EFL curriculum policy in Indonesia, China, and South Korea was strongly influenced by broader ideological orientations related to globalization, educational modernization, national competitiveness, and sociocultural priorities. Although all three countries recognized the strategic importance of English within international communication and global engagement, each government conceptualized English education differently according to its national educational agenda and governance structure (Kirkpatrick, 2017; Spolsky, 2004).

Table 1. Ideological Orientation of EFL Curriculum Policies

Country	Ideological Orientation	Main Characteristics	Educational Emphasis
Indonesia	Flexible and reform-oriented	Learner autonomy, contextualized learning, communicative competence	Competency-based education
China	Centralized and standardized	State regulation, curriculum standardization, examination culture	Academic achievement and national modernization
South Korea	Hybrid and globalized	Communicative reform, globalization, academic competitiveness	International competitiveness and social mobility

Source: Adapted from (Kemendikbudristek, 2022; Ministry of Education of Korea, 2022; Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022)

Indonesia's EFL curriculum policy reflected a relatively flexible and reform-oriented orientation emphasizing learner autonomy, contextualized learning, and competency-based educational reform through Kurikulum Merdeka. According to the *Capaian Pembelajaran* Bahasa Inggris, English learning is expected to develop students' communicative competence through meaningful interaction, contextualized learning experiences, and differentiated instruction adapted to learners' needs (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). These priorities reflect a learner-centered educational philosophy and broader efforts to transform teaching and learning through competency-based education (Permana, 2024). In contrast, China's EFL curriculum policy demonstrated a more centralized and standardized orientation characterized by strong governmental regulation and examination-oriented educational culture despite the incorporation of communicative educational goals (Hu, 2005; Wen & Zhang, 2020). The English Curriculum Standards for Compulsory Education (2022 Edition) identifies language ability, cultural awareness, thinking capacity, and learning ability as the core competencies of English education, indicating that English learning is expected to support both communicative development and broader educational goals (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022). Meanwhile, South Korea reflected a hybrid orientation combining communicative educational reform, globalization strategies, and highly competitive academic culture in which English education was closely associated with educational achievement and social mobility (Park, 2009). The 2022 Revised National Curriculum explicitly emphasizes communication skills, learner participation, creativity, and future competencies while preparing students for global citizenship and international engagement (Ministry of Education of Korea, 2022).

These findings suggested that EFL curriculum policy in Asia functioned not only as a pedagogical framework but also as an ideological instrument through which governments negotiated globalization, educational reform, and national priorities. This finding supported previous studies arguing that language policy reflects broader sociopolitical and institutional agendas within educational systems (Spolsky, 2004; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007).

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Curriculum and Pedagogical Orientation Across Contexts

The comparative findings further revealed substantial differences in curriculum orientation and pedagogical direction across Indonesia, China, and South Korea. Although all three countries officially promoted communicative language education and competency-based learning, curriculum implementation and pedagogical expectations varied according to institutional structures, educational traditions, and governance systems (Richards, 2013).

Table 2. Curriculum and Pedagogical Orientation Across Contexts

Country	Curriculum Orientation	Pedagogical Orientation	Major Challenges
Indonesia	Flexible and learner-centered	Differentiated and communicative learning	Teacher readiness and educational inequality
China	Standardized and examination-oriented	Grammar-focused and test-oriented practices	High-stakes testing pressure
South Korea	Hybrid and competitive	Communicative learning with rigorous academic expectations	Examination-oriented culture

Source: Adapted from Widodo (2016), Zein (2017), Hu (2005), and Park (2009).

Indonesia's curriculum orientation demonstrated a relatively flexible and learner-centered approach through the implementation of Kurikulum Merdeka. The curriculum emphasized communicative competence, contextualized learning, differentiated instruction, and learner autonomy within English education (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). Specifically, the *Capaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris* encourages students to use English meaningfully for interaction, information exchange, and communication in diverse contexts, while teachers are encouraged to adapt learning activities according to students' needs and local conditions (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). Teachers were encouraged to adapt instructional practices according to students' learning needs and local educational contexts, reflecting broader educational reform efforts promoting competency-based and interactive learning (Widodo, 2016; Zein, 2017). However, implementation challenges related to teacher readiness, professional training, and educational inequality remained significant barriers within classroom practice (Permana, 2024).

Conversely, China's EFL curriculum demonstrated a highly standardized and examination-oriented pedagogical orientation despite incorporating communicative curriculum goals. Although the curriculum framework promoted communicative competence, learner participation, and intercultural awareness, classroom practices remained strongly influenced by high-stakes examinations such as the *Gaokao* (Hu, 2005). The curriculum document explicitly identifies communicative competence, cultural awareness, thinking capacity, and learning ability as core competencies that should be developed through English instruction (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022). Consequently, many English classrooms continued to prioritize grammar instruction, memorization, and test-focused learning strategies due to institutional expectations emphasizing academic achievement and standardized assessment (Wen & Zhang, 2020).

