

# Rethinking Madrasah Education in a Globalised World

Why is there a need to rethink madrasah education? What is the positioning of Muslims in contemporary society, and how are they prepared? What is the role of the *ulama* in the reform process? This book explores these questions from the perspective of madrasah education and analyses curricular and pedagogic innovations in Islamic faith-based education in response to the changing place of Islam in a globalised world. It argues for the need for madrasahs to reconceptualise education for Muslim children. Specifically, it explores the problems and challenges that come with new knowledge, biotechnological advancement and societal transformation facing Muslims, and identifies the processes towards reformation that impinge on the philosophies (both Western and Islamic), religious traditions and spirituality, learning principles, curriculum and pedagogy. This book offers glimpses into the reform process at work through contemporary examples in selected countries.

**Mukhlis Abu Bakar** is Associate Professor at the Asian Languages and Cultures Academic Group, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

## **Routledge Critical Studies in Asian Education**

Series Editors: S. Gopinathan, Wing On Lee  
and Jason Eng Thye Tan

For the whole list please visit: [www.routledge.com/Routledge-Critical-Studies-in-Asian-Education/book-series/RCSAE](http://www.routledge.com/Routledge-Critical-Studies-in-Asian-Education/book-series/RCSAE)

### **Languages in the Malaysian Education System**

Monolingual strands in multilingual settings

*Edited by Asmah Haji Omar*

### **Policy Discourses in Malaysian Education**

A nation in the making

*Edited by Suseela Malakolunthu and Nagappan C. Rengasamy*

### **Making Sense of Education in Post-Handover Hong Kong**

Achievements and challenges

*Edited by Thomas Kwan-Choi Tse and Michael H. Lee*

### **English Education at the Tertiary Level in Asia**

From Policy to Practice

*Edited by Eun Sung Park and Bernard Spolsky*

### **English-Medium Instruction in Chinese Universities**

Perspectives, Discourse and Evaluation

*Edited by Jing Zhao and L. Quentin Dixon*

### **Rethinking Madrasah Education in a Globalised World**

*Edited by Mukhlis Abu Bakar*

### **Policies and politics in Malaysian education**

Education reforms, nationalism and neoliberalism

*Edited by Cynthia Joseph*

### **The Sustainability of Higher Education in an Era of Post-Massification**

*Edited by Deane E. Neubauer, Ka Ho Mok and Jin Jiang*

### **Emigration, Employability and Higher Education in the Philippines**

*Yasmin Y. Ortiga*

# Rethinking Madrasah Education in a Globalised World

Edited by Mukhlis Abu Bakar

First published 2018  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Mukhlis Abu Bakar; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Mukhlis Abu Bakar to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*  
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-73923-9 (hbk)  
ISBN: 978-1-315-18423-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Galliard  
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>List of contributors</i>	ix
<i>Reviewers</i>	xiv
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
MUKHLIS ABU BAKAR	
<b>PART I</b>	
<b>Social, political and cultural contexts</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1 Challenges to madrasah education in contemporary Muslim societies</b>	<b>17</b>
NOOR AISHA ABDUL RAHMAN	
<b>2 State, community and madrasah reform in India</b>	<b>36</b>
ARSHAD ALAM	
<b>3 Resistance to reform? Pakistani <i>madaris</i> in historical and political perspective</b>	<b>49</b>
CHRISTOPHER CANDLAND	
<b>4 Modernising madrasah education: the Singapore ‘national’ and the global</b>	<b>65</b>
S. GOPINATHAN	
<b>5 Muslim schools in Britain: between mobilisation and incorporation</b>	<b>76</b>
NASAR MEER AND DAMIAN BREEN	

**PART II****Curriculum and pedagogy** 103

- 6 Reconceptualising madrasah education: towards a radicalised imaginary** 105

YUSEF WAGHID

- 7 Developing *Shakhsiyah Islamiyah*: personalised character education for British Muslims** 118

FARAH AHMED AND TAHREEM SABIR

- 8 Integrating an Islamic Studies curriculum in both religious and secular classrooms in an American school** 135

HABEEB QUADRI

- 9 Integrated and holistic madrasah education curriculum: the Singapore madrasah model** 152

FARAH MAHAMOOD ALJUNIED AND ALBAKRI AHMAD

- 10 The Islamic Studies education curriculum of Malaysian national schools: a study of its philosophy and content** 174

ROSNANI HASHIM

**PART III****Issues in educational reforms** 193

- 11 Policy borrowing in madrasah education: the Singapore experience** 195

CHARLENE TAN AND DIWI BINTI ABBAS

- 12 Curriculum reform in the Indonesian madrasah: the position of madrasah in the post-independence education system** 210

RAIHANI

- 13 Development of madrasah education in Bosnia and Herzegovina** 228

DINA SIJAMHODŽIĆ-NADAREVIĆ

<b>14 Reform in madrasah education: the South African experience</b>	<b>244</b>
YUSEF WAGHID	
<b>15 Madrasah education and Muslim communities in Hong Kong</b>	<b>253</b>
WAI-YIP HO	
<i>Index</i>	<b>266</b>

## Acknowledgements

This book, while independently developed, nevertheless owes its genesis to a conference organised by the Islamic Religious Council of Singapore (*Majlis Ugama Islam Singapura* or MUIS) at the Singapore Islamic Hub, 15–16 March 2013. Four of the 15 chapters in this book are extensive revisions of the original papers presented at the conference – Chapter 4 by S. Gopinathan, Chapter 8 by Habeeb Quadri, Chapter 9 originally by Farah Mahamood Aljunied, and Chapter 14 by Yusef Waghid. I would like to thank MUIS for its generosity in allowing me to include these four chapters in this book.

I would like to extend my personal thanks to the Series Editor, S. Gopinathan, for his keen interest in this volume and for his unfailing encouragement. Special thanks go to all the authors for their well-researched chapters; the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful criticisms of the book proposal; the 24 international scholars who generously gave their time to review the chapters; Allan Luke for his thoughtful comments to an earlier draft of the Introduction; my wife, Kamisah binte Ismail, for taking it upon herself to attend to pressing family matters thereby allowing me to work on this book; Muhammad ‘Arif bin Muhammad Khairul Tan for his vetting of Arabic terms; and Christina Low, Tan ShengBin, and Katie Peace of Routledge, and Lisa Salonen of Apex, for their wonderful editorial support.

Mukhlis Abu Bakar  
June 2017



## Contributors

**Diwi Binti Abbas** is a PhD candidate in Policy and Leadership Studies at the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, with research interests primarily in Islamic leadership and Islamic education. Diwi was a graduate of Madrasah Al-Ma'arif Al-Islamiah before continuing her studies at the National University of Singapore with a Bachelor of Arts. She earned her Master of Science (Information Studies) from NTU and Master in Islamic Civilization from the International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, International Islamic University, Malaysia. Previously, she has worked as a librarian, a teacher, an education officer and a research assistant.

**Noor Aisha Abdul Rahman** is Head of the Department of Malay Studies, National University of Singapore. Her research and teaching areas include Malay legal history and institutions, Muslim law and its administration in Southeast Asia, sociology of religion and marriage in the Malay/Muslim community of Singapore. She is the author of *Colonial Image of Malay Adat Laws* (2005) and editor of *Secularism and Spirituality: Seeking Integrated Knowledge and Success in Madrasah Education in Singapore* (co-editor, 2006). Her articles and book chapters appeared in various journals including *Inter Asia Cultural Studies*, *Asian Journal of Social Science*, *The Muslim World* and *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*.

**Mukhlis Abu Bakar** is Associate Professor at the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University. Trained as an applied linguist, Mukhlis teaches in the area of grammar, linguistics, discourse, bilingualism and literacy. His current research interests lie in the field of childhood bilingualism and biliteracy, family literacy and a sociocultural approach to literacy learning in the home, school and faith settings. His work on Islamic religious education has led to a Fulbright American Studies Institute Program scholarship on "Religion in Contemporary America: Church, State and Society" at the Centre for Religion and American Public Life, Boston College, USA, in 2003.

**Albakri Ahmad** is Deputy Chief Executive of MUIS and Dean of MUIS Academy. Prior to his current appointment, he served in MUIS's Office of the Mufti, Religious Education, Research and Corporate Development Units. As

x *Contributors*

a member of the senior management team and working together with community partners, he is responsible for developing religious leadership and capacity building to achieve the vision of a Muslim Community of Excellence in Singapore. He has a MSc in systems design and a PhD in managerial cybernetics. His interest areas include Islamic education, ethics, interfaith understanding, religion and public policy, and Muslims in plural societies.

**Farah Ahmed** is Director of Education and Research at Islamic Shakhshiyah Foundation and Honorary Research Associate at UCL Institute of Education. She has a BA honours in Philosophy, PGCE in Secondary English, MEd in Educational Research and is a PhD candidate at the University of Cambridge. Her PhD is looking at the use of *halaqah* to develop autonomous thinking in Muslim children. Farah has over 20 years' experience teaching in and leading Islamic schools in the UK and has developed courses for teachers on philosophies of Islamic education including pedagogies and practices. Her publications include *Principles of Shakhshiyah Education* and *The Halaqah Curriculum*.

**Arshad Alam** is an independent researcher based in Delhi. He has taught at the Jamia Millia Islamia University and Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He was an International Ford Fellow at the University of Erfurt, Germany. He has published in the area of Muslim identity and education, low-caste political articulations, Indian Muslims and the question of diversity within Indian Islam. He was Assistant Editor with the journal *History and Sociology of South Asia* during 2006–12. His latest publications are “Madrasas and Educational Condition of Muslims in India” in Zoya Hasan and Mushirul Hasan (Eds), *India: Social Development Report* (Oxford University Press, 2013) and “Islam and Religious Pluralism in India” in *IIC Quarterly* (2014).

**Farah Mahamood Aljunied** is Director for Curriculum Planning and Development at MUIS. She oversees the development and implementation of the revised Islamic Education Curriculum at mosques – aL.I.V.E. (Learning Islamic Values Everyday) and the new Secondary Level Islamic Studies Integrated Curriculum for the Joint Madrasah System. She also supervises the Mosque-Based Kindergartens and facilitates the Islamic Education Providers network. A madrasah graduate, Farah studied communication and Islamic revealed knowledge, and early childhood education for her Bachelor's degrees and did her Master's degrees in sociology and education. Her interests include youth identity formation, minority Muslim issues and Islamic education

**Damian Breen** is a Senior Lecturer in Sociology at De Montfort University, Leicester, UK. His interests are primarily around 'race', ethnicity and education. These interests have most notably been manifested in his research on Muslim schools in Britain. This research informs a forthcoming monograph entitled *Muslim Schools, Communities and Critical Race Theory: Faith schooling in an Islamophobic Britain*.

**Christopher Candland** is Associate Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College, where he co-founded and co-directed the South Asian Studies Program. He has worked and lived in South Asia, on and off, for more than three decades. As a graduate student, he studied Pakistan's political economy at the University of Karachi in 1992–93. He has held several American Institute of Pakistan Studies fellowships and a Harry Frank Guggenheim fellowship for field research in Pakistan. He earned his PhD from Columbia University and has taught at the University of California Berkeley and at Fatima Jinnah Women University.

**S. Gopinathan** is Adjunct Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, and Academic Director, The HEAD Foundation, an education think tank. He was Dean of the School of Education, National Institute of Education, Singapore (1994–2000), and Professor of Education from 1999. He has been extensively involved in the development of teacher education in Singapore and has served on Ministry of Education review committees. He was a consultant to the World Bank, UNESCO, UNICEF, the Commonwealth of Learning, the Hong Kong Institute of Education and the Aga Khan University Institute of Education (Pakistan). He was Lead Consultant for the establishment of the Emirates College for Advanced Education in Abu Dhabi and the Bahrain Teachers College. His latest publications are *Education and the Nation State* (2012) and *Globalisation and the Singapore Curriculum* (co-editor, 2013).

**Rosnani Hashim** is Professor of Educational Foundations at the Faculty of Education, International Islamic University, Malaysia. Her areas of specialisation are Islamic education – history, philosophy and curriculum, mathematics education and the Hikmah (Wisdom) pedagogy of philosophical inquiry. She has been a Research Fellow, Japan Foundation; a Visiting Specialist, the Fulbright Programme; and a Visiting Professor of Global Education at Nagoya University. Presently, she is the Editor-in-Chief for *The IIUM Journal of Educational Studies*. Her works include *Educational dualism in Malaysia* (1996), *Reclaiming the conversation* (2010) and *Critical Issues and Reform in Muslim Higher Education* (co-editor, 2015).

