

From Pancasila to global citizenship: A new episteme of diversity in contemporary Indonesian education policy

Susanto^{1*}, Muhammad Fajru Sidqi¹, Dwi Ario Fajar¹, Rizka Hayati¹, Dwi Agustina¹, Pradnya Permanasari¹, Sarlita Dewi Matra¹, Ida Ayu Panuntun¹ and Inayatul Ulya¹

¹ Universitas Pekalongan, Pekalongan, Indonesia

*Corresponding author's email: susanto.unikal@gmail.com

Abstract

This article analyses the construction of global diversity in Indonesian education policy through Michel Foucault's Discourse Archaeology approach. The findings show that the discourse of global diversity in the Pancasila Student Profile (PPP) did not emerge naturally, but was the result of the convergence of three rationalities that formed a new episteme of education during Joko Widodo's administration. The first rationality is the moral rationality of Pancasila, which places Pancasila values as the highest moral source in shaping student character, as reflected in the Nawacita document and the vision of national character development. The second rationality is the global humanistic rationality, which adopts the discourse of tolerance, cultural openness, and intercultural interaction as universal moral values sourced from the UNESCO, OECD, and SDGs Global Citizenship Education framework. The third rationality is the technocratic rationality of developing superior human resources, which treats diversity as a strategic competency that can be measured, audited, and used as an indicator of educational success through instruments such as the Ministry of Education and Culture's Strategic Plan, curriculum regulations, BSKAP decisions, and learning outcomes. Through the interaction of these three rationalities, global diversity is constructed as stable, valid, and mandatory knowledge for every Indonesian student. This article argues that the new episteme of diversity not only combines national morality and global values, but also transforms both into technocratic components in human resource development projects. Thus, global diversity functions as a technology of power to shape students as Pancasila-based global citizens tolerant, competitive, and measurable.

Keyword

Global diversity, Pancasila, Episteme, Indonesian education policy

Published:
May 04, 2026

This work is licensed
under a [Creative
Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial 4.0
International License](#)

Selection and Peer-
review under the
responsibility of the 7th
BIS-HSS 2025 Committee

Introduction

In the past decade, Indonesian education has undergone a major epistemic shift marked by the introduction of the *Merdeka Curriculum* and the *Pancasila Student Profile (Profil Pelajar Pancasila, PPP)*. One of the most prominent dimensions of this new curricular framework is *global diversity (kebhinekaan global)*, which is positioned not simply as a moral value but as an essential competency required of every student. The PPP document defines global diversity as the capacity to understand cultural pluralism, engage respectfully with difference, and embody intercultural openness an articulation that constructs Indonesian learners simultaneously as national citizens and global citizens. Although this discourse appears progressive and universal, it is far from neutral. Rather, it emerges from a historically specific and politically charged configuration of power.

Under President Joko Widodo's administration, education policy has been strongly tied to the national project of building "superior human resources" (SDM unggul), a key pillar of his developmental populism. As articulated in the *RPJMN 2020–2024*, human resources are described as "the main capital of national development" whose quality determines Indonesia's competitiveness in a rapidly changing global environment. Students are therefore framed not primarily as subjects of rights, but as *human capital* to be optimized, measured, and mobilized for national progress (*RPJMN, 2020*). This form of subjectification resonates with what *Brown (2006)* identifies as the neoliberal "economization of the political", whereby citizens are recast as market-ready individuals governed through the logics of productivity, adaptability, and self-optimization. In this context, diversity itself becomes a strategic skill within the broader human-capital apparatus of twenty-first-century governance.

At the same time, the state reinforces *Pancasila* as the supreme moral framework for shaping student character. Through programs such as the *Revolusi Mental*, revitalization of ideological education, and the moralisation of citizenship, Pancasila is reproduced as the ultimate reference point for national identity and behavioural regulation. This mirrors *Žižek's (2008)* argument that ideology often operates not through explicit coercion but by establishing moral narratives that appear self-evident and universally valid. In the Indonesian context, Pancasila becomes the moral truth regime that legitimises state intervention into students' attitudes, behaviours, and modes of relating to difference.

