

**Comparison of the Implementation of the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 Curriculum in History Subjects: A Case Study in Senior High Schools (SMA) in Magelang**Muhamad Jufri Suryawan<sup>1</sup>, Romadi<sup>2</sup>**Abstract**

The research aimed to compare History study material based on Curriculum 1994 and Curriculum 2006 in Senior High Schools in Magelang Regency, to compare the method or learning models of History learning in Senior High Schools in Magelang Regency, to compare learning media for History in Senior High Schools in Magelang Regency, and to compare the evaluation of History learning in Senior High School in Magelang Regency. The object of the research was three senior high schools in Magelang Regency. The research used a descriptive qualitative approach and case study research design. Data collection methods were observation, interview, and documentation. The data analysis technique was interactive and consisted of data reduction, presentation, and conclusion. The research shows that History study notes, History learning method, History learning media, and History learning evaluation of Curriculum 1994 and Curriculum 2006 are significantly different during the curriculum implementation in three senior high schools as the location of the study, that is, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan.

**Keywords:** *Curriculum 1994, Curriculum 2006, History Learning*

**Introduction**

In this era of globalization, the progress of a nation is highly determined by the quality of human resources. The quality of human resources depends on the quality of education (Dacholfany, 2017; Yusutria, 2017). The role of education is vital to creating an intelligent, peaceful, and open society, as well as a democratic society. Therefore, a nation must have quality education to create national progress (Suharyanto, 2013; Ali, 2003). The nation's progress can be obtained through quality education owned by the nation. The nation's progress can be realized; one example is learning history through history subjects (Nasution, 2014; Fitriyani, 2018; Lubis, 2019).

According to Widja (1989, p. 23), history learning is a combination of learning and teaching activities in which learning about past events is closely related to the present. History learning has a fundamental role in the purpose of learning history. Through history learning, moral assessments can also be made at this time to assess the past.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prospective Teacher, Universitas Negeri Semarang, [muhamadjufrisuryawan@gmail.com](mailto:muhamadjufrisuryawan@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Universitas Negeri Semarang, [romadi@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:romadi@mail.unnes.ac.id)

Learning will be successful if equipped with an essential component of the education system, namely the curriculum. The curriculum is an educational component used as a reference by each educational unit, both by the manager and the organizer, especially by teachers and school principals. Therefore, since Indonesia has the freedom to organize education for its children, the government has compiled a curriculum (Mulyasa, 2006, p. 4).

In the educational process, the curriculum is a tool to achieve educational goals. Without an appropriate and appropriate curriculum, it will not be easy to achieve the desired educational goals and objectives (Pawero, 2018; Sugiana, 2018). As an essential tool to achieve goals, the curriculum should adapt to changing times, scientific advancement, and technological sophistication (Rohman, 2018; Addahil, 2019).

An effort to improve the quality of education in Indonesia is to make curriculum adjustments according to the development of science and technology. The 1994 curriculum, which has been in effect so far, is considered unsuitable to face the times' demands. The 1994 curriculum, which has been implemented for more than five years in the world of Indonesian education, has, in fact, not had an impact on progress (Machali, 2014; Jannah, 2020). Likewise, history subjects in history learning based on the 1994 Curriculum have not impacted progress in education, especially for school residents such as history teachers and students. History learning based on the 1994 Curriculum has not yet found its purpose and results. The 1994 Curriculum based on Active Student Learning (CBSA) concept is a stepping stone towards more modern and democratic learning. However, the reality in the field, in this case, is that educational institutions (schools), principals, and teachers have not been able to maximize learning according to the concept of Active Student Learning (CBSA) because the government, through the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture in 1993 as an education policy maker changed the teaching system in schools from the semester system in the 1984 Curriculum to the quarterly teaching system in the 1994 Curriculum.

Teachers are required to provide more and more holistic subject matter to students to achieve the goals of national education development in the New Order era at that time. In addition, the New Order government also places more importance on the Science (Natural Sciences) program in high schools. This makes teachers in almost all subjects, especially teachers of social science subjects, encounter quite a lot of obstacles, including history teachers in three high schools in Magelang Regency, namely history teachers at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, SMA Negeri 1 Grabag and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan. As social science learning designers, history teachers can ultimately not maximize the history learning process that can make students active and the atmosphere lively because of the dense teaching

load, which has much history subject matter for each quarter. In addition, during the 1994 Curriculum period, history learning had not yet entered the realm of information and communication technology-based learning media like today's (reform). This phenomenon is a reality that ultimately makes history learning away in place.