**Wai-Yip Ho** is Senior Fellow at Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, Marie Curie Fellow of the European Union and Associate Professor at the Education University of Hong Kong. He is the author of *Islam and China's Hong Kong: Ethnic Identity, Muslim Networks and the New Silk Road* (Routledge, 2015). His research interests include madrasah educational development in the Chinese context, China's Christian-Muslim relations, Arabia-China relations, and new media and Islam in China. He held visiting research fellowships at Zentrum Moderner Orient at Berlin, the Center of Muslim-Christian Studies at Oxford, Australian National University and Yemen College of Middle Eastern Studies.

**Nasar Meer** is Professor of Comparative Citizenship and Social Policy at the University of Strathclyde and a Royal Society of Edinburgh Research Fellow (2014–19). He has a longstanding interest in race, identity and citizenship. His publications include: *Islam and Modernity* (editor, 2017); *Interculturalism and Multiculturalism: Debating the dividing lines* (co-editor, 2016); *Citizenship, Identity and the Politics of Multiculturalism: The Rise of Muslim Consciousness* (2015, 2nd Edition); *Racialization and Religion* (editor, 2014), *Race and Ethnicity* (2014) and *European Multiculturalism(s): Religious, Cultural and Ethnic Challenges* (co-editor, 2012). In 2016, he was awarded the Royal Society of Edinburgh's Thomas Reid Medal.

**Habeeb Quadri** is the Principal of MCC Academy, one of the most long-standing Islamic Schools in North America. As an educator, author and youth activist, he has delivered lectures throughout the United States, Canada and abroad on Islam, society and social problems confronting Muslim youth. He was recently confirmed to a seat on the Harvard University Graduate School of Education Principals' Advisory Board. He has conducted workshops for the US Department of State, Islamic schools, public schools and universities around the world. His educational consulting company with IQRA Foundation initiated the first National Islamic Studies Standardized Test and National Islamic Studies Benchmarks. He has co-authored a number of books and has served as the religious and cultural consultant for children's books.

**Raihani** is Professor of Islamic Education Studies at the Islamic Education Faculty and Teacher Training, Sultan Syarif Kasim State Islamic University, Indonesia, as well as Adjunct Research Fellow at the School of Social Sciences, The University of Western Australia. Holding a doctorate in the area of educational management from the University of Melbourne, he has published many works in such areas as Islamic education in Indonesia and Australia, educational management and leadership, and multicultural education. He is the author of *Creating Multicultural Citizens: A portrayal of contemporary Indonesian education* published by Routledge in 2014.

**Tahreem Sabir** is Head Teacher of Shakhshiyah School, Slough, UK, having joined the school shortly after its inception as a class teacher. Prior to this, Tahreem founded and was Principal of the International Islamic Grammar School, Islamabad, Pakistan. She has 17 years' experience in education including expertise in training and mentoring teachers. Tahreem has a Master's in Educational Leadership from UCL Institute of Education. Her area of expertise is curriculum development and she has been instrumental in the development of the Shakhshiyah Holistic Curriculum. Tahreem's areas of interest also include children's literature and action research in schools.

**Dina Sijamhodžić-Nadarević** is Assistant Professor at the University of Sarajevo's Faculty of Islamic Studies in Bosnia and Herzegovina. She has two undergraduate degrees (Islamic Theology and Pedagogy), and has an MA in Religious Pedagogy and PhD in Pedagogy from the University of Sarajevo.

Dina spent one academic semester as a visiting scholar on the Junior Faculty Development Program managed and funded by the Educational and Cultural Affairs of the US Department of State at the Kent State University, Ohio, USA (2010). She participated in many professional conferences, seminars, symposiums in the country and abroad.

**Charlene Tan** is Associate Professor at the Policy and Leadership Studies Academic Group, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University. She has held visiting appointments at the Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta; Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Centre of Islamic Studies, University of Cambridge; and Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies, University of Oxford. She was the principal investigator of a university-funded research project on madrasah education in Singapore. She is the author of *Islamic Education and Indoctrination: The Case in Indonesia* (Routledge, 2011) and editor of *Reforms in Islamic Education: International Perspectives* (Bloomsbury, 2014).

**Yusef Waghid** is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy of Education in the Department of Education Policy Studies and previously Dean of the Faculty of Education at Stellenbosch University. He holds doctorates in the areas of Philosophy of Education (University of the Western Cape), Education Policy Studies and Philosophy (Stellenbosch University). He is Editor-in-Chief of *South African Journal of Higher Education*. His most recent books include: *Tolerance and Dissent within Education: Towards debate and understanding* (co-author, 2017); *Philosophy of Education as Action: Implications for teacher education* (co-author, 2017); *Educational Leadership-in-Becoming: On the potential of leadership in action* (co-author, 2017); and *African Democratic Citizenship Education Revisited* (co-editor, 2017).

## Reviewers

Ahmet Alibašić  
University of Sarajevo  
Bosnia and Herzegovina

Alison Scott-Baumann  
School of Oriental and African Studies  
United Kingdom

Charles J. Russo  
University of Dayton  
United States of America

Enes Karić  
University of Sarajevo  
Bosnia and Herzegovina

Fauzia Ahmad  
University College London  
United Kingdom

Fella Lahmar  
Independent Researcher  
United Kingdom

Hairon Salleh  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore

Iik Arifin Mansurnoor  
UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta  
Indonesia

Iqbal Singh Sevea  
University of North Carolina at Chapel  
Hill  
United States of America

Jamal Malik  
University of Erfurt  
Germany

Kamaludeen Mohamed Nasir  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore

Kung Lap Yan  
City University of Hong Kong  
Hong Kong

Lyn Parker  
University of Western Australia  
Australia

Ma Jianxiong  
Hong Kong Univ. of Science &  
Technology  
Hong Kong

Mardiana Abu Bakar  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore

Marian de Souza  
Australian Catholic University  
Australia

Mohammad Hannan Hassan  
Majlis Ugama Islam Singapura  
Singapore

Muhammad Zuhdi  
UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta  
Indonesia

Nuraan Davids  
Stellenbosch University  
South Africa

Paul Smeyers  
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven  
Belgium

Qibla Ayaz  
University of Peshawar  
Pakistan

Shamim Miah  
University of Huddersfield  
United Kingdom

Syed Farid Alatas  
National University of Singapore  
Singapore

Syed Khairudin Aljunied  
National University of Singapore  
Singapore

Review Copy - Not for Distribution

Raihani el-Banjary - UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim - Riau - 15/01/2018



# Introduction

*Mukhlis Abu Bakar*

In a globalised world where boundaries are blurred and ideologies are in transition, where science and modern technologies become ever more present and demographic changes bring on new societal pressures, we are confronted with new and emerging educational challenges. Advances in biotechnology and stem cell research, depletion of non-renewable natural resources, environmental pollution and growing interconnectedness but rising levels of ethnic, cultural and religious intolerance are examples of new developments that raise questions for education in its capacity to shape values and attitudes for living together. These challenges also require a religious response, for they speak to the ethical, moral and spiritual fabric of a religiously informed individual and society (Padela, 2006; Siddiqui, 1997; UNESCO, 2015; Wersal, 1995).

Indeed, these developments not only impact on the quality of human lives, questioning our understanding of values, tradition, norms and worldviews, but may also be perceived as challenging the sovereignty of a higher or deeper transcendent authority. How one lives one's faith in the face of such circumstances and how one engages with and overcome these challenges are issues that are increasingly relevant in this day and age. Invariably, an individual's positioning and participation in a globalised world will have to take on these connections.

This book explores these issues in the context of madrasah education. The madrasah, whether or not it is warranted in educational terms, has become a symbolic point of contention and conflict in those Islamic societies where sectarian and ideological differences have brought contending groups and communities into conflict. In countries like Indonesia, the issues about reform, control and curriculum have generated heated debate and dialogue. At the same time, in Western countries with large Muslim minorities, madrasahs have become important cultural institutions for their communities, and also symbolic objects of Islamophobia and hate crimes (Malik, 2008).

Over the centuries, madrasahs have been instrumental in circulating the knowledge and practice of the Muslim faith. They have succeeded in laying down taxing standards for students and the larger community to seamlessly connect religious beliefs to behaviour. This requirement of conduct is what differentiates madrasahs from secular educational institutions. However, they have been less successful, for the most part, in bringing about the intellectual transformation

## 2 Mukhlis Abu Bakar

of contemporary Muslim societies, particularly in the field of religious thought (Moosa, 2015). Still, no institution is potentially in a better position to carry out this transformational change than the madrasah itself through its religious scholars or *ulama* (plural of *alim*, ‘learned’) given the latter’s pervasive influence on the community. They have helped to increase “public understanding of morality, ethics, and conduct . . . , which ranges from intimate matters affecting the family to banking practices, national politics, governance, and the most complex questions of international relations, war, and peace” (Moosa, 2015: 10).

The book argues for the need for the madrasah to rethink education for Muslim children, to re-envision an education that provides for the children’s holistic development in a changing world – spiritual, moral, intellectual, aesthetic, emotional and physical, and to foster a worldview where critical thinking, an ethical code of conduct and a scientific outlook are prerequisites for addressing global issues. Amongst these students are a generation of future religious teachers and *ulama* whose ability to assess the complex issues of the day and articulate positions on those issues from an Islamic perspective becomes even more crucial (Zaman, 2002). As such, the positioning of these religious leaders, and more crucially how they are prepared, warrant attention. A concern for many nations, in particular Muslim-minority nations, is how to address the increasing demands for robust intellectual capacity and simultaneously nurture the development of sound moral and spiritual citizens. The book offers glimpses into the reform process at work and the extent it is successful through contemporary examples in selected countries.

### Clarifying the term ‘madrasah’

A clarification on the term madrasah as used in this book is in order. The word madrasah derives from the Arabic word *darasa*, which means ‘to study’. In the Arabic-speaking world, madrasah refers to all types of schools, those that teach only the traditional Islamic subjects as well as those that are completely secularised without the provision of any religious instruction. In much of the non-Arabic speaking parts of Asia, however, the term is used in a more restricted sense, referring to schools whose setup is geared towards providing students with what is understood as Islamic education. For the purpose of this book, the term madrasah is used in that restricted sense, but also in a broad sense to refer to all Muslim religious schools whose essential aim is to provide Islamic education, although what constitutes the breadth and depth of ‘Islamic education’ may vary from one madrasah institution to the next. Noor, Sikand and van Bruinessen (2008) alluded to this encompassing definition of the madrasah in their acknowledgement of its geographically and culturally diverse nature:

They differ widely in terms of curricula, teaching methods and approaches to the challenges of modernity, . . . [and] the levels of religious education that they provide their students, from the small *maktab* or *kuttub* attached to a mosque and catering to small children, providing them with skills to

read and recite the Quran and perform basic Islamic rituals, to university-size *jami'as* and *Dar al-'ulum*s.

(p. 9–10, italics in the original)

Madrasahs can be found wherever there is a sizeable Muslim community – in Southeast Asia, especially Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia and parts of Thailand and the Philippines; across South Asia that includes Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Afghanistan; the Middle East including Iran; and parts of Africa. They have been widely used as an educational resource to foster religious learning. The more advanced level of madrasah education specialises in the study of classical theological and legal texts and commentaries on the Muslim scripture, the Qur'an. They place particular importance on the study of the life and teachings of Islam's Prophet Muhammad, and engage in complex details about how rules and morals should regulate public and private behaviour according to religious norms. All the secondary subjects that are needed to acquire competence in these primary fields of study are also taught, such as Arabic grammar and literature, rhetoric and logic, among others (Hefner, 2009; Moosa, 2015).

The changing political and economic landscape of the early 21st century has transformed some of the madrasahs into modern schools such as those found in Singapore (Tan & Diwi, this volume) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (Sijamhodžić-Nadarević, this volume) which prioritise a range of Islamic subjects besides a broad-based curriculum that includes modern subjects such as science, social sciences and contemporary languages. These madrasahs exist alongside national or state schools which primarily offer secular-based education (Gopinathan, this volume). In Malaysia, where Islam is the official religion, the national schools have taken on the role of provider of Islamic religious education comparable to those offered in the traditional madrasahs. The distinction between the national schools and madrasahs in the provision of Islamic education has narrowed significantly of late that the more progressive among the madrasahs have decided to transform themselves into national schools or become government-aided schools (Rosnani, this volume) and benefit from a more stable source of funding.