The discourse of global diversity is further shaped by the adoption of global humanistic frameworks. Curriculum documents explicitly draw from UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education (GCED), OECD's Education 2030 learning compass, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These frameworks promote universal values such as tolerance, peace, intercultural communication, and global solidarity (*UNESCO, 2015; OECD, 2018*). As *Rizvi (2021)* and *Lim & Apple (2018)* argue, such global scripts often function as moralised discourses of modernity that present themselves as apolitical and humanitarian, despite being embedded in global power hierarchies. In Indonesian

curriculum documents, this global humanitarianism is harmonised with Pancasila morality, producing a hybrid normative framework that blends national ideology with transnational values.

These two rationalities the moral rationality of Pancasila and the global humanistic rationality of GCED are then subsumed under a third rationality: the technocratic rationality of human-resource development. Diversity becomes a competency that can be assessed, audited, and standardised through curriculum regulations, BSKAP decrees, graduate profiles, and learning outcome indicators. This transformation reflects Foucault's (1977, 1980) notion of power/knowledge, where moral concepts are converted into technical categories, enabling their measurement and governance. In this new technocratic regime, global diversity is framed not only as a moral imperative but also as a key performance indicator in national education reforms.

The convergence of these three rationalities Pancasila moral rationality, global humanistic rationality, and technocratic human-capital rationality forms a new episteme of diversity in Indonesian education. This episteme constructs global diversity as stable, legitimate, and mandatory knowledge for all students. As Laclau and Mouffe (2014a) remind us, hegemonic projects often succeed by stitching together disparate discourses into a coherent chain of equivalence. In the case of Indonesia, the articulation of Pancasila, global citizenship, and human-capital imperatives produces a powerful hegemonic discourse that naturalises global diversity as both ethically desirable and economically necessary.

Consequently, the discourse of global diversity does not merely encourage cultural openness; it functions as a technology of power that shapes students into Pancasila-based global citizens tolerant yet measurable, globally attuned yet morally anchored, open to the world yet disciplined by national standards. This study argues that analysing the emergence of this discourse requires attention to the historical and political conditions that enabled it, the institutional mechanisms that stabilised it, and the subjectivities it seeks to produce within the broader landscape of Jokowi's developmental populism (Aspinall & Mietzner, 2019; Kyle & Gultchin, 2018; Tugal, 2016).

Within this context, a Foucauldian Discourse Archaeology enables a systematic investigation of the rules, statements, and knowledge structures that govern how global diversity becomes thinkable, sayable, and actionable in Indonesian education policy. Such an analysis reveals that what appears to be a universal and harmonious vision of diversity is in fact a carefully constructed political-epistemic formation, deeply entangled with the imperatives of national moral identity, global legitimacy, and technocratic governance. This study examines how the discourse of global diversity is produced, legitimised, and operationalised within Indonesia's Kurikulum Merdeka. Using Foucault's discourse archaeology and Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory, the study is guided by two questions: first, how global diversity is constructed and stabilised in Indonesian education policy under Joko Widodo's administration; and second, what historical transformations and political rationalities shape its emergence within the

Pancasila Student Profile. These questions aim to reveal the power–knowledge relations that define legitimate meanings of diversity and govern student subjectivity through curriculum policy.

Method

This study employs a qualitative interpretive design using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA), complemented by Laclau and Mouffe’s post-structural discourse theory. This approach is used to examine how the discourse of global diversity emerges, becomes stabilized, and operates within Indonesian education policy during the Joko Widodo administration, particularly through epistemic rules, political articulations, and subject-forming mechanisms.

Data Sources

The study analyzes key national education policy documents and curricular materials that shape the formal discourse of global diversity. These include macro-policy documents such as the RPJMN 2020–2024, *Nawacita*, and the Jokowi–Ma’ruf vision and mission; education governance documents such as the Ministry of Education Strategic Plan 2020–2024, the Pancasila Student Profile framework, BSKAP Decision No. 031/H/KR/2024, and Permendikbudristek No. 12/2024; as well as curricular and instructional texts, including English learning outcomes in *Kurikulum Merdeka* and English textbooks for elementary to senior high school levels. These documents were selected because they represent the main discursive sites through which the state articulates educational goals, moral values, global orientations, and student identity formation.

