AL-TA'LIM JOURNAL, 26 (3), 2019, (243-253)

(Print ISSN 1410-7546 Online ISSN 2355-7893)

Available online at <http://journal.tarbiyahainib.ac.id/index.php/attalim>

The Changing of Islamic education curriculum Paradigm in Public Universities

Received: 31th April 2019; Revised: 28th May 2019; Accepted: 30th November 2019

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15548/jt.v26i3.552>

Yusuf Hanafi *)

Universitas Negeri Malang, Jawa Timur
Indonesia

E-mail: yusuf.hanafi.fs@um.ac.id

***) Corresponding Author**

Abstract: Since the reformation era, the curriculum of Islamic Education in public universities has gone through such three modifications as Islamic education curriculum of 2000, 2002, and 2013. The objective of this research is to analyze the construction of the three kinds of the curriculum as well as the changing of the paradigm related to them comparatively. The paradigm of Islamic education curriculum 2000 was the continuity of the curriculum in the New Order era which was purely oriented to normative Islamic concepts (*aqidah*, *syari'at*, *akhlak*). In the opposite, Curriculum 2002 indicated many changes in its paradigm and material. Religion was not only a set of norms, but it also existed in reality and it was dynamic in responding the development of human being. Meanwhile, curriculum 2013 tried to emphasize the scientific learning approach by activating the students in building their knowledge. In other words, the learning activity is activity base-oriented, not content base-oriented.

Keywords: Changing of paradigm; Islamic education curriculum in public universities; curriculum 2013.

How to Cite: Hanafi, Y. (2020). The changing of Islamic education curriculum paradigm in public universities. *Al-Ta Lim Journal*, 26(3). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15548/jt.v26i3.552>

INTRODUCTION

The Islamic Education learning in public universities (PU) undergoes flux modification. In the early of 1960s, Religion Education was a general subject that was not obligated since it was merely a “suggested” subject (Douglass & Shaikh, 2004; Halstead, 2004; Hilgendorf, 2003). In the new order era, Religion Education was enhanced to be a compulsory subject given to every student and managed by a bureau of religion education subject altogether with other compulsory subjects like Pancasila Education, Manliness Education, Citizenship Education, Indonesian Language Education and the other subjects.

Based on the mandate of curriculum 1983, the management of Compulsory Subject was shifted from bureau to General Basic Subject (GBS) under a faculty of which the field was closely related. The naming of GBS had a clear philosophy basis since the subjects included were the foundations giving a basis of religiosity spiritual, moral, nationality, nationalism and cultural social in developing the field and the expertise of every learner.

In 1990, the name of GBS changed into General Subject (GS) and in 2000 it changed again into Personality Development Subject (PDS). The change of this compulsory subject group name was followed by the alteration of institution and

management. Previously, GBS was at the level of department (Department of GBS), and subsequently, the management of GBS has been shifted to a Unit of Technical Manager of General Subject under the direct coordination of vice rector I for academic affair up to now.

The alteration of GBS into GS and PDS showed the flux modification of the existence and institutional of this compulsory subject group. Besides, the implementation merely tended to fulfill the demand of law and rule. Therefore, it was possibly reasonable if some of the students, lecturers, study programs and the chairmen of university viewed this compulsory subject as only a “complement” of the curriculum.

Referring to the Law number 12, 2012 about high education, the name of PDS changed into General Compulsory Subject (GCS). The alteration was expected to return the function and role of GCS as a group of subject giving spirit and basis in developing the students’ personality and field.

The alteration was not only on the subject nomenclature, Islamic education – as a part of religion education – has gone through the modifications of its content standard. Since the Reformation Order, Islamic Education subject has changed three times; they were Islamic education curriculum of 2000, 2002 and 2013. Reconstruction of Islamic education curriculum should be critically paid attention on, whether the alteration is in line with the situation and condition of the society or it is merely the part of reformation euphoria to perform “in different” from the New Order curriculum model previously. Based on such case, the author is willing to examine the changing of Islamic education curriculum post-New Order regime (Nor & Malim, 2014; Pohl, 2006).