There are also offshoots of the madrasahs brought about, in particular, by South Asian diaspora in Muslim-minority areas like Europe, South Africa and North America, all of which are independent of their Asian origin. These new establishments are referred to by different names: 'madrasah', 'Shakhshiyah schools', 'housques' or simply 'Muslim or Islamic schools' (see Ahmed & Sabir; Quadri; Ho; Meer & Breen; Waghid, this volume). What unites them with their more traditional counterparts in Muslim-majority countries is the aim of fostering religious learning and providing a foundation in religious knowledge and practice for the purpose of living a moral life and spiritual bonding. At one end of the spectrum, the transmission of the Islamic scholarly tradition goes towards cultivating religious specialists who teach and perform religious services. At the other, the inclusion of modern subjects serves the aim of developing Muslim professionals with appropriate knowledge, skills and demeanour to compete in the job market (Rosnani, 1996; Mukhlis, 2009). In this book, the term

4 *Mukhlis Abu Bakar*

‘madrasah’ encompasses all the different types of Islamic educational institutions existing today.

### **Embracing a changing world**

It is not only in modern times that Muslims face the intellectual challenge of a changing world. The history of Islam, particularly from the time of Prophet Muhammad and the Rightly Guided Caliphs (successor of the Prophet) through to the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphates, is a story of how the early Muslims put their new faith to the test when they established authority, first in Medina, and later in the complex ‘new world’ of the Middle East and beyond. The diversity of cultures, lifestyles and customs of these rich and developed areas such as the Byzantine-Christian and the Persian Sasanian empires was a stark contrast to the simple Arabian heartlands of these early Muslims. After an initial period of adjustment, they eventually drew upon the institutions and cultures that already existed in these lands and adapted to Arab Muslim needs. They built cosmopolitan and inclusive cities and created a relatively peaceful and conducive atmosphere that allowed knowledge, creativity and innovations to thrive (Esposito, 2010; Al-Khalili, 2011).

Early Islamic civilisation was thus pluralistic with various cultures and traditions thriving in the great cities built by the caliphate. Arab scholars, both Muslims and non-Muslims, not only translated important Western classical works but also produced new and original ideas of their own. Major advances in law, theology, philosophy, literature, art, medicine, mathematics, optics and astronomy were achieved during that period. Words like alchemy, algebra, alkali and alcohol – derived from Arabic roots, a cosmopolitan language of that age – are all traces of an intellectually sophisticated Muslim past (Esposito, 2010; Moosa, 2015). On the achievements of the early Muslims, Maria R. Menocal (2003) notes:

The virtue of this Arab-Islamic civilization (in this as in other things not so unlike the Roman) lay precisely in its being able to assimilate and even revive the rich gifts of earlier and indigenous cultures, some crumbling, others crumbled, even as it was itself being crafted. The range of cultural yearning and osmosis of the Islamic empire in this expansive moment was as great as its territorial ambitions: from the Roman spolia that would appear as the distinctive capitals on the columns of countless mosques to the Persian stories that would be known as *The Thousand and One (or Arabian) Nights*, from the corpus of translated Greek philosophical texts to the spices and silks of the farthest East. Out of this acquisitive confrontation with a universe of languages, cultures, and people, the Umayyad [Arabs], who had come pristine out of the Arabian desert, defined their version of Islam as one that loved its dialogues with other traditions.

(p. 21–22, italics in the original)

If indeed this keen interest in dialogue with other traditions contributed to the creation of a progressive civilisation, the shying away from dialogue impacted

on the society in other ways. There were among the early Muslims those who viewed the processes of acculturation – influx of “foreign” ways, the adoption of new ideas and practices – as departing from the idealised past. They criticised the Umayyad practice and policies as being more influenced by foreign innovations than by the practices of the Prophet and the early Medinan community, and the inspiration and unification of the empire as having more to do with Arab power and wealth than Islamic commitment and ideals (Esposito, 2010). In an attempt to bring the Umayyad practice and law into line with normative Islam (associated with the period of Prophet Muhammad and the Rightly Guided Caliphs), these men devoted themselves to the study of the Qur’an, Arabic language and linguistics, the collection and examination of Prophetic traditions, and the formulation and explication of Islamic law (the *shari’ah*). The ideology of restoring early Islam appealed to the masses and gave stature and influence to these men who eventually emerged as the religious class, the *ulama*. The Abbasids rode on this ideology when they replaced the Umayyad leadership, and developed Islamic scholarship and disciplines, built mosques and established schools. Under the patronage of the new rulers, the *ulama* entrenched their authority as theologians, jurists, educators and the interpreters and guardians of the *shari’ah*. The founders of the four main schools of Muslim (Sunni) religious jurisprudence emerged during this period and their work embodied the moral and social impulses of Islam (Esposito, 2010).

Dialogue with other traditions continued to be a hallmark of the early Islamic civilisation under the Abbasids. If the Umayyads incorporated Byzantine arts and architecture, the Abbasids patronised Hellenistic philosophy and science, Persian literature and other aspects of the Middle Eastern imperial cultural tradition (Lapidus, 1996). Theology then was not limited to studying the scriptures and *Sunnah* (example) of the Prophet but also the writings of Plato and Aristotle. This gave rise to the emergence of different schools of theology other than the one subscribed to by the *ulama*. The rationalists, for instance, who were favoured by the caliphs for political reasons, argued that the universe was arranged by certain principles that can be discovered by reason alone. This was at odds with the *ulama*’s position which, while accepting the use of reason as a tool in theological debates, conceded that God ultimately transcends reason.

Over time, the shying away from dialogue gained traction. In the theological tensions that ensued between rationalist (associated with the caliphs) and orthodox (the *ulama*) interpretations of Islam, the latter claimed victory, which resulted in the caliphs losing their position as a source of religious belief even as the *ulama* remained committed to them as the successors to the Prophet. While the caliphate evolved into a largely military and imperial institution, the *ulama* on the other hand, developed authority over the communal, personal, religious and doctrinal aspects of Islam (Lapidus, 1996). This loosening of government from religion was unfortunate as it weakened the rule of the caliphs whose legitimacy rested on them being both the political and religious leader of the community of believers or *ummah*. Yet, within the relative safety of this expansive and inclusive empire, faith and reason continued to “exist in comfortable harmony and accommodation” (Ahmed, 2007: 11) and the proliferation of new knowledge in the

6 *Mukhlis Abu Bakar*

various disciplines continued to prosper (Hernandez, 1991). One of the intellectual giants that emerged was Abu Hamid al-Ghazali (d. 1111), who, despite his combative attitude towards Greek learning was nevertheless not closed to cosmopolitan learning of his time (Moosa, 2005).

This fine balance between faith and reason, so beautifully struck despite inherent struggles, was characteristic of the caliphal period that stretched over six centuries. However, after defeat descended on the Muslims in 1258 with the invasion of Baghdad by the Mongols, followed by the loss of Muslim hegemony in world affairs, this fine balance lost its foothold. A resurgence that took place in the 15th century in the form of dynamic Muslim sultanates and the establishment of three major empires – the Ottoman Turkish centred in Istanbul; Persian Safavid in Isfahan; and Mughal empire in Delhi – could not bring back the glory of the past except for the occasional brilliant sparks in their history (Esposito, 2010). The *ulama* of that period had become part of a prosperous religious establishment that assisted the sultans in centralising and controlling the educational, legal and social systems. In education, *fiqh*, along with the Qur'an and *Hadith* (Prophetic sayings), was the mainstay of the madrasah curriculum, but there was an absence of a robust intellectual paradigm in Islamic thought. The content of education during this period also did not reflect available up-to-date knowledge, especially the rational sciences, and in technology (Riaz, 2011). Thus, while the *ulama* of the caliphal period actively built repositories of Islamic knowledge relevant to the needs of their time, the *ulama* of the sultanate period were contented with a lifeless study of those repositories (Moosa, 2015; Sikand, 2005). There are indications to suggest that the situation has improved little today (Noor Aisha, this volume).

### Reforming madrasah education

The foregoing reflection on the success and struggle in keeping both faith and reason in comfortable harmony during the caliphal period might give educators a lead in bringing madrasah education forward in a globalised world. Over the past centuries, there have been periodic debates and disagreement over whether the old madrasah curricula should be retained, altered or blended with a syllabus that consists of modern subjects. The results have been mixed. They range from those who object to any change to the madrasah syllabus, to some who tolerate superficial amendments, to others who favour a curriculum that combines the old and the new. On the whole, however, the madrasah has kept to the status quo.

Ebrahim Moosa (2015) makes the case that any change necessarily invites a modification of what it means to be a Muslim. And Muslim identity is a contested domain which goes beyond being an observant Muslim who practices Islam's five pillars. There are many contested interpretations and meanings of Islam. The protracted struggle between the caliphs and the *ulama* serves to demonstrate the difficulty of defining Muslim identity. This is also an issue of concern in the educational realm where community identity or nationhood is central. As proposed by pro-innovation traditionalist thinker Shibli Nu'mani (1955, cited in Moosa, 2015: 220), Muslim identity pivots on Islam in two ways: as a faith tradition

and as a cultural tradition. This is not dissimilar to the distinction made by pro-modernist intellectual Fazlur Rahman (1982) between normative Islam and historical Islam. Many Muslims would be able to say without much thought what it means to identify with Islam as a faith tradition. The *shari'ah* has long filled that capacity which Muslims, in the past and today, identify with, even though its presentation in the globalised world has come under tremendous strain.

In contrast, identifying with Islam as a cultural and civilisational tradition is harder to grasp. For Nu'mani, cultural tradition is associated with a modern, plural society involving citizenship and a version of political representation, possibly even democracy. Plurality here signifies a free-flowing, natural process not only articulated through the process of migration but also through cultural borrowings and adaptations (Shamsul, 2005). This cultural tradition necessarily evolves over time and is peculiar to the given context. It manifested in the plural society of the Abbasid era through, for example, their extensive borrowing from Persian culture with its divinely ordained system of government. True to Nu'mani's caution, it was a struggle for the Abbasid rulers to mobilise the *ulama* to embrace the cultural evolution of their society as part of their Muslim identity. But other segments of the society seemed to have reconciled the demands of the faith with the cultural pulse of that society to the point of engaging in highly fruitful intellectual and scientific endeavours.

One critique of the madrasah system is its strong interest in the classics of the Islamic tradition rather than with contemporary issues. Translating and clarifying the ancient Islamic texts must be carried out with an attempt to link the medieval world to contemporary realities. Ebrahim Moosa (2015) provides an interesting example – the delineation of the seven types of water usable to secure ritual purity: rain, sea, river, well, spring water and water melted from snow and ice. A lesson on the topic can be transformed into broader discussion, e.g., about the validity of recycled water for ritual purposes, which would be a novel contribution to the medieval authors' original treatment of the subject. Students should be armed with the practice of understanding the relevance of the text they study as well as how to apply their insights in a globalised world. As Allan Luke (2003) has suggested, what we teach students to 'do' with texts – intellectually, culturally, socially and politically – is as important as what we teach them to 'know'.

Complexity and the interweaving of disciplines is the order of the world today. The early Muslims of the caliphal period have long recognised the importance of constructing new knowledge by exposing Muslim religious thought to different methods of inquiry such as critical readings of Greek philosophy and Neoplatonism and Persian literature. Likewise, tremendous gains can be had if the madrasahs integrate modern science, social science, humanities and local knowledge into a continuous and coherent curriculum that speaks with the core traditional madrasah curriculum and its emphasis on religious teachings (Moosa, 2015). An ethicist who has training and expertise in history or socio-biology will surely appreciate the development and evolution of values formed within religious discourses much better than someone who does not. Similarly, an educator who clarifies theological issues with a contemporary resonance to the lived experience of his Muslim students is surely superior than one who only brings up uncritically references to seventh-century Arabia.

Muslim exposure to both modern secular and religious education is indispensable. Repeated calls for a fresh interpretation of the Qur'an and the *Sunnah* so that it is more appropriate to contemporary contexts have been made in the past by reformists including Muhammad Abduh of Egypt, who insisted that interpretation of divinely revealed texts is a dynamic process in which reason and revelation sit together in harmony (Abduh, 2002). The persistent stalemate over the use of modern knowledge in order to advance Muslim religious thought is thus perplexing. The Muslim world is rife with the belief that the careful following of the teachings of the learned teachers of the past and their treatment of the Qur'an and *sunnah* is what would return Muslims to the 'right path' (Esposito, 2010; Sikand, 2005). Among Muslim traditionalists, they appear to struggle in holding on to both the requirement of piety and the contemporary challenge to have the broadest grounding in knowledge (Moosa, 2015; Alam; Candland, this volume). These perhaps explain the ambivalence among Muslim intellectuals and elites to effect change, to inject a fresh perspective on how Islam can play a progressive role in developing a positive change in people's lives and not simply as a privatised religion that has no contributing content for public discourse.