Analytical Procedure

The analysis was conducted in three stages. First, Foucauldian archaeological analysis was used to identify the conditions that make global diversity appear as legitimate educational knowledge. This involved examining rules of formation, enunciative authority, surfaces of emergence, and systems of dispersion across policy and curriculum texts. Through repeated readings, three main rationalities were identified: moral-Pancasila, global-humanistic, and technocratic-human-capital. Second, Laclau and Mouffe’s hegemonic articulation analysis was applied to explain how diverse ideas such as Pancasila, tolerance, SDGs, competitiveness, and global citizenship are connected into a coherent discourse. This stage examined articulation, nodal points, floating signifiers, and hegemonic closure to show how global diversity becomes a dominant educational discourse. Third, subjectification analysis, drawing on Foucault’s concepts of technologies of power and technologies of the self, was used to examine how curriculum documents shape students’ and teachers’ conduct, identity, and affective orientations. This analysis focused on self-regulation, moral instructions, behavioral prescriptions, learning outcomes, and the implicit norms that construct the ideal figure of the global–Pancasila student.

Coding and Analytical Tools

The study used a codebook combining deductive codes derived from theory and inductive codes developed from policy statements. The codes were grouped into four main categories: rationalities, discursive functions, subject positions, and technologies of governance. Coding was conducted manually and supported by spreadsheet-based content matrices to maintain traceability between textual evidence and analytical interpretation.

Validity and Reflexivity

Analytical robustness was strengthened through triangulation across policy, curriculum, and textbook documents, iterative coding cycles, and reflexive positionality. The study acknowledges that discourse interpretation is situated and influenced by the researcher's standpoint.

Results and discussion

Archaeology of global diversity: The emergence of a new episteme

Foucauldian archaeological analysis reveals that global diversity (*kebhinekaan global*) emerges not as an isolated concept but as a node that stabilizes multiple discursive statements across documents. Three dominant *enunciative formations* crystallize around it.

1. The moral Pancasila formation
Policy documents consistently frame diversity as a moral duty grounded in Pancasila. Statements such as “*students must embody Pancasila values in character and conduct*” (PPP, p. 3) position global openness as an extension of national morality. Diversity here is not descriptive but prescriptive: it dictates the ethical horizon of the ideal Indonesian student.
2. The global humanistic formation
A second formation emerges from UNESCO, OECD, ASEAN, and SDGs frameworks integrated into the curriculum. Terms such as “*global citizen*,” “*universal values*,” “*intercultural competence*,” and “*harmonious coexistence*” are adopted almost verbatim. These statements situate Indonesia within a global regime of educational comparability and moral universalism. Diversity becomes a cosmopolitan virtue.
3. The technocratic-human capital formation
The third formation reflects deeply technocratic rationalities. Diversity is reframed as a measurable competency necessary for economic competitiveness. Statements like “*global diversity is essential to succeed in the future job market*” (Renstra, p. 10) and “*diversity-based skills contribute to innovation and*

productivity” (RPJMN, p. 29) treat cultural openness not as identity but as labour-market capital.

Together, these formations constitute a new episteme in which global diversity becomes:

- a. morally righteous,
- b. globally validated, and
- c. economically instrumental.

This triple function transforms global diversity into knowledge that appears natural, self-evident, and indispensable.

Genealogy: Historical-political conditions of possibility

While archaeology maps the structural rules of discourse, genealogy examines the historical, political, and ideological forces that made the emergence of global diversity possible. The analysis identifies five historical layers shaping diversity discourse:

1. Colonial period-diversity as disorder
Under Dutch rule, difference was framed as a source of disorder requiring control. Ethnic categories were classified hierarchically, and legal pluralism justified colonial governance. Diversity existed as a *problem of management*, not as value.
2. New order-diversity as risk
The Suharto era positioned diversity as a security risk. Slogans such as “unity above difference” reflected a disciplinary regime that tolerated diversity only insofar as it did not threaten political stability. Cultural heterogeneity was permitted but depoliticised.
3. Reformasi – diversity as identity
In the post-1998 context, diversity became tied to rights-based identity politics. Decentralisation, local autonomy, and the recognition of minority identities reframed diversity as cultural entitlement. This produced pluralism, but also fragmentation and contestation.
4. Globalisation – diversity as universal morality
With Indonesia’s integration into global governance frameworks, diversity was discursively aligned with universal human rights, intercultural communication, and sustainable development. UNESCO’s and OECD’s framings introduced a cosmopolitan tone to policy discourse.
5. Jokowi era – diversity as competency and human capital
Under Jokowi, diversity undergoes a new transformation: it becomes a strategic competency to build “*high-quality, competitive human resources*” (RPJMN, p. 29).