As the previous note, in 2000, the government through Director-General of High Education issued a Decree Number: 263/DIKTI/KEP/2000 about refinement of main curriculum of personality Development and religion education in universities in

Indonesia. However, it had not been two years; the high education changed the Islamic education curriculum in public university again via a Decree Number: 38/DIKTI/KEP/2002.

Recently, the Islamic education curriculum changed again based on curriculum 2013. The most prominent thing of the last curriculum reconstruction was the scientific approach as the learning approach by activating the students (active student centered) to build the knowledge (epistemological approaches) (Yasin & Jani, 2013). Briefly, the Islamic education learning is oriented more on the activity (activity-based), not on the content or content base (Court, 2013).

In the Islamic education curriculum 2013, the paradigm tends to change, and thus it gives impact to the learning approach changing if it is compared to the previous Islamic education curriculum 2000 and 2002. Such radical changing is interesting to examine. This problem will be the study focus of this paper.

This paper intends to identify the construction of the Islamic education curriculum in public universities in the last 15 years (in the reform era), while analyzing the paradigm shift from the curriculum for Islamic education in 2000, 2002 and 2013.

METHOD

This paper relies on the qualitative study attempting to collect, manage, analyze and define the data qualitatively (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Whittemore et al., 2001). The qualitative research generally is looser to the data collecting instrument since it focuses on the process rather than on the research object (Muhadjir, 2000), so the qualitative research is conducted based on the accurate data collected through literature study (Coleman & Robinson, 2018).

All data used in this research was from the literature sources. The data collection was conducted through a literature study that was relevant to the topic being discussed. The data

sources included: literature books, documents, newspapers, magazines, journals and websites (internet) containing the needed information. The collected data was classified based on the type to be analyzed further.

The collected data was analyzed by using content or text analysis technique that is studying the texts meticulously relying on the requirements like Muhadjir (2000) states – objective and systematic. In the data analysis, inductive and deductive logic were used in varied like in the general qualitative research.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the Law Number 20, 2003 about National Education system used as a basis for implementing national education, it is stated that religion education is aiming at forming the students to be a faithful and committed to the god and have good deeds. It is stated as

well that High Education curriculum must contain Religion Education.

As the part of main curriculum of high education, Islamic Education cannot be separated from the government control and political needs developing when the curriculum is implemented. Briefly, the orientation, vision, mission of a government regime might influence the content of Islamic Education.

In new order era, Islamic Education in PU was oriented purely to the basic concepts of Islamic norms. The discussion domain included such three main principles of Islamic teaching as: *aqidah*, *syariah*, and *akhlak*. These concepts are explored in the Islamic education curriculum in PU. After the new order collapse, the Islamic education curriculum changed three times and it is presented in below table.

Tabel 1. Islamic education curriculum in PU post new order

Year	Subject Name	Juridical Basis
Islamic education curriculum 2000	Personality Development Subject (PDS)	Decree Number: 263/DIKTI/ KEP/2000 about Refinement of Main Curriculum of Religion Education in PU
Islamic education curriculum 2002	Personality Development Subject (PDS)	Decree of National Education Ministry Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Number 045/U/2002
Islamic education curriculum 2013	General Compulsory Subject (GCS)	Law Number 12, 2012, about High Education; Rule of Cultural and Education Ministry number 49, 2014 about National Standard of High Education

In the formulation of Ministry Decree of national department number 232/U/2000, it has been explained that Islamic education subject in the university aims at helping to guide the students to be faithful and committed to the God as well as have good deeds. It also aims at thinking philosophically, rationally and dynamically, viewing broadly, including in cooperation between religious to develop and use science and technology as well as art for the sake of human and national.”

The formulation above is seemingly different from the formulation of Islamic education curriculum in new order era. In GBPP PAI, it is stated that Islamic Education

aims at “studying and giving an understanding of the nature of human needing life guidance individually and socially to reach the real happiness in the world and afterlife.” A person will understand him/herself and universe that have been regulated by namely *kauniyah* and *tanziliyah* verses. The *tanziliyah* verses explore *aqidah*, *syariah*, *akhlak* and Islamic history. The main emphasize is on the application of the teaching in the daily behavior relying on both Al-Qur’an and As-Sunnah Rasulullah SAW.