In some places, reforms were forced onto the madrasah such as in Singapore where the legislation on compulsory elementary education resulted in the madrasahs having to take the national curriculum to their students. The mandatory national examination for maths, science, English and the mother tongue language at the end of primary schooling – with serious repercussions for the madrasahs' continued survival should students fail to reach a certain minimum standard set by the government – diverted attention away from thinking about the complexity of integrating the different streams of knowledge into a coherent whole (Mukhlis, 2009; but see Aljunied and Albakri, this volume).

There is evidence, however, that holds out hope that the transformational shift in the outlook and practice of Muslims will make a change for the better. The call to forge an Islamic modernity has inspired pockets of enlightened Muslims to build schools and institutions that develop syllabi that are contemporary and relevant. One example is the attempt by scholars and students of Zaytuna College in the United States to critically engage the Islamic discursive tradition in order to craft an 'American Islam' based on a shared moral and ethical system that draws from the heterogeneous experiences of diverse Muslims and their material circumstances (Kashani, 2014). Other examples of attempts at curricular and pedagogic reform can be found in this book (e.g., Ahmed & Sabir; Quadri; Aljunied & Albakri, this volume), which also includes essays that explore key challenges that arise from the reform process (e.g., Raihani; Waghid, this volume).

Needless to say, it is with a certain advocacy that this book was conceptualised – the necessity to rethink madrasah education and learning in a changing world.

## **Outline of the chapters**

This is not a typical academic book in the sense that the authors come from a variety of perspectives and experiences – scholars who have worked extensively on the issue of madrasah education in different countries as well as practitioners



who have at some point played an important role in their respective institutions and worked directly in the reform process. They speak to the issue of rethinking madrasah education from their respective vantage points. The book comprises 15 chapters grouped in three sections. Each section reflects the chapters' particular emphasis on the topic. The chapters in the first section – Social, political and cultural contexts – give readers a good appreciation of the contexts in selected countries within which the madrasahs operate, and the challenges from both inside and outside the madrasahs. The chapters in the second section – Curriculum and pedagogy – provide contemporary examples of some of the curriculum and pedagogical reform processes at work including suggestions of how students can connect their religious heritage with contemporary issues. Finally, the last section – Issues in education reforms – describe how Muslim communities in different countries have worked to make the madrasah stay relevant, and the extent to which these efforts have been successful.

### *Social, political and cultural contexts*

The section begins with Noor Aisha Abdul Rahman discussing the impact of the rapid and massive social change induced by the processes of industrialisation and modernisation on Muslim societies. She then explores major socio-historical factors that have impeded madrasah development in Southeast Asia and South Asia, giving attention to analysing the nature of political culture, the historical experience of colonialism, the orientation of the dominant religious elite, and the impact of the phenomenon of religious revivalism in Muslim societies. She warns that any lag in revaluing the aims, philosophy and modes of learning in madrasah education will have an impact on the general progress of the Muslims and the relevance of Islam in contributing to creative assimilation of contributions from diverse civilisations and to the direction of modernisation.

Revaluation of madrasah education can become a tricky venture when the parties involved are in conflict as to what reform means to them. In his analysis of the reform process in India, Arshad Alam notes that both the state and the madrasahs (represented by the *ulama*) have their own notions of reform in the madrasah context. The state views such reforms as a means of introducing contemporary and relevant knowledge into the curriculum while the madrasah understands them as a process of returning to the fundamentals of true religion, to rid it of what are seen as harmful or non-essential accretions. It gets trickier when state-led modernisation efforts are seen as mere rhetoric, which only builds mistrust between the two parties.

Distrust underlies much of the resistance of the madrasah in Pakistan towards government-led reforms. Christopher Candland places these reform efforts in historical and political contexts in order to understand why they have failed. At the risk of simplifying the complex issues around the madrasahs, which Candland carefully articulates, suffice to say that discourses that often get foregrounded are those predicated on whether the madrasahs promote violence or whether madrasah education is inadequate for employment and life in the modern world. That there is a gem of Islamic education practiced in some madrasahs – where critical

thought and liberal education are celebrated in harmony with the religious and the spiritual – is lost on many.

Moving on to Singapore where Malay Muslims constitute an indigenous but small minority, S. Gopinathan suggests that efforts to modernise the madrasah curriculum are best understood in the wider context of education reform in the country. Calls to modernise curriculum and pedagogy in the madrasahs are to some extent echoes of proposals at the national level. By considering the historical and current changes in Singapore's educational system (multiple pathways at the secondary level, greater school-level autonomy and the cultivation of 21st-century competencies), he shows how economic and social changing contexts place substantive challenges and implications on madrasah education.

Muslims are a more recent minority community in Britain where schooling is a major area of struggle for equality of opportunity and assertion of identity. As such, the position of madrasah (or generally known there as Muslim faith schools) is best understood in the context of prevalent critiques or political circumstances within which these schools are embedded. Nasar Meer and Damian Breen present in detail the myriad of challenges facing these schools as well as the challenges to society posed by the presence of the schools. A critical issue amongst Muslims in Britain is reconfiguring what being a Muslim in the West means, with part of that process being linked to the issue of schooling.

### *Curriculum and pedagogy*

The section begins with Yusef Waghid offering a philosophical account of the integration of knowledge that is premised on a non-dichotomous, or what he calls 'non-bifurcatory', view of knowledge, which he suggests is critical to an understanding of a reconceptualised view of madrasah education. He first cites Islamisation and the conceptual problems associated with it as an instance of how one conceives of knowledge integration, and illustrates the extent it has succeeded in selected Muslim countries. He then describes the alternative, non-bifurcatory view of knowledge and examines some of its implications for teaching and learning. In this radicalised imaginary of madrasah education, memorisation and the acquisition of factual knowledge are accompanied and informed by reflective thought and critical reasoning, where students and teachers are co-learners, in a system that is open to the critical scrutiny of others.

The next three chapters in this section focus on the practice of education in some private schools in Britain, the USA and Singapore respectively. Farah Ahmed and Tahreem Sabir make the point that rethinking Islamic education in the context of Britain should be firmly located in rethinking the role of Muslims as a minority, and supporting the integration of Muslims as Muslims in the society. They present the curricular and pedagogical innovations in the *Shakhsiyah* schools as an example of that endeavour. A key feature of the schools' curriculum is the personalised learning approach that centres the development of each individual child's character within a holistic thematic curriculum that promotes dialogue about Islamic concepts and values in relation to other worldviews, be it

religious or the dominant secular-liberal worldview of the society the child lives in. Through such dialogues and independent learning, children gain a broad as well as deep historical, social and geographical understanding of the world.

Habeeb Quadri discusses the importance of integration in his description of how his school in the US integrates Islamic knowledge into the general curriculum to provide a holistic and practical understanding and application of Islam. Drawing from the knowledge that Islam is to be lived, as illustrated by Prophet Muhammad himself, he cautions against an Islamic education that fails to help students find a connection with the knowledge of the Qur'an in the everyday issues that children face – gender relations, Islam and culture, character and leadership, issues of identity, to name a few. He shares practical examples of how knowledge of Islam can be infused into the different subject areas such as English literature, history and science by applying modern pedagogical tools including researching, writing and acting out unique plays relevant to the topic of study.

Echoing the call for integrated holistic education, Farah Mahamood Aljunied and Albakri Ahmad describe the attempt at improving madrasah education in Singapore. This is facilitated with the introduction of the Joint Madrasah System (JMS), which consolidates the operations and resources of three madrasahs. After an elaborate review process, the revised curriculum introduced at the secondary level hinges on three components: integration of curriculum both within the Islamic subject areas and across the modern subjects; creation of learning materials that are contemporary and contextualised; and methods in pedagogy and assessment that are more in tune with current developments in education. There is much hope that the new curriculum will produce graduates who are steeped in the Islamic tradition yet able to embrace modernity in an intellectually productive way.

Rosnani Hashim takes a bold step back by focusing on evaluating the Islamic Studies education (ISE) curriculum of Malaysian national schools, which is comparable to that offered in the religious schools. Her contention is that if ISE is to be a moral compass for Muslim students, it will serve the schools well to identify areas in both the curriculum and pedagogy that match with the needs and challenges of modern times. She found little emphasis in the curriculum on the application of religious knowledge to contemporary issues and everyday situations which, converging with the earlier point by Quadri, must be addressed to ensure that students do not develop a disconnect between the classroom and the outside world.

### *Issues in educational reforms*

The final section begins with Charlene Tan and Diwi Binti Abbas's analysis of madrasah reform at the primary level set against the national, state-sponsored system of education in Singapore. The authors contrast the state's 'secular' view of knowledge that underpins the creation of a qualified and flexible workforce that excels in the new globalised world with an Islamic view that does not distinguish between 'religious' and 'secular' knowledge, viewing all knowledge as coming

from God and education as an integral part of religious inculcation and devotion. This ‘compatibilist’ view between ‘religious’ and ‘academic’ knowledge, they opine, has enabled a case study madrasah to tap into the resources that the state provides and aim for its students the acquisition of both ‘modern’ subjects and ‘religious’ subjects within an Islamic ethos.

Raihani follows up by describing how the madrasah is positioned in the Indonesian education system by reviewing the changes to the madrasah curriculum over two periods of Indonesian history – New Order and Reform Order. Where previously, the madrasah was seen as incompatible with the modernisation process of the country, now it is positioned as equal to the general schools. Raihani argues that the curriculum changes that made this possible were not due to the madrasah’s modernisation efforts alone but driven by several socio-political factors including the historical conflict between Islamist and secular nationalist groups, the structural dichotomy between general and religious education, the political willingness of both national and local governments, and the societal stigmatisation of madrasah as a ‘second-class’ schooling system.

Historical, political and social factors have also impacted on the madrasah institution in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this chapter, Dina Sijamhodžić-Nadarević describes how the madrasah, the first of which was established during the Ottoman rule in the 15th century, has responded to the challenges amidst radical political and social changes and varying ideologies over the course of the country’s turbulent history. The thrust of the chapter is on the madrasah’s survival alongside concerns of its status, structure and curriculum as it adapts to its new milieu and challenges posed by the changes. Although unique, in some ways, the madrasah’s transformation into an institution that keep pace with the developmental needs of the country mirrors the developmental trajectory of madrasahs in other settings such as those in Singapore.

The preceding three chapters evaluate the success of madrasah reforms in places where Muslims are native to the area. The focus of the final two chapters is on the experiences of Muslim communities providing Islamic religious education in their adopted countries.

The first migrants arrived in South Africa more than 350 years ago and since then, madrasah education has evolved, sensitive to the changing social and political situation of the day – the colonisation, apartheid and democratisation periods. Yusef Waghid describes the pedagogical rationales and curricular activities that guided education for Muslims during those periods and examines the implications of an integrated understanding of madrasah education for Muslim pedagogy. He argues that critical madrasah education (which includes critical reasoning, limited rote learning, deliberative inquiry and social justice) can be attentive to the waves of change in post-apartheid South African society. He harbours hope that such education can cultivate students who are responsive to the politico-societal demands of an emerging economy.

Muslim migration in Hong Kong is a more recent phenomenon. Socio-cultural factors and geopolitical forces play a part in the development of madrasah education culture in Hong Kong. Wai-Yip Ho identifies three distinct groups of

Muslims – South Asian Muslims, Chinese Hui Muslims and Indonesian Muslims – who together form a sizeable Muslim community in need of places of worship and religious education. Given the community's financial constraints (properties in Hong Kong are ludicrously expensive), the Muslims resort to renting small private flats and converting them into sacred spaces called 'housques' for the combined purpose of prayer and religious education. This enables Muslim youths to embrace both worldly knowledge (in school) and spiritual piety (in the house-style madrasah).

Taken together, the chapters in this book offers an overview of what it means to rethink madrasah education in the context of a globalised world, the issues that confront such an endeavour and the extent it can and cannot succeed. The book will be of interest to policy makers and government officers who have oversight over madrasah education or who are interested in Muslim educational reform as it pertains to curriculum and pedagogical development and innovation.