This shift marks the move from moral-cultural to technocratic logic: diversity is no longer merely something to be respected; it is something to be *measured, audited, cultivated, and optimised*. It becomes a skill for employability, innovation, and global mobility.

Through these shifting layers, genealogy reveals that the current discourse of global diversity represents the convergence of moral nationalism, global humanitarianism, and neoliberal technocracy—an articulation unique to the Jokowi administration’s political project.

Regime of truth: Moral, global, and technocratic legitimations

Foucault’s concept of “regime of truth” illuminates how discourses gain authority and become normative. In this study, global diversity is legitimised through three intertwined truth-claims:

1. Moral-National Legitimacy

Statements in PPP and national ideology documents position global diversity as an extension of Pancasila’s moral authority. For example: “*to be a good citizen, students must reflect divine values and uphold harmony across cultural differences*” (PPP, p. 16). Moral truth thus anchors diversity in national identity.

2. Global Universalist Legitimacy

UNESCO-MGIEP, SDGs, PISA, and OECD frameworks are repeatedly invoked as sources of “scientific” and “internationally accepted” truths. Citations such as “*UNESCO reports that Asia’s curricula lack global citizenship content*” (PPP, p. 18) give global diversity an aura of inevitability and correctness.

3. Technocratic-Economic Legitimacy

The strongest legitimising force is technocratic: diversity becomes measurable via competencies, indicators, learning outcomes, and skill taxonomies. Statements like “*global diversity is essential to face the demands of Industry 4.0*” (Renstra, p. 8) reflect the dominance of this regime.

Together, these legitimations create a powerful assemblage in which global diversity becomes *truth*—not simply an idea or value but a governing norm embedded in policy, curriculum, and evaluation.

Subjectification: Producing the global-Pancasila student

The final layer examines how discourse shapes the ideal learner, drawing on Foucault’s concept of *subjectification* and Laclau–Mouffe’s notion of *subject positions*. Across documents, the student is constructed as a hybrid figure: a Pancasila-based global citizen. Three mechanisms shape this subject:

1. Moral subjectification

The student must internalise moral values: “*reflect divine attributes,*” “*prioritise the common good,*” “*maintain harmony*”. These statements demand self-governance, moral discipline, and affective regulation.

2. Intercultural subjectification

The student must acquire universal behaviours: “*communicate equally*,” “*avoid stereotypes*,” “*promote cultural exchange*”. Here, the student becomes a cosmopolitan subject aligned with global citizenship norms.

3. Competency-based subjectification

The student must exhibit measurable diversity-related capabilities: analysis, classification, collaboration, reflective thinking. For instance: “*students identify groups based on behaviour, gender, communication style, and culture*” (PPP, p. 27). Such competencies transform diversity into a skillset that can be assessed and improved.

Through these three mechanisms, the student is shaped into a productive, tolerant, responsible, and globally competitive figure who aligns moral-national ethics with global humanistic values and technocratic metrics.

This constitutes the hegemonic articulation of the “Global-Pancasila Student” the ultimate subject of Kurikulum Merdeka.

The findings of this study demonstrate that “global diversity” in Indonesian education policy is not a neutral pedagogical innovation but a discursive construction that emerges from the articulation of multiple rationalities under specific political and historical conditions. Through an archaeological reading, the study reveals that the discourse of global diversity is produced at the intersection of Pancasila moralism, global humanitarianism, and technocratic human capital logic. In Foucault’s terms, this configuration constitutes a new episteme that defines what counts as legitimate knowledge about diversity and what forms of subjectivity must be cultivated in the figure of the “ideal” Indonesian student. The convergence of these rationalities constructs an apparently coherent and naturalised truth regime that is taken for granted in policy language, curriculum documents, and classroom materials.