The government's efforts to improve the quality of education are continuously carried out, such as improving the curriculum, subject matter, learning process, learning media, and learning evaluation. One of the innovations developed is the development of the 1994 Curriculum into a Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK) (Sari, 2019; Ritonga, 2018).

Thus, competency-based education was born, which focuses on developing the ability to perform competencies in specific tasks by the performance standards that have been set. The competency-based curriculum was implemented in all schools effectively in 2004. In the early stages, the implementation of the KBK (Competency-Based Curriculum) still encountered many difficulties, including differences in objectives, materials, teaching and learning processes, media, and evaluation systems, because history teachers have been using the 1994 Curriculum (Simatupang et al., 2019; Jumikun, 2017). These difficulties are also experienced by schools and history teachers in the Magelang Regency area, such as SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan. According to the government's policy that the competency-based curriculum (KBK) aims to improve the 1994 curriculum, the implementation of the KBK needs to be understood and considered so that its implementation does not experience the same mistakes as the previous curriculum.

At the time when the implementation of the Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK) was still in a limited test, in early 2006, the limited test was stopped. Furthermore, with the issuance of Ministerial Regulation No. 24 of 2006, which regulates the implementation of Ministerial Regulation No. 22 of 2006 concerning Curriculum Content Standards and Ministerial Regulation No. 23 of 2006 concerning Graduation Standards, the 2006 Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) was born, as a continuation of the improvement of the 2004 Competency-Based Curriculum. In the 2006 KTSP Curriculum, the authority in its preparation refers to the spirit of the decentralization of the education system.

In the 2006 KTSP Curriculum, the central government sets competency standards and essential competencies. Meanwhile, schools, in this case, teachers are required to be able to develop the form of syllabi and assessments based on the conditions of the school and the region. The results of the development of all subjects are compiled into a device called the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP). The preparation of the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) is

the responsibility of schools under the guidance and monitoring of the regional and local education offices.

The curriculum at the Education Unit Level (KTSP) was inaugurated on July 7, 2006. The curriculum accommodates regional interests. Teachers and schools are given autonomy to develop the curriculum according to the school's potential, problems, and needs. The Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) requires the ability of teachers to develop a curriculum based on the ability and needs of the school. The presence of the 2006 Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) is expected to be able to independent and empower educational units through granting authority (autonomy) to educational institutions and encouraging schools to make participatory decision-making in curriculum development, as well as being able to improve the quality of national education including the quality of history learning.

This is what makes history teachers get positive motivation like what history teachers experience in Magelang Regency Senior High School (SMA), namely at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan because history teachers can design history learning according to the ability and needs of the school. History teachers are also faced with a change in conventional education patterns to information and communication technology-based education in the digital era. The presence of KTSP 2006 is also expected to be able to change the pattern of history learning and its most important aspects, including history subject matter, history learning methods, history learning sources and media, as well as the evaluation of history learning, which has been in place or monotonous to a more varied and democratic history learning according to the times. Based on the background explained above, the following problem formulation can be taken: (1) How is the concept of the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum compared to the history subject at Magelang Regency High School? (2) How are the 1994 and 2006 KTSP curricula compared to history learning in history subjects at Magelang Regency High School? (3) How is the comparison of the use of history learning media in the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum in history subjects at Magelang Regency High School? (4) How does the evaluation system compare to the 1994 and 2006 KTSP curricula in history subjects at Magelang Regency High School?

This study aims to (1) compare the 1994 and 2006 KTSP curricula in history subjects at Magelang Regency High School. (2) To compare history learning in the 1994 and 2006 KTSP curricula in history subjects at Magelang Regency High School. (3) To compare the use of history learning media in the 1994 and 2006 KTSP curricula in history subjects in Magelang

Regency High School. (4) To compare the evaluation system in the 1994 curriculum with the 2006 KTSP curriculum in history subjects at Magelang Regency High School.

### **Method**

The research method used to compare the implementation of the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum in history subjects at Magelang Regency High School is qualitative. According to Bogdan & Taylor in Moleong (2006, p. 4), qualitative research is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written or spoken words of people and observed behaviors. According to them, this approach is directed to the setting and the individual holistically (whole). So, in this case, isolating an individual or organization into variables or hypotheses is impossible, but it is necessary to view it as part of a need.