Similarly, South Korea reflected a hybrid pedagogical orientation balancing communicative educational reform with strong academic competitiveness. Curriculum frameworks encouraged communicative interaction, creativity, and learner participation while simultaneously maintaining structured academic expectations and rigorous assessment systems (Ministry of Education of Korea, 2022). The 2022 Revised National Curriculum highlights communication skills, collaboration, creativity, and learner engagement as essential competencies expected from English education in contemporary Korean society (Ministry of Education of Korea, 2022). Nevertheless, educational implementation remained strongly influenced by examination-oriented educational culture and societal pressure for academic success, particularly through the influence of the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT) (Chang, 2009; Park, 2009).

These findings indicated that communicative curriculum reform did not automatically produce similar pedagogical implementation across Asian EFL contexts. Instead, classroom practice continued to be shaped by local educational realities, institutional support,

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

sociocultural expectations, and assessment systems. This finding aligned with Educational Change Theory, which argues that curriculum reform is frequently negotiated and reinterpreted within different educational contexts rather than implemented uniformly (Fullan, 2007; Wedell & Grassick, 2018).

Assessment Culture and Policy-to-Practice Implications

Assessment culture emerged as one of the most influential factors affecting curriculum implementation across Indonesia, China, and South Korea. The findings demonstrated that assessment systems significantly shaped classroom instruction, pedagogical priorities, and students' learning experiences within English education (Cheng, 2008).

Table 3. Assessment Culture and Policy Implications

Country	Assessment Orientation	Main Assessment System	Policy-to-Practice Implications
Indonesia	Authentic and competency-based assessment	Project-based and formative assessment	Supports learner-centered learning
China	Examination-oriented assessment	*Gaokao*	Reinforces test-focused instruction
South Korea	High-stakes examination culture	*CSAT*	Shapes academic competitiveness

Source: Adapted from (Kemendikbudristek, 2022), Hu (2005), and Park (2009).

Indonesia increasingly promoted authentic and competency-based assessment aligned with the broader objectives of Kurikulum Merdeka. The curriculum encouraged project-based evaluation, communicative assessment, and formative learning practices intended to support meaningful learning and learner development (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). Official assessment guidelines within Kurikulum Merdeka emphasize formative assessment, performance tasks, projects, and reflective activities designed to support continuous learner development rather than solely measuring academic achievement through traditional testing (Kemendikbudristek, 2022). Nevertheless, many schools and teachers continued to experience difficulties adapting to alternative assessment approaches because traditional testing practices remained deeply embedded within educational culture (Permana, 2024).

In contrast, China maintained a strongly examination-oriented assessment culture characterized by high-stakes standardized testing and centralized educational evaluation. English assessment was closely associated with academic achievement, educational mobility, and university admission processes, particularly through the influence of the *Gaokao* examination system (Hu, 2005). Although the curriculum promotes comprehensive competency development, assessment practices remain closely aligned with standardized evaluation and university entrance requirements, particularly through the *Gaokao* examination system (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022). Consequently, assessment systems continue to reinforce examination-focused instructional practices.

Similarly, South Korea's EFL assessment culture remained heavily influenced by high-stakes examinations and academic competitiveness. The College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT) strongly shaped instructional priorities, students' learning strategies, and educational expectations because English proficiency was closely associated with university admission and social mobility (Park, 2009). While the curriculum increasingly promotes communicative learning and competency-based education, curriculum implementation remains closely connected to assessment expectations associated with the CSAT and broader academic performance indicators (Ministry of Education of Korea, 2022). Although curriculum reforms increasingly promoted communicative learning and learner-centered pedagogy, classroom implementation frequently remained examination-oriented due to institutional and societal pressure for academic performance (Chang, 2009).