The genealogical analysis further clarifies that this episteme does not emerge *ex nihilo* but inherits sedimented traces from earlier political regimes. Diversity has historically been governed as disorder in the colonial period, as a security threat in the New Order, as a rights-based entitlement in the Reformasi era, and as a universal virtue under globalisation. In the Jokowi era, these earlier discursive patterns are rearticulated and stabilised into a new form in which diversity has become a measurable competency aligned with the project of producing “SDM unggul” (superior human resources). Foucault’s notion of governmentality illuminates this shift: diversity becomes an object of administrative control, not through repression but through the shaping of dispositions, emotions, and intercultural behaviours that align students with state-defined norms of global citizenship. As the analysis shows, policy statements such as “Pelajar Pancasila yang berkebinekaan global” (Wahyudin et al., 2024) and learning outcomes such as “students demonstrate intercultural sensitivity in global

communication” (BSKAP, 2022) exemplify how moral, global, and technocratic rationalities are braided together to create a governable subject.

The discursive synthesis identified in this study resonates with Laclau and Mouffe’s theory of hegemony, particularly their argument that hegemonic projects are built around floating signifiers whose meanings are stabilised through chains of equivalence. “Global diversity” functions precisely as such a floating signifier. It binds together nationalist ideals (“Pancasila character”), cosmopolitan values (“global citizenship”), and economic imperatives (“competitive human capital”), which in themselves are ideologically heterogeneous and often contradictory. The success of this articulation lies in its ability to eliminate antagonisms by presenting these contradictions as harmonious. The official narrative asserts that the student must be at once morally rooted in national identity, open to global cultural flows, and equipped with cognitive and behavioural competencies measurable through standardised indicators. Through this articulation, global diversity becomes an “empty signifier” that sutures disparate political projects into a single coherent discourse, naturalised through curricular instruments and assessment regimes.

This hegemonic process also produces specific forms of subjectivity. In Foucault’s sense, the curriculum acts as a technology of the self that invites students to internalise certain ways of feeling, behaving, and knowing. They are expected to be empathic, tolerant, and reflective, yet simultaneously efficient, disciplined, and competitive. Subjectification occurs through repeated discursive practices in textbooks, learning activities, and reflective tasks, which ask students to “compare cultural practices,” “reflect on identity,” and “demonstrate respectful behaviour across cultures.” These tasks are not merely pedagogical but normative, aligning students with broader political objectives of creating globally competent citizens who embody state-sanctioned values. The subject produced here what this article terms the “Pancasila-based global citizen” is therefore not a spontaneous outcome of intercultural engagement but the result of a calculated political-educational project.

The technocratic dimension adds another layer of complexity. The decision of the BSKAP to operationalise diversity into measurable indicators turns moral and cultural dispositions into quantifiable competencies. This transformation from value to metric exemplifies what Foucault describes as the dominance of biopolitical techniques, where populations are managed through assessment, evaluation, and performance monitoring. Diversity becomes an auditable field of expertise, framed through rubrics, descriptors, and learning outcomes. This process aligns Indonesian education with global policy trends identified by scholars such as Rizvi (2021) and Lim & Apple (2018), who argue that neoliberal globalisation increasingly governs education through the normative language of tolerance, empathy, and intercultural competence while masking the power relations that shape global mobility and inequality.

At the same time, the articulation of global diversity within the discourse of Pancasila moralism performs a distinctly Indonesian form of hegemonic consolidation. By rooting

global values in the moral authority of Pancasila, the state constructs a narrative in which nationalism and global citizenship are not only compatible but mutually reinforcing. This is a powerful political move, as it shields the project of neoliberal global integration from criticism by anchoring it in the nation's foundational ideology. It also sanitizes globalization by suggesting that global norms and national identity naturally converge, thereby depoliticizing the economic and geopolitical interests that underpin global citizenship agendas promoted by UNESCO, OECD, and SDGs frameworks.

Overall, the discussion reveals that the discourse of global diversity in the Curriculum Merdeka serves as a strategic site for the operation of power. It integrates moral authority, global knowledge, and technocratic governance into a single, coherent truth regime that legitimizes the production of a new kind of citizen subject. Through this discursive formation, the Indonesian state exercises governmentality by shaping not only what students must know but also how they must behave, feel, and relate to cultural others. In doing so, the curriculum becomes an apparatus of hegemony, simultaneously advancing a neoliberal human capital agenda and reinforcing national moral identity through the language of global citizenship.