## References

- Abduh, M. (2002). Laws should change in accordance with the conditions of nations and the theology of unity. In C. Kurzman (Ed.), *Modernist Islam, 1840–1940: A Sourcebook* (pp. 50–60). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ahmed, A. (2007). *Journey Into Islam*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.
- Al-Khalili, J. (2011). *The House of Wisdom: How Arabic Science Saved Ancient Knowledge and Gave Us the Renaissance*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Esposito, J. L. (2010). *Islam: The Straight Path* (4th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hefner, R. W. (2009). *Making Modern Muslims: The Politics of Islamic Education in Southeast Asia*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Hernandez, M. C. (1991, December). The roots of coexistence. *UNESCO Courier*, 20–23.
- Kashani, M. (2014). *Seekers of sacred knowledge: Zaytuna College and the education of American Muslims*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, TX.
- Lapidus, I. M. (1996, May). State and religion in Islamic societies. *Past & Present*, 151, 3–27.
- Luke, A. (2003). Literacy education for a new ethics of global community. *Language Arts*, 81(1), 20–22.
- Malik, J. (Ed.). (2008). *Madrasas in South Asia: Teaching Terror?* London and New York: Routledge.
- Menocal, M. R. (2003). *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*. New York: Back Bay Books.
- Moosa, E. (2005). *Ghazali and the Poetics of Imagination*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Moosa, E. (2015). *What Is a Madrasa?* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mukhlis, A. B. (2009). Islamic religious education and Muslim religiosity in Singapore. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. New York: Routledge.

- Noor, F. A., Sikand, Y., and Bruinessen, M. V. (2008). *The Madrasa in Asia: Political Activism and Transnational Linkages*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Padela, A. I. (2006). Medical ethics in religious traditions: A study of Judaism, Catholicism, and Islam. *Journal of the Islamic Medical Association of North America*, 38(3), 106–117.
- Rahman, F. (1982). *Islam & Modernity: Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Riaz, A. (2011). Madrassah education in pre-colonial and Colonial South Asia. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 46(1), 69–86.
- Rosnani, H. (1996). *Educational Dualism in Malaysia: Implications for Theory and Practice*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Shamsul, A. B. (2005). Islam embedded: Religion and plurality in Southeast Asia as a mirror for Europe. *Asia Europe Journal*, 3(2), 159–178.
- Siddiqui, A. (1997). Ethics in Islam: Key concepts and contemporary challenges. *Journal of Moral Education*, 26(4), 423–431.
- Sikand, Y. (2005). *Bastions of the Believers: Madrasas and Islamic Education in India*. New Delhi: Penguin.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good*. Paris: The United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Wersal, L. (1995). Islam and environmental ethics: Tradition responds to contemporary challenges. *Zygon®*, 30(3), 451–459.
- Zaman, M. Q. (2002). *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam: Custodians of Change*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

## 12 Curriculum reform in the Indonesian madrasah

### The position of madrasah in the post-independence education system

Raihani

#### Introduction

Islamic education in Indonesia developed following the development of Islam in the country. When Islamic preachers from the Indian and Arabian subcontinents arrived in the seventh century (Hasbullah, 1995), they established mosques or prayer places for them to worship and spread the Islamic teachings. *Halaqah* (circles of religious learning) were established in mosques following the great tradition of knowledge transmission of the Prophet Muhammad, his companions and followers. This practice of teaching continued, and when the number of students from areas far from the mosques increased, *pondok* (student accommodation) were built around the mosques. This system was called *surau* in West Sumatra, *dayah* in Aceh, *langgar* in Kalimantan and *pesantren* in Java. This type of institution was then considered as one of the first Islamic educational institutions in Indonesia, which has continued to exist to date (Abdullah, 1986), but *pesantren* seems to be a name that is now popularly and nationally used.

Madrasah, often translated as Islamic day school, is another Islamic educational institution in Indonesia. It is a relatively new institution introduced as a response to the spread of the Dutch schooling system in the Indonesian community (Azra, 2014). Its introduction occurred in the context of the developing Islamic movement in the 20th century, i.e., the rise of *kaum muda* (group of young Muslim scholars) opposing *kaum tua* (older scholars) (Azra, 1999). According to Azra (1999), *surau*, a place to learn and practice Sufism became the object of fierce criticism of *kaum muda* after their return from Saudi Arabia, bringing with them the Wahhabi teachings which emphasised the return to the perceived original and true Islam based on the Qur'an and the Prophet's traditions. Bloody conflicts escalated and claimed deaths including Islamic scholars (*ulama*) from both sides. *Surau*, as a traditional institution, gradually demised, and Islamic schools as a manifestation of the Islamic reform transnationally brought from the Middle East began to develop. Currently, madrasahs, which follow certain requirements and regulations set up particularly by the Ministry of Religion (MoR), are described as more modern than *pesantren* in terms of their curriculum, structure and teaching approach, even though there are now madrasahs established in the *pesantren*

compound to cater to students who want both *pesantren*-based Islamic education and the government curricula. In this context, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a madrasah and a *pesantren* particularly in terms of management and location. Modern-day madrasahs, like other schools, consist of three schooling levels, i.e., elementary (*madrasah ibtidaiyah*), junior secondary (*madrasah tsanawiyah*) and senior secondary (*madrasah 'aliyah*) (Mastuhu, 1994).

In this chapter, I focus on the madrasah, excluding *pesantren*, as representing an analytical case of the curriculum of Islamic education in Indonesia after its independence (1945 onwards). Curriculum is the core of an educational establishment by which educational objectives and orientation are institutionalised, school cultures are created, learning and teaching are planned and enacted, and more importantly the nation's vision is manifested (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998; Parkay, Hass, and Anctil, 2010). In this chapter, the concept of curriculum encompasses the load of subjects taught in the madrasah and developed in a particular context of change, which indicates efforts done by the government and the Muslim community and/or scholars to reform this Islamic institution. As discussed later, the load of subjects with the deliberate inclusion of Islamic and/or secular knowledge can be seen as a playing field for Muslims and secular nationalists to colour the face of Indonesian Islamic education. Thus, what is meant by curriculum reform here are changes to the madrasah's curriculum orientation and content as a result of such ongoing political and ideological contestations.

Historically, the place of the madrasah in the Indonesian education system has been continuously contested. Initially, it was seen incompatible with the modernisation process of the country after its independence in 1945. This contestation occurred despite the real and significant roles that madrasahs had played particularly in providing Indonesian citizens with Islamic education. The incompatibility of the madrasah with modernity was often seen from its curriculum, which was characterised by heavy, if not full, classical Islamic and Arabic subjects and their traditional approaches to teaching and learning (Steenbrink, 1994). Currently, madrasahs are positioned as equal to the general schools<sup>1</sup> in the education system, even though there remain some problems and challenges. The 'equal position' of madrasah was gained partly through curriculum changes, improvements and compromises. The process of such changes, I argue, cannot be seen as mere efforts in modernising madrasah education; rather it has been influenced and driven by several socio-political factors including the historical conflict between the Islamist and the secular nationalist groups, the structural dichotomy of secular and religious education and social changes and demands.

## **The dichotomy and integration of Indonesian education<sup>2</sup>**

Education in Indonesia is characterised by a structural dichotomy in the form of two schooling systems. One is the general schools which are administered by the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) and the other the Islamic schools which are under the administration of the Ministry of Religion (MoR). Karel Steenbrink (1994) opines that this structural dichotomy is rooted in the failure of



the Dutch colonial government to accommodate the Islamic education sector in the public education which the government introduced in 1906 through the system of *sekolah desa* (village schools). The government was reluctant to support the Islamic education system then, i.e., *pesantren*, which had long been established by the Islamic community, as politically, it did not want to be seen as intervening in the Islamic affairs of the community (Steenbrink, 1994: 6). Maksum (1999), however, speculates that the main reason for the Dutch government's hesitance to integrate Islamic education was the fear that this education could become a basis for anti-colonialism. Another reason, according to Steenbrink (1994), was that the *pesantren* system was considered to be heavily characterised by traditional pedagogy, i.e., rote learning of Arabic scripts. Since then, Islamic education became obscured from the public eye and independently developed its own system.

The dichotomy of structure continued into the independence era of the Republic of Indonesia. The government established the MoEC in 1945 with the primary role of managing the national education excluding Islamic schools. In 1946, to accommodate Muslim demands that the government support the implementation of aspects of the *shari'ah*, the Old Order government<sup>3</sup> established the MoR (Boland, 1982; Effendy, 1998). This Ministry was established to manage Islamic affairs including Islamic marriage, mosques, pilgrimage, Islamic courts and high courts. In education, the MoR was authorised to take over the administration of religious classes in the schools from the MoEC and given the responsibility to administer the Islamic education sector (including both religious and secular curricula of the madrasahs) and to establish the School for Religious Teachers (*Sekolah Guru Agama*). The MoR has since become a venue for Muslims to accommodate their Islamic aspirations and interests after their lost in the 'fight' for an Islamic state against the nationalists. By establishing the MoR and keeping Islamic education under its authority, the government maintained the structural dualism of the national education system.

However, as Mujiburrahman (2006) explains, there were several attempts to unify the Islamic education sector with the general schools under the MoEC. During the Old Order, in the Eight Year Development Plan (1961–69), there was a proposal by the government to the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly (MPRS) to transfer the madrasah administration to the MoEC but the MPRS decided that this sector should remain with the MoR. During the New Order, however, through the presidential decree of No.34 in 1972 followed by the presidential instruction of No.15 in 1974, the government moved to place all education matters under the control of the MoEC. Although there was no specific mention of madrasahs and other Islamic educational institutions, what was implied by these regulations was clear – that such Islamic institutions should be placed under the MoEC. In line with this, in the late 1970s, Pranarka and Priyono of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) recommended a similar idea in order to achieve more effectively the aim of national education. Supporting this unification idea, in 1988, the new MoEC Minister, Fuad Hassan, proposed a bill of education to Parliament which did not make any mention of madrasahs and the authority of MoR in the affairs of education.

The unification attempts, however, did not succeed as the Muslim leaders responded negatively to the idea of integrating the madrasahs into the administration of the MoEC. As Mujiburrahman (2006, p. 225) states: “For Rasjidi [the first Minister for Religion], the unification would not only reduce the authority of the Department of Religion but also would completely secularise Islamic schools.” So, giving up the Islamic education sector to the MoEC would mean another loss for Muslims to the nationalists. Moreover, the idea of placing Islamic education under the MoEC came from the nationalists and Christian figures, which made Muslim leaders more suspicious of the unification efforts. As such, during the Old Order, the Islamic education sector remained autonomous under the MoR (Maksum, 1999, p. 132).

Attempts at integrating madrasahs into the national education system took on a new life with the enactment of the Education Laws of 1989 and 2003. While the Law of 1989 implicitly included madrasah as a type of “*pendidikan keagamaan*” (religious education) and part of the national education system, the Law of 2003 under the Reform Era government made clear the equal position of madrasahs and the general schools. The mention of ‘*sekolah*’ (school) was always followed by the mention of ‘madrasah’ indicating acceptance of these two institutions in the national education system (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2003). Thus, instead of placing madrasahs under the MoEC, the new attempt was focused on making madrasahs equal to the general schools within a unified system of national education in terms of funding, secular curriculum, graduate qualification and competencies and management. Under this system, the MoR remained as the authority that managed the Islamic education sector.

Madrasahs thus became an integral part of the Indonesian education system equal to the general schools. Reflecting on the attempts to unify general and Islamic education in Indonesia during the New and Old Orders, Steenbrink (1994, p. 7) rightly describes: “General education system in Indonesia did not emerge from the adoption of the existing traditional Islamic education. Conversely, the Islamic education system as can be seen now will gradually adapt [integrate] into the general system.” His description is correct as the Islamic education sector gave up a large portion of its interests when it adapted to the general education system. The madrasah has lost some of its characteristics as an Islamic education institution as it gradually transformed into a general school-type institution. To sum up, even as the madrasahs were ‘integrated’ into the national system, it remained under the MoR’s administration, which means that the structural dualism or dichotomy of the national education system was maintained, i.e., one under the MoEC and the other under the MoR.

### **Madrasah curriculum reforms**

The integration of the madrasahs into the national system has to be seen as a compromise on the part of the madrasahs. This section will explain in more detail the gradual reforms in the madrasah curriculum in the post-independence era and how the initial madrasah religious identities have become less important.