The research design is a case study. This design focuses intensively on a particular object by studying it as a case. Various social units, such as a student who shows abnormalities, a family, a group of delinquents, a village, a social institution, and others, can be investigated thoroughly and on certain aspects that need special attention (Nawawi, 1983, p. 77). According to Yin in Arifianto (2016, p. 15), case studies that use several units of analysis are called embedded case studies. In this study, the case study research design is embedded, and the cases that are the research focus are tied to the predetermined units of analysis. Meanwhile, Yin (2014, p. 54) explained that the design of a case study is to determine the unit of analysis (the case itself) to ensure that the case is relevant to the research's focus questions. The case study of this research is included in the category of multi-case studies. According to Creswell (2015, p. 139), collective case studies or compound or multi-case case studies can study one program from several research places, like this study studies the history learning of the 1994 and 2006 Curricula in three schools as research or research locations.

The form of case study in this study is an observational case study, both directly and indirectly. Direct observation (participation observation) by observing the history learning process at SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan. Indirect observation (non-participant) by collecting documents related to the research as complementary data, namely school profile books, photos as research documentation at the research site, and other relevant data.

The stages of research carried out by the researcher broadly include observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation studies (Artapati, 2017; Habsyi, 2016). The observations made by the researcher in this study are direct observation and indirect observation. Direct observation was carried out at SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, and

SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan, which were researched by determining the focus of observation first, namely the physical condition of the school, facilities and infrastructure, media, and tools for learning history, and the implementation of history teaching and learning activities. Indirect observations were carried out at SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan by collecting research data from school documents owned by history teachers. The documents are in the form of archives of the 1994 curriculum history subject teaching plan, the 2006 KTSP history subject learning implementation plan, and the history subject package book for high school with the implementation of the 1994 curriculum and the 2006 KTSP, which is equipped with verbal direct explanations from related history subject teachers in the three schools.

The next stage is an in-depth interview. The data source is obtained directly through interviews with respondents or field informants. The primary data sources related to this study are history teachers at Magelang Regency Senior High School (SMA), including history teachers of SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan as respondents or informants. The next stage is documentation. In this study, the documentation study conducted by the researcher is by collecting data through written sources at the research location (SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan) in the form of official documents, archives of teaching plans for history subjects in the 1994 curriculum, implementation plans for learning history curriculum 2006 (KTSP), history package books for high schools with the 1994 curriculum and KTSP 2006, Photos of history learning in schools, and school profile books and books relevant to this research. The source triangulation technique is used to maintain the credibility of the data.

After the data is obtained, it must be analyzed. The data analysis consists of data collection, namely all data obtained in the study and then reduced. Furthermore, the selected data is presented, and the last conclusion is drawn.

### **Results and Discussion**

The components in the history learning process, which include learning materials, learning methods, learning media, and learning evaluations, interact with each other to achieve the goal of comprehensive history education.

History learning materials as a component in the history learning process have experienced developments in implementing the 1994 Curriculum to the 2006 KTSP Curriculum. The history learning material between the 1994 and 2006 KTSP curricula has several differences. The

prominent difference in the history learning material in the 1994 Curriculum is that there is no introductory material on history. Introductory material on history is a teaching material that informs students about the meaning of history, the scope, and the benefits of learning history. Meanwhile, in the 2006 KTSP Curriculum, the introductory material for history has been taught while teaching and learning history subjects. Furthermore, in the history learning of the 2006 KTSP Curriculum, there is already material on the history of Indonesia in the reform era.

The application of history learning in both curricula also has advantages and disadvantages. The 1994 Curriculum history learning materials are more detailed because the history learning materials are divided into each quarter. However, the history learning materials of the 1994 Curriculum given to students are only mandatory knowledge considering the lack of time allocation for only 2 hours in one week. Furthermore, there are also many history learning materials in the 2006 KTSP Curriculum. However, the same thing was experienced by the 1994 curriculum, namely the lack of time allocation, so history subjects were only mandatory knowledge and routines, especially what happened in the science class where the time allocation was only 45 minutes per meeting so that PAIKEM-based history learning did not run optimally. Although the advantage point is that teachers can develop learning methods such as local history content and carry out active learning activities such as group discussions and presentations, the history learning process is still not optimal because the time allocation is only 45 minutes in one class meeting.