Conclusion

This article concludes that global diversity in Indonesia's Kurikulum Merdeka is not a neutral educational value, but a historically and politically constructed discourse shaped by moral, humanitarian, and technocratic rationalities. Using Foucauldian archaeology and genealogy, combined with Laclau and Mouffe's theory of discourse and hegemony, the study shows that global diversity functions as both a moral virtue and a measurable competency within the Pancasila Student Profile. It operates as a floating signifier that connects national identity, global citizenship, and economic competitiveness while concealing underlying tensions between nationalism, cosmopolitanism, moral values, and market demands. The study argues that global diversity works as a technology of power that forms the ideal subject of the "Pancasila-based global citizen," while also contributing to broader debates on curriculum, citizenship education, and the politics of diversity.

References

1. Ahl, H. (2007). Sex business in the toy store: A narrative analysis of a teaching case. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(5), 673–693.
2. Anggraena, E. al. (2020). *Kajian Pengembangan Profil Pelajar Pancasila* (1st ed.). Kemenristekdikbud RI.
3. Apple, M. W. (2003). Patriotism, Religion, and the Struggle Over Knowledge in Schools. *Educational Policy*, 17(3), 385–391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904803017003005>
4. Aspinall, E., & Mietzner, M. (2019). Southeast Asia's Troubling Elections: Nondemocratic Pluralism in Indonesia. *Journal of Democracy*, 30(4), 104–118. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2019.0055>
5. Azevedo, M. L. N. de, & Robertson, S. L. (2022). Authoritarian populism in Brazil: Bolsonaro's Caesarism, 'counter-trasformismo' and reactionary education politics. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 20(2), 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1955663>
6. Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity* (Vol. 5). Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.

7. Boyraz, C. (2018). Neoliberal populism and governmentality in Turkey: The foundation of communication centers during the AKP era. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 44(4), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453718755205>
8. Brown, W. (2006). *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton University Press.
9. BSKAP. (2022). *Dimensi, Elemen, dan Subelemen Profil Pelajar Pancasila pada Kurikulum Merdeka*. 1–35.
10. Doğan, S., & Selenica, E. (2022). Authoritarianism and academic freedom in neoliberal Turkey. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 20(2), 163–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1899801>
11. Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge: Translated from the french by AM Sheridan Smith*. Pantheon Books.
12. Kyle, J., & Gultchin, L. (2018). Populism in Power Around the World. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3283962>
13. Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2014a). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (Vol. 8). Verso Books.
14. Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2014b). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. In Verso.
15. Lim, L., & Apple, M. W. (2016). *Strong state and curriculum reform*. Taylor & Francis.
16. Pinson, H. (2022). Neo Zionist right-wing populist discourse and activism in the Israel education system. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 20(2), 124–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1872372>
17. Popkewitz, T. S. (2018). *The formation of school subjects: The struggle for creating an American institution*. Routledge.
18. Rizvi, F. (2021). Populism, the state and education in Asia. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 0(0), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1910015>
19. Robertson, S. L., & Nestore, M. (2022). Education cleavages, or market society and the rise of authoritarian populism? *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 20(2), 110–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1955662>
20. Tugal, C. (2016). Neoliberal populism as a contradictory articulation. *European Journal of Sociology*, 57(03), 466–470. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003975616000205/type/journal_article
21. Wahyudin, D., Subkhan, E., Malik, A., Hakim, M. A., Sudiapermana, E., LeliAlhapip, M., Nur Rofika Ayu Shinta Amalia, L. S., Ali, N. B. V., & Krisna, F. N. (2024). *Kajian Akademik Kurikulum Merdeka. Kemendikbud*, 1–143.
22. Ylimaki, R. M., & Uljens, M. (2017). Theorizing educational leadership studies, curriculum, and didaktik: NonAffirmative education theory in bridging disparate fields. In *Leadership and Policy in Schools* (Vol. 16, Issue 2, pp. 175–227). Taylor & Francis.
23. Žižek, S. (2008). Tolerance as an ideological category. *Critical Inquiry*, 34(4), 660–682.