Although the material is presented as such, the refinement of Islamic education curriculum 2000 was not different from the Islamic education curriculum in new order

era. The Islamic education emphasized more on traditional Islamic concept that included *aqidah*, *syariah* (in the context of *fiqih*) and *akhlak*. Besides, in some cases, there was no significant difference between the Islamic education curriculum in the level of High Education and the one in the level of elementary as well as secondary educations (Daun & Arjmand, 2005; Lukens-Bull, 2001).

Briefly, although there was a development of material in high education level that was more vertical which means that the material that had been learned in the previous levels was be sharpened with a philosophy rational approach. There was no a horizontal development, however, in expanding the study of contemporary issues.

By such condition, the dominance of a doctrine approach in the Islamic education learning process is inevitable. Religious teaching is positioned as one thing that should be believed in, taken for granted without any critic and it is a fixed good that is ready to use. In other words, the paradigm of Islamic education curriculum 2000 was the continuity of the paradigm of New Order curriculum. The Islamic domain was relatively restricted; it was only related to the pillars of faith and Islam adding with a set of rules of daily interaction ways. Therefore, the religiosity concept tended to be static since it merely continued the theological tradition of the former Islamic scholars (Ziebertz & Riegel, 2007).

Some speculations state that such paradigm was deliberately fixed by the New Order government to muffle the opposition power potentially raised up from dynamical and progressive religiosity understanding. Such thinking is reasonable since the curriculum is the government's product and the Islamic people in Indonesia have bargaining power.

Islamic education curriculum 2000 tending to be dichotomy and mono-discipline obviously had bad sides. First, it was dominated with Islamic reasoning that was textual, rigid and primly. Second, the model

of the study was dogmatic, definitive, apology and polemic due to the restricted study domain (it was restricted to the core concept of Islam; they were *aqidah*, *syariah*, and *akhlak*). Third, it potentially supported the practices and models of diversity which tended to be exclusive, radical and fundamental in the society, such as the attitude of discrediting each other, secularizing each other, even claiming the others as *murtad* and *kafir* gratuitously (Abdullah, 2007).

Another weakness of IE curriculum 2000 was a lot of repetitions of IE material that had been taught in the previous level of education. The context and content of IE material, ideally, should be flowing and different from the other educational unit. The context of IE material for elementary school level limited on family should be increased to the broader level like "around environment" (local). In senior high school level, the context of IE material should be on the level of "nation and state life" (national). In high education level, the domain of IE content should be "global world" (international).

Figure 1. Context and Content of IE Material Based on the Educational Unit

The content of IE material in curriculum 2000 did not develop. In the elementary school level, IE material was allowed to be presented merely as a "factual knowledge" that was a knowledge of something based on the real fact. For example, before pray, someone should be pure from small and big *hadast*, the proper way to do purification and the other things. In the junior high school level, the religiosity knowledge taught was conceptual knowledge

in the form of knowledge dealing with classification and categorization, such as the type of water, *najis*, and the other things. In the senior high school level, the knowledge should be developed and greater than the previous level. It should be in the form of procedural knowledge (knowledge of subsequent procedure at specific or emergency conditions such as the way of *tayammum* when someone was in traveling). In the university level, the knowledge should be increased to metacognitive knowledge that is thinking about thinking to understand the self-cognitive. For example, in praying should be pure not only physically but also in the heart.

The stagnation and context repetition in the IE material like what has been stated in curriculum 2000 seriously affected the IE learning. First, the students got bored with and disparaged IE and considered IE as a compliment of credits since it did not contribute to their knowledge. Second, the students' religiosity knowledge was restricted; they understood religion as a media of self-purification, spiritual satisfier to get salvation in the afterlife. Third, the students' religiosity understanding beyond the real life context expanded the "gap" between theory and reality and raised up a secular view (dichotomy of world-afterlife) (Yani, 2009).

The changing of political climate in the early of reformation order, the social conflicts in many areas as well as the emerging of new order sound-phobia gave impact to the education world including IE curriculum in the public university (PU).

Therefore, if the refinement paradigm of IE curriculum 2000 was still derived from new order, the paradigm of curriculum 2002 was truly different. Islamic education subject in PU did not discuss pillars of faith and Islam (even this portion was too limited). It dominantly studied Islam related to such contemporary issues as human rights, democracy, law, political system, *madani* (civil) society and inter-religious tolerance (Hook et al., 2017).