History learning materials in the KTSP 2006 Curriculum class X already have introductory materials for history. Introductory materials for history science need to be given starting from class X as the basis for historical knowledge before learning other historical materials. However, overall, the subject matter of history in high school from the past to the present is almost the same; only now has it developed more into the reform period. The history learning material in the 2006 KTSP Curriculum is also different in each department, namely for the science and social studies departments.

History learning materials in each of the curriculum applications, namely in the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum, are assessed by history teachers to have several comparison points. The history learning material of the KTSP 2006 Curriculum is more varied because there is already introductory material on history and history during the Indonesian reform period. In addition, the implementation of history learning in the 2006 KTSP Curriculum is also better than the 1994 Curriculum because teachers and students have been helped by modern learning media accompanied by history learning methods that make students more active, such as group discussions. The history learning material of the KTSP 2006

curriculum also contains local history material and reform era history material as applied in history learning at Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan High School. The local history material is the Van Lith school's history and Christian missionaries' history by Father Francis Georgius Josephus van Lith, SJ, in Muntilan, Central Java. This is very interesting because it provides Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan High School with insight into local history students.

The method of learning history during implementing the 1994 Curriculum at SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan, and SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan is almost the same. Although the concept of the learning model regulated according to the 1994 Curriculum is the Learning Method of Active Students (CBSA), in the field, the application of this method is not optimal due to the emergence of CBSA (Active et al. Method) even though in the name of the strategy of using the word active student, in reality, student learning tends to be inactive. This CBSA emphasizes teachers as the center of learning. The 1994 Curriculum history learning based on CBSA (Active et al.) did not run as it should due to a lack of time allocation constraints. So, history learning takes place only in one direction: friendly teachers and students listen more to the history learning process in the classroom. The 1994 Curriculum history learning method is still conventional, meaning that teachers still give many lectures. Meanwhile, teachers received more marks by applying the history learning method of the 2006 KTSP Curriculum. History teachers also prefer the history learning method of the 2006 KTSP Curriculum because it enlivens the classroom atmosphere through PAIKEM-based history learning (Active, Innovative, Creative, Effective, and Relaxing Learning).

A complementary element, such as learning media, is needed in history education, and support for the history learning process is needed. The function of history learning media is to make it easier for teachers and students to interact in the classroom. It is said that it makes it easier for teachers to interact with students because history learning media helps teachers explain history subject matter. On the other hand, students are also helped in understanding history learning materials because of the existence of history learning media.

History learning media must be flexible, meaning that history learning media must be developed by the times. When the 1994 Curriculum was implemented, history learning media was still conventional, including history package books, wall maps, globes (globes), pictures of national heroes, whiteboards, and OHP media. However, it differs from the implementation of the 2006 KTSP Curriculum, where the development of the world of education is familiar with internet-based and electronic-based information technology. This also has an impact on history learning where the emerging history learning media are increasingly varied, such as history blog media, social media, online journals (online), PowerPoint media (presentation



slides), LCD Projectors, digital maps, historical films, and so on, the majority of which are internet-based.

There is a prominent comparison between the 1994 curriculum history learning media and the 2006 KTSP curriculum. The 1994 curriculum history learning media is still conventional, and teachers and students are still focused on using only history package books. Meanwhile, with the history learning media of the KTSP 2006 Curriculum, teachers and students can access internet-based history learning media such as history blogs, history education journals, electronic books, and PowerPoint media.

In the learning process, an evaluation is needed to measure the success of the program and the learning process that has taken place. The evaluation of history learning in the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum is different in the system, but the form of evaluation is almost the same, namely the type of objective questions and essays. The history learning evaluation system between the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum has several differences, including the fact that the 1994 Curriculum history learning evaluation system uses a quarterly evaluation system. Meanwhile, the evaluation of history learning in the 2006 KTSP Curriculum uses a semester system. The two systems were also implemented in three schools when the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum were implemented, namely at SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan. History teachers prefer the 2006 KTSP Curriculum evaluation system because its implementation is better than the 1994 Curriculum evaluation. In the 2006 KTSP, the evaluation of history learning is not only concerned with learning outcomes but also assesses the history learning process. In addition, history teachers can also organize remedial programs for students who have not achieved the value of learning completeness in the evaluation of history learning.