*Madrasah curriculum in the Old Order era (1945–66)*

As mentioned earlier, not long after the independence of the Republic of Indonesia, the MoR was established to cater to the interests and needs of the Muslims and to manage their affairs, one of which was Islamic education. Prior to this, Islamic education, which was mostly represented by *pesantren* and the traditional madrasahs, was managed by Muslim groups and/or individuals (Maksum, 1999). These educational institutions had spread sporadically without valid data on their numbers. There was a lack of attention given to *pesantren* and the madrasahs by the Old Order government as it preferred the centralised secular schooling system over the Islamic one. As in the colonial era, the madrasahs were ignored by the government.

The madrasah curriculum generally consisted of religious subjects to cater to mostly Muslims who could not afford, or did not want, to send their children to secular schools. Maksum (1999) suggests that the madrasah curriculum in the early part of this era was just a continuation of what was in the pre-independence period. He concludes that there were three forms of madrasah in this period, i.e., madrasahs with a heavy load of Islamic teachings and only a few secular subjects, those with a relatively balanced Islamic and secular teachings and those with a heavy load of secular subjects as in the former Dutch schools. These various types of madrasah curriculum were influenced by the fact that the majority of madrasahs were private and only a few were state-managed.

As most madrasahs were privately managed by Islamic organisations or individuals, there were various types of madrasahs with different curriculum orientation. In order to unify these madrasahs, in 1950, the Minister for MoR, Wahid Hasyim, introduced a policy of madrasah compulsory education or *Madrasah Wajib Belajar* (MWB) (Maksum, 1999). This policy was aligned with the Basic Education Law 1950 which states that learning in religious schools (madrasah) administered by the MoR is considered as fulfilling compulsory education. The madrasah curriculum was, therefore, designed to provide students with religious instruction, the secular/general subjects and skills development, and would be completed in eight years. The MWB, however, failed to flourish because of the lack of teachers, facilities and the enthusiasm of the madrasahs' community (Maksum, 1999).

Later, the MoR initiated the establishment of madrasahs which in structure were similar to the general schools, i.e., primary (*ibitidaiyah*) for six years, junior secondary (first *tsanawiyah*) for four years and senior secondary (second *tsanawiyah*) for four years. The curriculum of these madrasahs was developed with 30 percent religious instruction and the rest general subjects. Besides replacing the previous failing policy of MWB, the inception of these madrasahs was to respond to community demands for Islamic schools that produced citizens who possessed not only religious knowledge but secular knowledge as well (Ramayulis, 2012). Many were of the view that madrasah graduates contributed less significantly to the development of the new country due to their training.

It is pertinent to add here that what is quite remarkable about the Old Order in terms of Islamic education was the introduction of an institution called Religious

Teacher Education (*Pendidikan Guru Agama* or PGA) by MoR (Maksum, 1999; Ramayulis, 2012). The move was important for the development of Islamic education as PGA produced Islamic religious teachers for both the madrasahs and the schools. In the madrasahs, PGA graduates were expected to teach Islamic religious subjects such as Islamic faith, Islamic jurisprudence, Islamic history and so forth, whilst in schools they were assigned to teach Islamic religion as a subject which, in the Old Order era and according to the Decree of the People Assembly in 1960, was compulsory for students (Ramayulis, 2012). The establishment of this Islamic religious teacher training institution, however, was limited to several big cities only.

### *Madrasah curriculum in the New Order era (1966–98)*

Madrasahs in the Old Order developed with little support from the new government, which prioritised general education. The madrasah curriculum was seen as incapable of providing its graduates with the same quality of education as their counterparts in the general schools. This further affirmed the belief within the community that madrasahs were only second-class institutions with traditional approaches to teaching and learning, heavy religious instruction and ineffective management.

During the New Order, efforts to reform the madrasahs through the curriculum were more seriously and successfully made. In 1975, the New Order government issued a three-minister joint decree (*Surat Keputusan Bersama Tiga Menteri*) involving the Ministers for Education and Culture, Religion and Interior, in an attempt to improve the quality of the madrasahs and the national education as a whole (Zuhdi, 2005). With this decree, the madrasahs began to be considered a formal education system equal to the general school system and as part of the national education system. This decree had curricular ramifications for the madrasahs. In 1976, MoR issued a ministerial decision to adopt and standardise a new madrasah curriculum comprising 30 percent religious subjects and 70 percent secular subjects. The secular subjects were the same as the general schools', which were developed by the MoEC. Zuhdi (2005) argues that this decree has been pivotal in empowering madrasah students to become effective participants in society just like students in the general schools. In a more detailed description, this decree produced a positive impact on the madrasahs: a madrasah certificate is equally valued as a school certificate, madrasah graduates may continue on to higher education in the general schools and madrasah students may transfer to the general schools at the same level (Maksum, 1999; Ramayulis, 2012, Zuhdi, 2005).

The madrasah curriculum, after the 1975 decree, comprised, among others, Islamic faith/ethics, Islamic laws, Islamic history, Qur'an and *Hadith* and Arabic (Zuhdi, 2005). These subjects were classified as Islamic subjects and formed 30 percent of the whole madrasah curriculum. The balance of 70 percent consisted of Pancasila Moral Education, Indonesian language, social sciences, natural sciences, Indonesian history, mathematics, art education, physical and health

education and skills development. All these subjects were designed for both the madrasahs and the schools at the elementary level. For the secondary madrasah curriculum, general subjects were added that included English and civic education. With the proportion of 30 percent and 70 percent for religious and general subjects respectively, it does not mean that the religious instruction was reduced to 30 percent of what it used to be. The religious curriculum remained roughly the same as before, but it now formed only 30 percent of the whole madrasah curriculum. This means that madrasah students had more hours to study compared to general school students because of the religious subjects. Muslim students in school learned only one compulsory religious subject, i.e., Islamic religion. Different from the Old Order madrasah levels, the madrasahs after 1975 were structured into *ibtidaiyah* (primary) for six years, *tsanawiyah* (junior secondary) for three years and *'aliyah* (senior secondary) for three years. This new system of educational levels is the same as that of the general schools.

To support the 1975 decree, different policies throughout the period of 1975–88 were issued (Hasbullah, 1995; Ramayulis, 2012). The policies brought about curriculum changes in the madrasah following changes in the general school curriculum. For example, there were notable curriculum changes in 1976 (implemented in 1978) and in 1984. These affected both the madrasahs and the schools equally. Another example was the introduction of the active learning approach (*Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif*) in the 1980s. This teaching and learning strategy was equally promoted in the madrasahs and the schools through various teacher education and training. Through such policies and programmes, madrasah education started to become an equal, alternative option for Indonesian Muslims to send their children to. Yet, the impression of madrasahs as a second-class educational institution remained intact partly due to the higher proportion of private madrasahs which usually cater to rural and poor Islamic communities and which suffer from bad management, poor facilities and low achievement rate (Parker and Raihani, 2011). According to statistics (Kementerian Agama RI, 2011; Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2012), the whole madrasah population accommodated more than 43 percent of poor students. Also, about 30 percent of madrasahs were not accredited, which was higher than the national proportion of non-accredited schools and madrasahs, i.e., 20 percent.

The 1975 decree was seen as an effort to bring the madrasahs into the fold of the national education system. There was a positive impact on madrasah education and its graduates from this integration including the equal status of its graduates. Fadjar (1999) notes that this integration has ramifications for the madrasahs including the curriculum changes as mentioned above. They include all the academic requirements for students to be accepted in the madrasahs, the standardisation of learning programmes and the implementation of the national examination. As a result, students from the madrasahs can be accepted in the general schools and vice-versa. The integration also implies that both the madrasahs and the schools receive equal support from the government. However, madrasah education suffered from its inability to groom Islamic scholars (*ulama*) who possess deep Islamic knowledge, particularly at a time when new social problems

emerged and needed appropriate responses. It was the *pesantren* which served as the major Islamic institution that provided education for future Islamic scholars after the madrasahs became part of the national system through the Education Law of 1989. Yet, the *pesantren* was not the favourite option for producing modern Islamic scholars given its traditional approaches to curriculum and instruction. Therefore, in 1988, the MoR Minister, Munawir Syadzali, introduced a new type of madrasah at the *alimah* level, initially in five cities: Jember, Padang, Ciamis, Makassar and Solo. Named as *Madrasah Aliyah Pendidikan Khusus* (MAPK or Special Senior Secondary Islamic School) and then *Madrasah Aliyah Keagamaan* (MAK or Religious Senior Secondary Islamic School), these madrasahs were later established in many more areas of Indonesia due to their promising educational programmes (Ramayulis, 2012). The establishment of these madrasahs was a clear message that the regular madrasahs at the *alimah* level have failed to produce graduates with strong Islamic credentials.

The curriculum of MAPK was designed specifically to fulfill the above purpose. It contained 70 percent religious instruction and only 30 percent general subjects with Arabic and English as the main skills. These madrasahs adopted the *pesantren* system in which students were required to live in a dormitory to enable them to attend morning, afternoon and evening lessons. Selected from the top-performing students at the madrasah *tsanawiyah* level, they learned religious knowledge from morning to evening every day. With such a curriculum structure, the MAPK graduates were able to further their education in the faculties of the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) or Islamic universities in the Middle East. At this tertiary level, they demonstrated high performance and their Arabic and English abilities were outstanding. Unfortunately, these madrasahs did not receive sufficient support from the government and they closed in the 2000s. The reason for this decision remains unclear.

### *Madrasah curriculum in the Reform era (1998–now)*

Following 1998, there was a dramatic change in Indonesian education particularly in terms of education management, which had some consequences for school curriculum (Bandur, 2008). Consistent with global trends then, decentralisation of education became the main policy of the government when it issued the Decentralisation Law in 1999. The previously centralised education system was now changed into a system in which a significant amount of power and authority was invested in provinces and districts. Schools became more autonomous institutions. The madrasahs, however, remained centralised since they were under the administration of the MoR – one of three ministries which maintained the centralisation of authority. The other two were Finance and Defence (Aspinall and Fealy, 2003). In terms of curriculum reform, however, there was almost no difference between schools and madrasahs. This is to say that curriculum reforms that occurred in this post-1998 Reform era were inclusive and indiscriminate. This inclusive curriculum reform was founded on the Education Law of 2003 that explicitly positioned madrasahs and schools equally in the national education

system (Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional, 2003). Consequently, all curriculum development activities were centralised in the MoEC through the Center for Curriculum Development, but as explained later, madrasahs insisted on using MoR-developed curriculum for religious subjects.

The first curriculum reform during this period was the introduction of the 2006 curriculum or the so-called *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* (KTSP or school-based curriculum) (Raihani, 2007; Yamin, 2007). This curriculum, following the spirit of the decentralisation of education, was introduced to provide more school-based curriculum development and contextual, competency-based and student-centred approaches to teaching. Teachers were given more freedom to decide on subject curricula and classroom strategies. The central government continued to play a role in determining the general curriculum objectives and competencies for students to achieve and how schools assess students' learning progress and achievement. The national examination was mandated at the end of every schooling level, which was designed to establish the extent the curriculum's general competencies were achieved by students across the country.

The introduction of students' competencies in the new curriculum seemed to be one of its main characteristics. Previously, the curriculum was developed based on the Tylerian model (Tyler, 1949), which placed educational objectives as the main focus. The terms popularly used in the previous curriculum to describe students' learning targets and outcomes were "general instructional aims" and "specific instructional objectives" (*Tujuan Instruksional Umum dan Khusus*, or TIU & TIK). TIU was the first and more generic set of learning objectives students should achieve in a particular unit of lesson, while TIK was a breakdown of the TIU, and hence, more specific. Often, these objectives were vague or abstract to the teachers such that it was difficult for them to interpret and use them to assess their students' learning progress. The 2006 curriculum, however, emphasised the importance of competencies which were defined as "*keterampilan, sikap, dan nilai-nilai yang diwujudkan dalam kebiasaan berfikir dan bertindak*" (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2007: 18) meaning "skills, attitudes, and values manifested in habitual thinking and actions". Every competency that the students master as a result of the educational process should be observable and measurable so that its achievement can be clearly recognised.