The findings demonstrated that curriculum reform in Asian EFL contexts was shaped by complex interactions among educational ideology, governance systems, pedagogical priorities, sociocultural expectations, and assessment orientation. Consistent with Educational

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Change Theory, implementation gaps frequently emerged between official curriculum policy and actual classroom practice because curriculum reform required not only policy revision but also sustainable teacher development, institutional support, contextual adaptation, and alignment between curriculum goals and assessment systems (Fullan, 2007; Wedell & Grassick, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS

This study conceptually compared EFL curriculum policies in Indonesia, China, and South Korea through the analysis of official curriculum documents and relevant scholarly literature. The findings revealed that while all three countries recognize the importance of English for globalization, international communication, and educational development, they differ significantly in their curriculum orientations and implementation strategies. Indonesia emphasizes learner-centered and competency-based learning through *Kurikulum Merdeka*, China maintains a centralized and examination-oriented system despite ongoing communicative reforms, and South Korea adopts a hybrid model that balances communicative competence with academic competitiveness. The study also demonstrated that EFL curriculum policies are shaped not only by pedagogical goals but also by broader sociopolitical priorities, governance structures, educational traditions, and national assessment systems. Across the three contexts, assessment culture emerged as a key factor influencing curriculum implementation, often creating tensions between communicative learning objectives and examination-driven practices. Academically, this study contributes to the fields of comparative education, language policy, and EFL curriculum studies by providing a broader understanding of how English education is conceptualized across different Asian contexts. The findings highlight the importance of contextual and institutional factors in educational reform. Future research is recommended to investigate classroom implementation, teacher and student perspectives, and emerging issues such as digital learning, artificial intelligence, and multilingual education within contemporary EFL curriculum development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to all lecturers, academic colleagues, and institutions that helped me with this study. Appreciation is also extended to researchers and scholars whose works contributed significantly to the theoretical and conceptual development of this paper. The author additionally acknowledges the use of artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted tools to help me with my writing especially to make my language better, check my grammar, improve my sentences and make my academic writing better. However, all interpretations, analyses, arguments, and conclusions presented in this study remain entirely the responsibility of the author. No external funding was received for this study.

REFERENCES

Azizah, D. M. (2025). *A literature review on the implementation and challenges of the language policy in teaching English to young learners*. https://doi.org/10.38048/jipcb.v12i2.5360

Bowen, G. A. (2009). *Document analysis as a qualitative research method*. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Bray, M., Adamson, B., & Mason, M. (2014). *Comparative Education Research* (M. Bray, B. Adamson, & M. Mason (eds.)). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05594-7

Butler, Y. G. (2011). *The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000122

Chang, B. M. (2009). *Korea's English education policy innovations to lead the nation into the globalized world*.

Cheng, L. (2008). *Washback, impact and consequences*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_24

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.)*.
Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.)*.
Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing global Englishes*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734347
Gilson, L. L., & Goldberg, C. B. (2015). Editors' Comment. *Group & Organization Management*, *40*(2), 127–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115576425
Hu, G. (2005). *English language education in China: Policies, progress, and problems*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-004-6561-7
Jaakkola, E. (2020). *Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0
Kemendikbudristek. (2022). *Keputusan Kepala Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan Nomor 033/H/KR/2022 tentang capaian pembelajaran pada pendidikan anak usia dini, jenjang pendidikan dasar, dan jenjang pendidikan menengah pada Kurikulum Merdeka*. https://kurikulum.kemdikbud.go.id
Kirkpatrick, A. (2017). *The languages and linguistics of ASEAN*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48145-9
Li, F., Fan, S., & Wang, Y. (2022). Mobile-assisted language learning in Chinese higher education context: a systematic review from the perspective of the situated learning theory. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(7), 9665–9688. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11025-4
Macalister, J. (2023). *Teacher agency and curriculum reform in Asian English language education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2022.2145116
Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.)*.
Ministry of Education of Korea. (2022). *2022 Revised National Curriculum*. https://english.moe.go.kr
Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2022). *English Curriculum Standards for Compulsory Education (2022 Edition)*. http://en.moe.gov.cn
Nguyen, T. M. H., & Hamid, M. O. (2024). *Language policy and English curriculum reform in Asian education systems*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09678-4
Park, J. K. (2009). *'English fever' in South Korea: Its history and symptoms*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607840900008X
Permana, P. G. A. M. (2024). *Contemporary translingual English language policy and practices in Indonesian education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2404059
Prior, L. (2003). *Using documents in social research*.
Richards, J. C. (2013). *Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293
Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2021). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching*, *54*(2), 157–189. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518
Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615245
Sun, W., & Rong, X. L. (2021). *English education reform in Asian countries*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.838
Tsui, A. B. M., & Tollefson, J. W. (Eds.). (2007). *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*.
Wedell, M., & Grassick, L. (2018). *International perspectives on teachers living with curriculum change*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-54348-5
Wen, Q., & Zhang, H. (2020). *China going global: Challenges and responses in English as a foreign language teaching and teacher education*. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108856218.007
Widodo, H. P. (2016). *Language policy in practice: Reframing the English language curriculum in the Indonesian secondary education sector*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_6
Zein, S. (2017). *Language-in-education policy on primary EFL in Indonesia: Current practices and future directions*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1266643
OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.