### **Conclusion**

In comparing the implementation of history learning materials in the 1994 curriculum and the 2006 KTSP curriculum, history learning materials in the 1994 curriculum have no introductory material on history. Introductory material on history is a teaching material that informs students about the meaning of history, the scope, and the benefits of learning history. Meanwhile, in the 2006 KTSP curriculum, the introductory material for history has been taught while teaching and learning history subjects. The application of history learning in both curricula also has advantages and disadvantages. The 1994 Curriculum history learning materials are more detailed because the history learning materials are divided into each quarter. However, the

history learning materials of the 1994 curriculum given to students are only mandatory knowledge, considering the lack of time allocated for history learning. Furthermore, there are also many history learning materials in the 2006 KTSP Curriculum. However, the same thing was experienced by the 1994 curriculum, namely the lack of time allocation, so history subjects were only mandatory knowledge and routines, especially what happened in the science class where the time allocation was only 45 minutes per meeting so that PAIKEM-based history learning did not run optimally. Although the advantage point is that teachers can develop learning materials such as local history content and carry out active learning activities such as group discussions and presentations, the history learning process is still not optimal because the time allocation is only 45 minutes in one class meeting.

The comparison of the implementation of the history learning method in the 1994 Curriculum and the 2006 KTSP Curriculum is the history learning method when the implementation of the 1994 Curriculum at SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan, and SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan is almost the same. Although the concept of the learning model regulated according to the 1994 Curriculum is the Learning Method of Active Students (CBSA), in the field, the application of this method is not optimal due to the emergence of CBSA (Active et al. Method) even though in the name of the strategy of using the word active student, in reality, student learning tends to be inactive. This CBSA emphasizes teachers as the center of learning. The history learning of the 1994 curriculum based on CBSA (Active Student Learning Methods) did not run as it should due to the lack of time allocation constraints. So, history learning takes place only in one direction. Namely, lecture teachers and students listen more to the history learning process in the classroom. The method of learning history in the 1994 curriculum is still conventional, which means that teachers still give many lectures. Meanwhile, teachers received more marks by applying the history learning method of the 2006 KTSP curriculum. History teachers also prefer the history learning method of the KTSP 2006 curriculum because it enlivens the classroom atmosphere through PAIKEM-based history learning (Active, Innovative, Creative, Effective, and Fun Learning).

Comparison of the implementation of history learning media in the 1994 curriculum and the 2006 KTSP curriculum, namely when the implementation of the 1994 curriculum is still conventional, namely in the form of history package books, wall maps, globes (globes), pictures of national heroes, whiteboards and OHP machines. However, it differs from the implementation of the KTSP 2006 curriculum, where the development of the world of education is familiar with internet-based and electronic-based information technology. This also impacts history learning where the emerging history learning media are increasingly varied,

such as history blog media, social media, online history education journals, PowerPoint media, LCD Projectors, digital maps, historical films, and so on, the majority of which are internet-based. In implementing KTSP 2006, teachers and students can access internet-based history learning media such as history blogs, history education journals, electronic books, and PowerPoint media. History learning in the 2006 KTSP curriculum runs better because internet-based learning media support it.

Comparison of the implementation of history learning evaluation in the 1994 curriculum and the 2006 KTSP curriculum, namely the evaluation of history learning in the 1994 and 2006 KTSP curricula, is different in the system. However, the evaluation form is almost the same: the type of objective questions and essays. The history learning evaluation system between the 1994 curriculum and the 2006 KTSP curriculum has several differences, including the 1994 curriculum history learning evaluation system, which uses a quarterly evaluation system. Meanwhile, evaluating the history learning of the 2006 KTSP curriculum uses a semester system. The two systems were also implemented in three schools when the 1994 curriculum and the 2006 KTSP curriculum were implemented, namely at SMA Negeri 1 Grabag, SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Muntilan, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Van Lith Muntilan. History teachers assessed that the evaluation of history learning in the 2006 KTSP curriculum was better than the 1994 curriculum because the evaluation pattern was more varied and not only prioritized the cognitive aspect but also assessed the affective and psychomotor aspects. In addition, students are also helped by a remedial program so that the results of history learning can reach the completeness value that the history teacher has determined.