The students are demanded to master the ability of thinking, acting rationally and dynamically, viewing broadly as an intellectual by observing the targeted vision, mission, and basic competence. The IE in PU aims at bringing on the student an intellectual capital to do long-life learning process and be a mature scholar upholding humanity and life (Decree of High Education, Number 38, 2002, article 3, verse 1). In the IE curriculum 2002 for PU, there was no the theme of "faith" and "piety" like what had been stated in the previous curriculum.

The paradigm underlying IE curriculum 2002 was a paradigm viewing a dynamical thing and living in every aspect of life. Religion is not a set of norms to fulfill the need of human's spirituality. Religion is a view of life, and thus it is influential in forming the view of life reality. Considering the changing reality, the religiosity concept should be dynamic in responding current situation.

The multidimensional crisis afflicting Indonesia in the Reformation era has changed the paradigm of nation and state. The appreciation of human right, democracy enforcement, law supreme, and empowering civil society is an important agenda in the Reformation era that should be distributed and managed through education. Besides, the social conflicts occurred in the homeland should be reviewed our view of religion pluralism, culture, tribe and ethnic. What we need is the understanding of the diversity, not creating homogeneity in the diversity like what had been done in the new order.

If it is compared to curriculum 2000, there was a significant changing of a paradigm of IE Curriculum 2002 in PU. Political interests influenced such changing, of course. The author assumes that the curriculum renewal was not only to succeed the reformation agenda such as human right enforcement, democratization, civil society empowerment, enhancement of pluralism awareness but also to muffle the emergence of Islamic based-radical groups. As we know that the issue of terrorism addressed to the

“radical” Islamic groups in Indonesia is one of the problems getting extra serious attention from Indonesian government in the Reformation era. Furthermore, the “radical” Islamic groups in Indonesia are specially supervised by international.

Different from the previous curriculum, the portion of pillars of faith and Islam in the curriculum 2002 was extremely minimum. The topic was dominated with Islam relating to contemporary issues such as human rights, democracy, law, political system, *madani* (civil) society and tolerance among religious community. In the IE curriculum 2002, religion is no longer positioned as a set of norms to fulfill the human’s spirituality. Religion, however, is placed in the reality context growing up since the religious teaching should be dynamical in responding the current condition. This phenomenon is in line with the famous jargon of *umat Islam* “*al-Islam shalih li kulli zaman wa makan*” (Islam is accordance with every context of space and time)

The other good side of IE curriculum 2002, the material of IE was presented in a broad, historical, contextual and interdisciplinary knowledge. In this context, Islam brings up the dimension of its teaching that is dynamical, moderate and care of plurality as well as highlights its characteristics *rahmatan lil ‘alamin*. Rationalization of this choice is if the model of historical-contextual-interdisciplinary study is considered as ‘taboo’, what kind of level then that is considered proper? Is it limited only to the Islamic University? If we think like that, basically we are secularized unconsciously.

Figure 2. Paradigm Comparison of IE Curriculum 2000 and 2002 (Curriculum 2000 has a paradigm of Isolated Entities [Monodisciplinary])

Figure 3. Curriculum 2002 has a paradigm of Interconnected Entities (Interdisciplinary) (Abdullah, 2007)

The most important thing is the Islamic study model like what had been applied on IE curriculum 2002 is actually to keep the balance of three aspects such as *hadharat al-nash*, *hadharat al-‘ilm*, and *hadharat al-falsafah*. *Hadarat al-nash* means the willingness to take into account the content of religiosity text (Islamic text). *Hadharat al-‘ilm* means the willingness to be professional-objective-innovative in the field included in. The last, *hadarat al-falsafah* means the willingness to correlate the scientific content (that is got from *hadarat al-‘ilm* and had a dialogue with *hadarat al-nash*) with a moral-ethical responsibility in the real life praxis among the society. *Hadarat al-nash* is the guarantee of Islamic identity, *hadarat al-‘ilm* is a guarantee of professional-scientific, and *hadarat al-falsafah* is a guarantee of scientific content developed not like an “ivory tower” that is stagnant over the “sky of academic”, but it should contribute the real positive-emancipative thing in the society life (Abdullah, *et. al.*, 2007).