Other than the emphasis on competency, many praised this curriculum for its compatibility with the decentralisation efforts of education as teachers gained more autonomy and stronger authority in their own areas (Yamin, 2007). Others valued the clear set of competencies determined for students in every learning area and every subject. In 2013, however, the government introduced a new curriculum to replace the 2006 version without proper evaluation of the latter. From the government's perspective, the 2013 curriculum was oriented to develop character education in students and designed to assess student learning more authentically. However, character education was already one that the Education Law of 2003 mandated on every school and madrasah. As such, the reasons for the change were challenged as its design was no different from the former curriculum. Based on my observation, one of the obvious differences

was the introduction of a thematic approach to teaching at the elementary level. Another was that teachers' freedom and authority in the 2013 curriculum were reduced to a level that they would become mere implementers of the centrally designed curriculum.

The 2013 curriculum began to be implemented just prior to the national election. A series of seminars and workshops were conducted in every province to explain the developers' perspectives to various stakeholders including lecturers, teachers, principals, education policy makers and community. These sessions required certain budgets to be allocated. Although it is always hard to prove that there is corruption in such activities, money-oriented projects are quite common in Indonesian bureaucratic culture as a means for government officers to earn additional income. As such, it was hard not to associate such programmes with political and economic interests. The initial plan to trial the curriculum only in selected schools was abandoned and instead it was implemented in every school including the madrasahs no matter whether the schools were prepared or otherwise. This indiscriminate implementation led to "chaos" and confusion in schools, and among teachers and parents (Rabu, 2014). Many school principals and teachers did not even understand the concept of the curriculum and how to implement it despite the massive efforts at education and training. Teachers particularly were confused as there were many administrative papers to deal with, and they were in a panic about the lack of appropriate handbooks for the subjects they taught. Parents were required to buy new books for their children but the books were not available in the market. Considering the poor conceptualisation of the curriculum and its messy implementation, the new government at the end of 2013 issued a decree to stop the K13 implementation and to return to the initial plan to trial it in selected schools (Sarnia, 2014).

What became of the madrasahs in the context of such curriculum reforms in the post-1998 Reform era? As indicated earlier, since the enactment of the Education Law of 2003, the madrasahs were placed on equal terms as the general schools. Therefore, every policy on school education also affected the madrasahs with the exception of the madrasahs' administrative policies and affairs (including the Islamic religious curriculum), which remained under the jurisdiction of MoR. This does not mean, however, that there was little difference left between the madrasahs and the schools. The administrative differences were found to have influenced the madrasahs greatly. First, as explained previously, the decentralisation policy did not include MoR in the package, which means that the institutions within the MoR's authority, including the madrasahs, remained centrally managed. As mandated by the regulation, these institutions could not be budgeted by the local government, whilst general schools were well placed as local institutions to receive regular budget and funds from the local government. Underfunded, the madrasahs, particularly the private ones, found it hard to develop equally as the schools (Parker and Raihani, 2009). Second, as a consequence, it was difficult for the madrasahs to successfully implement the educational policies including the curriculum. Based on my observation of many madrasahs across Indonesia, many of which were privately run, they have been struggling to keep up to date



with the national curriculum and instructional policies and strategies due to lack of facilities, infrastructure and human resources.

Another obvious difference is in the area of curriculum. Madrasahs prescribe more religious subjects than schools do (Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional, 2006). Like the previous curriculum, the additional subjects similarly include Islamic theology and ethics, the Qur'an and the Prophet's traditions, Islamic jurisprudence and Islamic history (see Table 12.1 for a sample of madrasah curriculum). A compulsory addition at every schooling level is Arabic. Despite the fact that the Education Law of 2003 applied equally to madrasahs and schools, the MoR and the madrasah community rejected the idea of madrasahs offering only one religious subject like the schools, i.e., *Pendidikan Agama Islam* (Islamic Religious Education). An allocation of two to four learning hours per week was not considered sufficient to cover the very broad four areas of Islamic religious knowledge. Another consideration to reject the idea of offering only one Islamic religious subject was the need to maintain the primary characteristic of madrasahs as an Islamic educational institution which has a heavier content of Islamic curricula than general schools. Therefore, the Islamic religious curriculum as developed and published by the MoEC was not implemented in the madrasahs, even though it was explicitly stated that the curriculum was developed for both types of educational institutions. Other subject curricula, however, remained the same.

To provide more insight into the Islamic subjects in the madrasahs, I outline briefly what is contained in each of the subjects (Departemen Agama RI, 2008). In Al-Qur'an and *Hadith*, students learn to read, memorise and understand

*Table 12.1* Comparative table of madrasah *tsanawiyah* curriculum in 1989 and 2013

<i>1989 Curriculum (learning hours per week)</i>	<i>2013 Curriculum (learning hours per week)</i>
1. Al-Qur'an and <i>Hadith</i> (1)	1. Al-Qur'an and <i>Hadith</i> (2)
2. Islamic Faith and Ethics (2)	2. Islamic Faith and Ethics (2)
3. Islamic Jurisprudence (2)	3. Islamic Jurisprudence (2)
4. History of Islamic Civilisation (1)	4. History of Islamic Civilisations (2)
5. Arabic (3)	5. Arabic (3)
6. Pancasila and Civic Education (2)	6. Civic Education (3)
7. Indonesian (6)	7. Indonesian (5)
8. Mathematics (6)	8. Mathematics (5)
9. Natural Sciences (6)	9. Natural Sciences (6)
10. Social Sciences (6)	10. Social Sciences (6)
11. Hand Skills and Arts (2)	11. Arts and Culture (2)
12. Physical and Health Education (2)	12. Physical and Health Education (2)
13. English (4)	13. English (5)
14. Local Content Curriculum (2)	14. ICT (2)
	15. Local Content Curriculum (2)
14 subjects with 44 learning hours	15 subjects with 49 learning hours

*Adapted from Maksum (1999, p. 157) and the unpublished curriculum of one madrasah in Pekanbaru*

selected short chapters of the Qur'an and selected Prophet's traditions. Unlike primary madrasah students, secondary students are exposed to more contextualised teachings of both scriptures. What often becomes a problem is the students' lack of competence in Arabic to understand the verses of the Qur'an and *Hadith* let alone interpret their meanings. Their understanding is solely based on translations and the teachers' preferred interpretations. Islamic faith and ethics (*Akidah* and *Akhlak*) provide students the opportunity to develop understanding of, and faith in, Islamic beliefs and to inculcate Islamic manners in daily life. Indoctrination and often memorisations of, for instance, God's characteristics are among the approaches that teachers are encouraged to use for primary students, whilst more reasoning and contextualisation are preferred for secondary students. These two subjects – Al-Qur'an and *Hadith* and Islamic faith and ethics – seem to complement, if not overlap, each other as several themes of ethics and good deeds are contained in both subjects.

Islamic jurisprudence (*Fiqh*) for primary madrasah students contains teachings of the five pillars of Islam, food and drinks and other basic daily injunctions. More senior students learn about the Islamic principles in human interactions, crime, politics and even the foundations of Islamic jurisprudence (*Usul al-Fiqh*), which explains how to draw legal conclusions and verdicts from the Scriptures. The last theme requires more knowledgeable teachers and Arabic-literate students. In History of Islamic Civilisation, students learn periodical phases of Islam from the Prophet's time to the modern period. Finally, although not part of Islamic subjects, Arabic is one of the subjects that distinguishes madrasahs from schools. This subject teaches different language skills including listening, speaking, reading and writing. In my experience, Arabic teaching in the madrasahs is ineffective due to the lack of a supportive milieu including students' limited exposure to the language.

There is another reform related to the madrasah curriculum, i.e., the introduction of the LAPIS (which stands for Learning Assistance Program for Islamic Schools) programme funded by the Australian government from 2004 to 2010 for the benefit of madrasah students. The programme trained teachers to use more innovative and student-centred teaching approaches. Although the effectiveness of this programme was not known to the public, Parker and Raihani (2011) found interesting examples of how LAPIS-trained teachers demonstrated outstanding teaching ethos and abilities. These young teachers demonstrated much better teaching skills than their older counterparts after they joined the LAPIS teacher improvement programme.

## **Underpinning factors**

The reforms of the madrasah curriculum during the three different eras of the Republic of Indonesia – the Old Order, New Order and Reform Order – cannot be seen in separation from various influential contexts and factors. It has not been a standalone process, but has been impacted by a complex set of conditions that have – directly or indirectly – coloured strongly the reform process and

the product, i.e., the curriculum. The national educational reform is one of the obvious factors as explicitly described above. Other factors, which are discussed below, include the ideal objective of Islamic education, socio-historical changes, political rivalry between Islamists and secularists and rivalry between sectors particularly MoR and MoEC.

The ideal objective of Islamic education – to produce students who possess Islamic knowledge and morality and are active participants in society (Al-Attas, 1979; Al-Baghdadi, 1996) – has been influential in the formation of the madrasah curriculum. The defense of the madrasahs for having more Islamic subjects compared to general schools is a manifestation of the desire to uphold such an objective. The Islamic subjects that are retained in the curriculum seem to have been developed following al-Ghazali's (Fazul-Ul-Karim, n. d.) framework of *fiqh 'ain*, which is a collection of Islamic knowledge that every Muslim is obliged to seek as compulsory requirement. This comprises knowledge about the Islamic faith, Islamic jurisprudence (included here is al-Qur'an as a precondition for the accepted Islamic compulsory prayer) and Islamic ethics. In addition to these, al-Attas (1979) argued that Islamic history should be one of the compulsory knowledge. However, realising this ideal objective is not easy for many reasons. First, both the Islamic subject curricula and the madrasah curriculum as a whole demand too many competencies as a prerequisite, and are loaded with too many learning materials that it is questionable if proper teaching and learning ever took place within the time allocated (Parker and Raihani, 2011). One can only assume that teachers have glossed over the materials. Currently, many Islamic university lecturers like myself who teach madrasah graduates have complained about their poor mastery of the Islamic subjects. For example, many still have problems understanding the main concepts in Islamic theology and Qur'anic recitation. These poor competencies are probably not only related to the learning materials, but also due to the ineffectiveness of classroom instructions. As mentioned earlier, the maintenance of the four Islamic subjects plus Arabic have meant longer study hours and caused the whole *madrasah* curriculum to overload.

Second, Islamic knowledge largely involves the teaching of values, which is a challenging task: how to teach and internalise Islamic values in children (e.g., honesty, tolerance and respectfulness) and how to assess its effectiveness. In the literature, this has become a topic of debate (Muhaimin, Suti'ah, and Ali, 2001). What is seen as the main problem is that the teaching of Islam in both the madrasahs and the schools is reduced to the transfer of Islamic knowledge or the development of students' cognitive domain only. Teachers lack the expertise to teach students how to internalise such noble values despite textbooks being available in the market to help teachers deal with the challenge. The difficulty of teaching values is also reflected in the madrasah examination system, which depends heavily on paper-pencil tests as an assessment tool. In short, the Islamic teachings have effectively geared towards developing students' cognition and skills with little attention paid to the affective domain.

The madrasah curriculum has also been influenced by continuous socio-historical changes and demands. Besides the political conditions described above,

Hefner (2009) notes that the gradual changes in the curriculum with the adoption of more secular subjects occurred early in the history of modern madrasahs during Dutch colonial rule through to the post-independence eras. He pointed to some innovations made by several madrasahs in West Sumatra and East Java to incorporate secular subjects into their madrasah or *pesantren* curriculum. The Dutch-imposed educational system has influenced the madrasahs to respond to changes in society. By doing so, the demands for citizens who can contribute significantly to the societal development can be met since madrasahs and schools alike are on the move together to achieve the national educational objectives. The added value of madrasah graduates is that they possess Islamic knowledge although not to the level of those categorised as Islamic scholars. With the increasing awareness amongst Indonesian Muslims of their Islamic identity, the trend to put children in Islamic schools – either madrasah, *pesantren* or Islamic integrated schools<sup>4</sup> – has risen (Ahmad, 2008). The enrollment particularly in the public madrasahs has increased from year to year.

The table below provides a brief statistics of the madrasahs and the schools.

From the above table, madrasahs constitute 13.9 percent of the whole educational institution population, with the largest percentage of it being private, i.e., around 80 percent.