### Reference

- Addahil, M. I. J. (2019). Problematika Pengembangan Kurikulum Di Lembaga Pendidikan Islam: Tinjauan Epistemologi. *journal TA'LIMUNA*, 8(2), 01-11.
- Ali, M. (2009). *Pendidikan untuk pembangunan nasional: menuju bangsa Indonesia yang mandiri dan berdaya saing tinggi*. Grasindo.
- Arifianto, S. (2016). Implementasi Metode Penelitian Studi Kasus Dengan Pendekatan Kualitatif. *Yogyakarta: Aswaja Pressindo*.
- Artapati, L. W., & Budiningsih, C. A. (2017). Pelaksanaan pembelajaran Kurikulum 2013 di SD Negeri Serayu Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi Pendidikan*, 4(2), 185-200.
- Creswell, John W. (2015). Penelitian Kualitatif & Desain Riset Memilih di Antara Lima Pendekatan Edisi Ke-3. Terjemahan Ahmad Lintang Lazuardi. *Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar*.

- Dacholfany, M. I. (2017). Inisiasi strategi manajemen lembaga pendidikan Islam dalam meningkatkan mutu sumber daya manusia islami di Indonesia dalam menghadapi era globalisasi. *At-Tajdid: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pemikiran Islam*, 1(01).
- Fitriyani, P. (2018). Pendidikan karakter bagi generasi Z. *Prosiding Konferensi Nasional Ke-7 Asosiasi Program Pascasarjana Perguruan Tinggi Muhammadiyah Aisyiyah (APPPTMA)*. Jakarta, 23-25.
- Habsyi, I. (2016). Manajemen Pembiayaan Pendidikan Pada Smp Negeri 13 Kota Ternate. *Edukasi*, 14(2).
- Jannah, R. (2020). Strategi Penerapan Kurikulum Dan Problematikanya Di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *MAGISTRA: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Pendidikan Dasar Dan Keislaman*, 11(2).
- Jumikun, J. (2017). *Manajemen peningkatan kompetensi profesional tenaga pendidik di MIN Melayu Muara Teweh* (Doctoral dissertation, IAIN Palangka Raya).
- Lubis, M. A. (2019). Pembelajaran ppkn (teori pengajaran abad 21 di SD/MI). *Samudra Biru*.
- Machali, I. (2014). Kebijakan perubahan kurikulum 2013 dalam menyongsong Indonesia emas tahun 2045. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 3(1), 71-94.
- Moleong, L. J. (2006). Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif. *Bandung:PT Remaja Rosdakarya*.
- Mulyasa, E. (2006). Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan;Sebuah Panduan Praktis. *Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya*.
- Nasution, E. (2014). Problematika pendidikan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Mediasi*, 8(1).
- Nawawi, H. (1983). *Metode Penelitian Bidang Sosial*. Yogyakarta:Gadjah Mada University Press
- Pawero, A. M. V. D. (2018). Analisis Kritis Kebijakan Kurikulum Antara KBK, KTSP, dan K-13. *Jurnal Ilmiah Iqra'*, 12(1), 42-59.
- Ritonga, M. (2018). Politik dan dinamika kebijakan perubahan kurikulum pendidikan di Indonesia hingga masa Reformasi. *Bina Gogik: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 5(2).
- Rohman, M. (2015). Problematika Kurikulum Pendidikan Islam. *Madaniyah*, 5(1), 1-15.
- Sari, R. M. (2019). Analisis Kebijakan Merdeka Belajar Sebagai Strategi Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan. *PRODU: Prokurasi Edukasi Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 1(1).
- Simatupang, H., Simanjuntak, M. P., Sinaga, L., & Hardinata, A. (2019). *Telaah kurikulum SMP di Indonesia*. Pustaka Media Guru.
- Sugiyama, A. (2018). A Proses Pengembangan Organisasi Kurikulum di Indonesia. *EL-HIKMAH: Jurnal Kajian Dan Penelitian Pendidikan Islam*, 12(1), 91-103.

- Suharyanto, A. (2013). Peranan pendidikan kewarganegaraan dalam membina sikap toleransi antar siswa. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik*, 2(1), 192-203.
- Widja, I Gde. (1989). *Dasar-Dasar Pengembangan Strategi serta Metode Pengajaran Sejarah*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Yusutria, M. A. (2017). Profesionalisme guru dalam meningkatkan kualitas sumber daya manusia. *Curricula: Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 2(1).