Figure 4. Basic Commitment of Curriculum 2002 in Studying Islam Interdisciplinary

We should realize that before curriculum 2002 was launched; the form IE performance in PU was too centered on the ritual aspect and ignored social and

intellectual issues. Whereas, an Islamic social study demand a broader knowledge rather than merely classical treasure study (or in the terminology of *Kitab Kuning*, it is called *turats*). It needed an interdisciplinary approach like combining the normative approach (classical text-based) with the empirical and socio-historical approach (using the theory framework and methodology used by contemporary sciences like the exact science, social and humanities). Such combination would give positive impact to the expanding study orientation and the depth of analysis.

After eleven years passed by, IE Curriculum 2002 was no longer sufficient to meet the era challenge. There was changing of learning paradigm requiring positive response: (1) individual learning changed into cooperative learning; (2) rote learning changed into learning for understanding; (3) knowledge transmitted changed into interactive learning, process skill and problem based-learning; (4) teacher-centered changed into student-centered; (5) manual-traditional assessment (like working on items/questions) into authentic assessment (in the form of portfolio, project, report, students' performance) (Teng, 2016).

In the global level – international world – entering the third millennium through UNESCO and campaigning four education basic visions, they are: learning to be, learning to live together, learning to know, and learning to do. It is believed that in certain cases, the global dynamic supports the government as well to reform the national education curriculum including IE curriculum in PU through the issuing curriculum 2013.

Relying on the Law Number 12, 2012 dealing with High Education, IC in PU has transformed to follow curriculum 2013. General Compulsory Subject of IE is mandated to bring the next noble missions. First is by developing the students' faithfulness, commitment to the God, good deeds and good characteristics potential (psycho-pedagogic). Second is by preparing the students to run an Islamic life as an

individual, the member of family, the member of society and a good citizen (psycho-social mission). Third is by building a spirituality culture for primary determinant in the life of nation and state (socio-cultural mission). Fourth, studying and developing Islamic teaching integrated with any science fields (academic mission) (Fransisca & Ajisukmo, 2015).

Conceptually, IE curriculum 2013 relies on some of competencies that should be reached. Competency is the students' ability to behave, use their knowledge and skill to do a certain task in the campus, society and environment in which they interact with the others. The curriculum is designed to share the learning experience as widely as possible to the students as the learners to develop their behavior, skill, and knowledge needed to build the skill. The result of the learning experience is the learners' achievement describing human with the quality stated in Graduate Competency Standard (GCS).

In more detail, the GCS standard can be seen in the Rule of Education and Culture Ministry Number 49 2014 dealing with National Standard of High Education. In the rules, the formulation of every graduate's behavior and general skill are standardized for diploma, graduate, post-graduate, doctoral as well as profession programs.

Based on GCS of IE curriculum 2013, the competencies intended are subsequently explored into two competencies; they are Core Competency (CC) and Basic Competency (BC). Core competency is a generic ability or competency referring to: (1) the goal of National Education (law number 20/2003); (2) the goal of High Education (law number 12/2012); (3) KKNP (the rules of education and Culture Ministry 73/2013); and (4) GCS (the rules of Education and Culture Ministry SNPT). The core competency functions as a competency integrator of subject/study program group. The core competency holistically is classified into four categories; they are CC 1 (reflecting religious attitude), CC 2 (reflecting the social attitude,

CC 3 (reflecting knowledge), and CC4 (reflecting skill).

Table 2. Core Competency of IE Curriculum 2013 in PU

Aspect	Formulation
Religious Attitude	Deepening and applying Islam teaching as a lifestyle in the context of academic and profession.
Social Attitude	Developing behavior (honesty, discipline, responsible, environmentally friendly, cooperative, team-work, peaceable, responsive and pro-active), behaving as the part of nation problems and positioning themselves as a transformation agent among society having good deeds in building nation civilization.
Knowledge	Understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating factual, conceptual, procedural and metacognitive knowledge with humanity, nationality, statehood and civilization knowledge dealing with any phenomena and occurrences as well as using procedural concept in a particular study based on the talent and interest.
Skill	Managing, reasoning, creating and presenting any concrete and abstract things independently, efficiently, effectively and creatively as well as using them based on the scientific rule and/or professionalism.