The contestation between Islamists and secular nationalists has been an ongoing tension between the two groups in Indonesia particularly since independence in 1945 when the founding fathers were in the process of deciding what kind of state Indonesia was to become (Effendy, 1998). Under Soekarno, Hatta and other figures, the secular nationalists won the ‘battle’ over the Islamists who proposed the Jakarta charter, which would have laid the foundation for an Islamic State of Indonesia. This charter was rejected and replaced with Pancasila (the Five Principles) as the nation’s philosophy, which ensures mutual understanding and tolerance and thus national unity amongst religious and cultural groups. As indicated before, to accommodate the interests of Muslims, the government established the MoR to manage Islamic affairs including Islamic education. The decision for installing Pancasila as the nation’s philosophy, however, did not pass without objection and challenge. There were rebellious movements from the Islamists, most notable of which was the Darul Islam armed rebellion led by

*Table 12.2* Number of madrasahs and schools in 2011

Levels Status	Primary		Junior Secondary		Senior Secondary	
	Sch	Mad	Sch	Mad	Sch	Mad
State	25,036,636	413,168	7,172,401	622,285	2,827,517	334,587
Private	2,547,283	2,669,058	2,252,935	1,964,821	1,368,950	667,411
Sum	27,583,919	3,082,226	9,425,336	2,587,106	4,196,467	1,001,998

*Adapted from the government’s Statistics of Education (Kementerian Agama RI, 2011; Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2012)*

Kartusuwiryo in West Java. Kartusuwiryo was one of the independent fighters who, unlike other national leaders, was not satisfied with the decision to reject the idea of an Islamic state for Indonesia (Formichi, 2012).

The rivalry between Islamists and secular nationalists has continued throughout the history of modern Indonesia till today. Besides colouring Indonesian politics where Islamic parties and secular nationalist parties have always competed with, and even often opposed, each other, this rivalry has manifested in the government institutions, i.e., the MoR versus other ministries particularly the MoEC in the area of education. The integration efforts done by the relevant ministries described earlier in this chapter can be seen as part of this rivalry between Islamists and secular nationalists. The madrasah curriculum gradually adopts almost fully the general school curriculum, which makes madrasahs almost like general schools. The religious curriculum of the madrasahs is kept to the minimum, limited to the mentioned four subjects. If the madrasahs were to develop more religious subjects or programmes in order to strengthen their identity as a religious institution, they would have demanded more hours from teachers and students. This may negatively impact on madrasah students' achievement relative to that of general school students even though this needs to be verified through further comprehensive studies. Yet, anecdotal evidence seems to show that madrasah students' achievement is generally lower than that of general school students.

The sectoral competition between the MoR and the MoEC has remained intact, even though this was often not acknowledged by officials from both ministries. The impact of this competition has been felt by madrasah teachers, who are the key players in the curriculum. For example, when the government introduced the teacher certification programme in 2006, teachers in the general schools were 'privileged' to be the first to be certified and received the professional incentive. I was in the committee for the Sumatra Zone madrasah teacher certification, and I could see how madrasah teachers were often overlooked in favour of their national counterparts. It was not clear, however, what were the reasons for this discrimination. But Kingham and Parsons (2013) have highlighted the absence of structural mechanism between both ministries "to encourage inter-ministerial cooperation or to provide overarching authority and funding for the education system as a whole" (p. 81). The exclusion of the MoR in the autonomy package, as indicated earlier, and the inability of the government to 'state-ise' private madrasahs (transforming private madrasahs into state ones) have now contributed to the severity of the impact. However, there is no denying that some private madrasahs started to perform better in the autonomy era in areas where the local governments have the political will to help.

## **Conclusion**

All in all, the development of the madrasah curriculum in Indonesia can be seen as evolving – changing gradually and continuously from the strictly religious Islamic focus to one which is more general knowledge-oriented, and hence, more similar to that of general schools. There has been a compromise mainly on the part of

the madrasahs in this evolution. One is the reduction in the number of Islamic subjects and materials to only four subjects whilst adopting all the curriculum of the general schools. Theoretically, the four subjects are as good as one big subject called *Pendidikan Agama Islam* (Islamic Religion Education) and imparted in four learning hours per week like in the general schools. This reduction, to some extent, has rendered the madrasahs incapable of meeting societal demands for its graduates to become Islamic scholars. In essence, the madrasahs' objective has changed from one that grooms Islamic scholars as it did before the independence era to one that produces common school graduates with only a little 'touch' of Islamic knowledge. Another change is the transfer of authority in curriculum development and design from the MoR to the MoEC. This transfer, mandated in the Education Law of 2003, is limited to the development and administration of the general subject curricula. The development of Islamic subject curricula remains in the MoR's jurisdiction.

However, madrasahs have gained some notable advantages from this compromised curriculum reform. First, madrasahs are now seen as an educational institution fully equal to the general schools except that there are too many private madrasahs with low-quality education services and outcomes, which contributes to the relatively negative image of madrasahs as a whole. Second, madrasah students learn secular knowledge, and hence, its graduates are fully acknowledged by the national educational system to be able to compete with the general schools' graduates in gaining places in universities. Depending on their streams, madrasah graduates are eligible for admission in the national universities. Third, more broadly, madrasah graduates, as a result of the curriculum reforms, are able to contribute more significantly to society with the added value that they have relatively better Islamic knowledge. Yahya Umar, a former General Director of Islamic Education of the MoR, in a private conversation some years ago, said that madrasah graduates are now eligible to enter, for example, the Faculty of Medicine in various universities so that we will have Muslim medical doctors who treat patients in the spirit of Islamic teachings and values.

## Notes

- 1 "General schools" here means educational institutions administered by the Ministry of Education and Culture, whose curriculum tilts heavily to the secular subjects. Religious knowledge constitutes only a small part of the curriculum.
- 2 This section is significantly adapted from my previous publication, i.e., Raihani (2014), *Creating Multicultural Citizens: A Portrayal of Contemporary Indonesian Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 40–43.
- 3 Post-independence Indonesia is divided into three eras of regime, i.e. Old Order (1945–66), New Order (1966–98), and Reform Order (1998–now).
- 4 Islamic integrated schools are private educational institutions which follow the MoEC curriculum with the additional teaching of more Islamic subjects and a heavier emphasis on Islamic culture and values. In my observation, only the religious curriculum as prescribed by the MoR was adopted; the other curriculum was developed by the institutions themselves. However, they are bound by the government's regulation to join the national examination.

## References

- Abdullah, T. (1986). The Pesantren in historical perspective. In T. Abdullah and S. Siddique (Eds.), *Islam and Society in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Ahmad, Z. (2008). Analisis Tingkat Partisipasi Pendidikan Siswa Madrasah. In D. J. P. Islam (Ed.), *Analisis Data Statistik Pendidikan Islam* (pp. 1–25). Jakarta: Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Islam Departemen Agama.
- Al-Attas, S. M. N. (Ed.). (1979). *Aims and Objectives of Islamic Education*. Jeddah: King Abdulaziz University.
- Al-Baghdadi, A. (1996). *Sistem Pendidikan Di Masa Khilafah Islam*. Surabaya: Al-Izzah.
- Aspinall, E., and Fealy, G. (2003). *Local Power and Politics in Indonesia: Decentralisation & Democratisation*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Azra, A. (1999). *Pendidikan Islam: Tradisi dan Modernisasi Menuju Milenium Baru (Islamic Education: Tradition and Modernisation Towards the New Millenium)*. Jakarta: Logos.
- Azra, A. (2014). Reforms in Islamic education; a global perspectives seen from the Indonesian case. In C. Tan (Ed.), *Reforms in Islamic Education: International Perspectives* (pp. 59–75). London: Bloomsbury.
- Bandur, A. (2008). *A study of the implementation of school-based management in Flores Primary Schools in Indonesia*. Unpublished Unpublished PhD, The University of Newcastle, Australia, Newcastle.
- Boland, B. J. (1982). *The Struggle of Islam in Modern Indonesia*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Departemen Agama RI. (2008). *Peraturan Menteri Agama Republik Indonesia Nomor 2 Tahun 2008 Tentang Standar Kompetensi Lulusan Dan Standar Isi Pendidikan Agama Islam Dan Bahasa Arab Di Madrasah*. Retrieved September 10, 2016, from <http://pendis.kemenag.go.id/file/dokumen/permenag02th2008.pdf>
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2003). *Undang-Undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional Tahun 2003*. Retrieved August 10, 2003, from [www.depdiknas.go.id](http://www.depdiknas.go.id)
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2007). *Naskah Akademik KTSP Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*.
- Effendy, B. (1998). *Islam dan Negara: Transformasi Pemikiran dan Praktik Politik Islam di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Paramadina.
- Fadjar, M. (1999). *Reorientasi Pendidikan Islam*. Jakarta: Fajar Dunia.
- Fazul-Ul-Karim, M. (n. d.). *Imam Gazzali's Ihya Ulum-id-din*. Lahore: Sind Sagar Academy.
- Formichi, C. (2012). *Islam and the Making of the Nation: Kartosuwiryo and Political Islam in 20th Century Indonesia*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Hasbullah. (1995). *Sejarah Pendidikan Islam di Indonesia (History of Islamic Education in Indonesia)*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Hefner, R. W. (2009). Islamic Schools, Social Movements, and Democracy in Indonesia. In R. W. Hefner (Ed.), *Making Modern Muslims: The Politics of Islamic Education in Southeast Asia* (pp. 55–105). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kementerian Agama RI. (2011). *Statistik Pendidikan Tahun 2010/2011*.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2012). *Ikhtisar Data Pendidikan 2011/2012*.

- Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional. (2003). *Undang-Undang Sistik Pendidikan Nasional Tahun 2003*. Retrieved August 10, 2003, from [www.depdiknas.go.id](http://www.depdiknas.go.id)
- Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional. (2006). *KTSP Pendidikan Agama Islam: Standar Kompetensi dan Kompetensi Dasar Tingkat SMA, MA, SMALB, SMK dan MAK*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Kingham, R., and Parsons, J. (2013). Integrating Madrasah into the national education system – architecture over implementation. In D. Suryadarma and G. Bolton (Eds.), *Education in Indonesia* (pp. 68–81). Singapore: ISEAS.
- Maksum. (1999). *Madrasah: Sejarah & Perkembangannya*. Jakarta: Logos Wacana Ilmu.
- Mastuhu. (1994). *Dinamika Sistem Pendidikan Pesantren: Suatu Kajian Tentang Unsur dan Nilai Sistem Pendidikan Pesantren*. Jakarta: INIS.
- Muhaimin, S., and Ali, N. (2001). *Paradigma Pendidikan Islam: Upaya Mengefektifkan Pendidikan Agama Islam di Sekolah*. Bandung: Rosda Karya.
- Mujiburrahman. (2006). *Feeling Threatened: Muslim-Christian Relations in Indonesia's New Order*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press/ISIM.
- Ornstein, A. C., and Hunkins, F. P. (1998). *Curriculum: Foundation, Principles, and Issues* (3rd edition.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Parkay, F. W., Hass, G., and Anctil, E. J. (Eds.). (2010). *Curriculum Leadership: Readings for Developing Quality Educational Programs*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Parker, L., and Raihani. (2009). *Policy Briefs: Governing Madrasah*. Canberra: Australia Indonesia Governance Research Partnership (AIGRP) – The Australian National University.
- Parker, L., and Raihani. (2011). Democratizing Indonesia through education? Community participation in Islamic School. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 39(6), 712–732.
- Rabu, F. (2014). Ini Delapan Masalah dalam Implementasi Kurikulum 2013. *Metronews.com*. Retrieved from <http://news.metrotvnews.com/read/2014/10/19/307023/ini-delapan-masalah-dalam-implementasi-kurikulum-2013>
- Raihani. (2007). *Successful School Leadership in Indonesia: A Study of Principals' Leadership in Successful Senior Secondary Schools in Yogyakarta*. Pekanbaru: SUSKA Press.
- Raihani. (2014). *Creating Multicultural Citizens: A Portrayal of Contemporary Indonesian Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Ramayulis. (2012). *Sejarah Pendidikan Islam*. Jakarta: Kalam Mulia.
- Sarnia, P. (2014, Friday, December 5). Menteri Anies Baswedan Stop Kurikulum 2013. *Tempo.co*. Retrieved from [www.tempo.co/read/news/2014/12/05/079626628/Menteri-Anies-Baswedan-Stop-Kurikulum-2013](http://www.tempo.co/read/news/2014/12/05/079626628/Menteri-Anies-Baswedan-Stop-Kurikulum-2013)
- Steenbrink, K. A. (1994). *Pesantren, Madrasah, Sekolah*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penelitian, Pendidikan dan Pengembangan Ekonomi dan Sosial (LP3ES).
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Yamin, H. M. (2007). *Profesionalisasi Guru dan Implementasi KTSP*. Jakarta: Gaung Persada Press.
- Zuhdi, M. (2005). The 1975 three-minister decree and the modernization of Islamic education in Indonesia. *American Educational History Journal*, 32(1), 36–43.