The Core Competency 1 and 2 (CC 1 and 2) are developed coherently and harmonically as nurturant effects. Core Competency 3 and 4 philosophically function as an axiological tool. Core Competency 3 and 4 (CC 3 and CC 4) are developed consistently as the instructional effects. Core Competency 3 and 4 philosophically function as ontological and epistemological tools. The Core Competencies 1, 2, 3, and 4 altogether should be understood and claimed as a holistically entity of learning outcomes in the holistically context of psychological-pedagogic (andragogy) process and as a process of reaching and realizing the national education goal.

The particular basic competency describes the ability related to the substance of subject, in this case, is Islamic Education subject as one of four elements of General

Compulsory Subjects. In the context of KKNI, BC is similar to the concept and the position of learning outcomes.

In the context of Islamic education, the Basic Competency and learning outcomes developed holistically with the framework of CC 1, 2, 3 and 4 are very consistent and coherent with the integrity of realizing glory of Islam diversity (religion virtues) by developing interactively and making the synergy of the skills of Islamic knowledge, Islamic dispositions, Islamic skills, Islamic confidence, Islamic commitment, Islamic competence, that finally realizing the Islamic responsibility and Islamic engagement.

The learning material of IE based on the curriculum 2013 should be elaborated and studied further by orienting more on the activity base that is in line with every Basic Competency. The Islamic Education learning basically applies scientific/epistemological approach with following generic syntagmatic: examining, questioning, collecting information, associating and communicating.

Such approach is performed in any kind of learning model having psychological-pedagogic learning characteristics to create an active learning student as a learner as well as an adult. By this approach, the student is facilitated to build knowledge (epistemological approaches) through experience transformation in any kind of models such as: (1) Problem-Based Learning/PBL, (2) Project Citizen Project, (3) Case Study, (4) Work Experiences/Service Learning, (5) Syndicate Group, (6) Controversial Issues, (7) Simulation, (8) Collaborative Learning, (9) Snow-balling Process.

The assessments used were in the form of test and non-test conducted integrally and sustainably by emphasizing on the realization of Islamic teaching in daily life. Therefore, the assessment of GBS-IS can be conducted by using such assessment instruments as: objective test, essay test, behavior test, case study, anecdote note, peer assessment/socio-metric, portfolio

assessment, learning outcomes, process assessment and field study. The suitable criteria and assessment procedure are necessary for every assessment.

From the context and content of material, the IE Curriculum 2002 was not far different from IE Curriculum 2013. Curriculum 2013 is also oriented to the historical, contextual and interdisciplinary Islamic study as what had been stated in curriculum 2002. The essential difference between both of them is curriculum 2013 introduces different learning approach and strategy centering on such keywords as: (1) scientific approach; (2) student active learning; (3) Epistemological approaches, and (4) activity-based approach, not content-based approach.

The most important thing brought by IE curriculum 2013 is guiding the students to develop good habits such following things. First, development of self-management: identifying the most appropriate learning style (visual, auditive, kinesthetic, deductive or inductive); monitoring and increasing learning skills (reading, writing, listening, time management and problem solving); utilizing varied learning environment (in the class with speech, discussion, giving task, practice in the laboratory, group learning, and many other things). Secondly, developing positive thinking habit; increasing self-confidence and self-esteem; identifying the learning goal and enjoying learning activity. Third is by developing hierarchy thinking habit; making decision and solving problem; combining and creating the correlations and new concepts. Fourth, developing habit to ask: identifying ideas and main concepts as well as supporting proofs; raising interest and motivation; centering on attention and memory.

Curriculum 2013 believes that the standard of education success is how far all educational efforts give the broader space and facility in developing personality and the freedom in the society. Besides, curriculum applied in the last of cabinet of Indonesia *Bersatu* (United Indonesia Cabinet) part 2

aimed at developing and empowering all students' potential (cognitive, affection, conation, and psychomotor) with the support of appropriate learning model. Only by such efforts, the education process enables the finding and developing innovation that will bring change to society and future. Such glorious ambition will never be realized unless there is a changing of learning paradigm. Briefly, learning should be enjoyable, relax, interesting, so it enables the students to record all information holistically.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

From the study of three generation of IE Ccurriculums in the Reformation era, it can be concluded: first, paradigm of IE curriculum 2000 is the continuity of New Order paradigm oriented purely on normative Islamic concepts. The domain was limited in three main pillars of Islam: *aqidah*, *syariah*, and *akhlak*.

Second, IE Curriculum 2002 was different from curriculum 2000 since it indicated the changing of paradigm and material radically into more dynamical, contextual, interdisciplinary, and responsive to the current situation. Religion was not only positioned as a set of norms to fulfill human's spirituality. Religion, however, was placed on the reality context that always changes since the "religion teaching" should be dynamical in responding the current situation. Such changing paradigm gave impact to the changing of IE learning material in PU that no longer repeated the material taught in the elementary and secondary levels, but it was more accommodative to the contemporary issues such as human rights, democracy, pluralism, feminism and *madani* (civil) society).

Third, IE Curriculum 2013 highlights more the learning with scientific approach by activating students (active students centered) to build knowledge (epistemological approaches). Briefly, IE learning according to curriculum 2013, is oriented more on the

activity (activity-based), not content (content-based).

Islamic education curriculum 2013 does not change the context and content of previous IE totally. This last generation of IE Curriculum barely does not change the content of curriculum 2002. The extreme change is only the learning strategy relying on such keywords as Scientific Approach, Student Active Learning, Epistemological Approaches, Activity Base, Content Base.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. A. (2007). Desain Pengembangan Akademik IAIN Menuju UIN Sunan Kalijaga. *Dalam Integrasi Ilmu Dan Agama, Interpretasi Dan Aksi, Zainal Abidin Bagir Dll.*
- Coleman, S., & Robinson, J. B. (2018). Introducing the qualitative performance gap: Stories about a sustainable building. *Building Research & Information*, 46(5), 485–500.
- Court, D. (2013). Religious experience as an aim of religious education. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 35(3), 251–263.
- Daun, H., & Arjmand, R. (2005). Islamic education. In *International Handbook on Globalisation, Education and Policy Research* (pp. 377–388). Springer.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). *Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research.*
- Douglass, S. L., & Shaikh, M. A. (2004). Defining Islamic Education: Differentiation and Applications. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 7(1), 5–18.
- Fransisca, L., & Ajisuksmo, C. R. (2015). Keterkaitan antara moral knowing, moral feeling, dan moral behavior pada empat kompetensi dasar guru. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, 45(2).
- Halstead, M. (2004). An Islamic concept of education. *Comparative Education*, 40(4), 517–529.
- Hilgendorf, E. (2003). Islamic education: History and tendency. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78(2), 63–75.
- Hook, J. N., Farrell, J. E., Johnson, K. A., Van Tongeren, D. R., Davis, D. E., & Aten, J. D. (2017). Intellectual humility and religious tolerance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1), 29–35.
- Lukens-Bull, R. A. (2001). Two sides of the same coin: Modernity and tradition in Islamic education in Indonesia. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 32(3), 350–372.
- Muhadjir, N. (2000). Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif Edisi IV. Yogyakarta. Penerbit Rake Sarasin.
- Nor, M. R. M., & Malim, M. (2014). Revisiting Islamic education: The case of Indonesia. *Journal for Multicultural Education*.
- Pohl, F. (2006). Islamic education and civil society: Reflections on the pesantren tradition in contemporary Indonesia. *Comparative Education Review*, 50(3), 389–409.
- Teng, L. S. (2016). Changes in teachers' beliefs after a professional development project for teaching writing: Two Chinese cases. *Journal of Education for TEaching*, 42(1), 106–109.
- Whittemore, R., Chase, S. K., & Mandle, C. L. (2001). Validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(4), 522–537.

- Yani, M. T. (2009). Dinamika Pendidikan Islam di Perguruan Tinggi Umum. *Jurnal Penelitian Keislaman*, 2(5).
- Yasin, F. B. R., & Jani, M. (2013). Islamic education: The philosophy, aim, and main features. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(10), 1–18.
- Ziebertz, H.-G., & Riegel, U. (2007). Religious education and values. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 20(1), 52–76.