

## MANAGING ISLAMIC EDUCATION CURRICULUM REFORM: AN INTEGRATIVE, ADAPTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE FRAMEWORK

Ilham<sup>1</sup>, Bustanul Iman RN<sup>2</sup>

<sup>12</sup>Universitas Islam Negeri Palopo, Indonesia

---

### Corresponding Author:

Ilham,

Universitas Islam Negeri Palopo, Palopo, Indonesia

Email: ih123681@gmail.com

### Article Info

Received: June 10, 2026

Revised: July 10, 2026

Accepted: July 20, 2026

Online Version: July 31, 2026

### Abstract

This review article examines Islamic education curriculum reform through three connected dimensions: integration, adaptation, and responsiveness. Using a narrative literature review and conceptual synthesis of sources contained in the original academic paper, the study analyses curriculum development, integrative learning, curriculum change in Indonesia, teacher readiness, digital transformation, and contemporary educational challenges. The findings show that an integrative curriculum connects Islamic values with knowledge, science, technology, and lived social problems; an adaptive curriculum requires institutional flexibility, contextual learning, professional development, and participatory management; and a responsive curriculum addresses digital ethics, religious moderation, twenty-first-century competencies, moral challenges, social and environmental responsibility, and learner diversity. The article proposes an Integrative-Adaptive-Responsive (IAR) curriculum management framework linking curriculum design, pedagogy, educator capacity, governance, resources, and evaluation. Its novelty lies in repositioning curriculum reform as a continuous management process. The framework implies that sustainable reform depends on leadership consistency, teacher competence, infrastructure, stakeholder participation, and systematic evaluation.

**Keywords:** Islamic Education Curriculum, Curriculum Reform, Integrative Curriculum, Adaptive Curriculum, Responsive Curriculum



© 2026 by the author(s)

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

---

Journal Homepage

<https://ejournal.lerc-edu.org/index.php/praefectura>

How to cite:

Ilham, & Bustanul Iman RN. (2026). Managing Islamic education curriculum reform: An integrative, adaptive, and responsive framework. Praefectura: Journal of Transformational Leadership and Educational Management

Published by:

Lagaligo Education and Research Centre

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Curriculum reform in Islamic education is inseparable from the wider transformation of Indonesia's education system after the Reform era. The source paper describes this period as a movement away from highly centralised and content-heavy arrangements toward greater decentralisation, competency orientation, character formation, and institutional flexibility. In that trajectory, curriculum change is not merely a technical revision of subjects or teaching hours. It represents an effort to realign educational aims, learning experiences, assessment, and institutional responsibilities with social change, technological development, and the evolving needs of learners (Aini et al., 2025; Astuti et al., 2023). Within Islamic education, the challenge is more demanding because reform must preserve the normative orientation of Islamic values while ensuring that learners can participate effectively in contemporary society.

This tension is visible in the basic definition of curriculum used in the source manuscript. Curriculum is treated as a systematic design of learning objectives, content, processes, and experiences intended to guide learners toward expected outcomes (Astuti et al., 2023). Reform therefore concerns the coherence of the entire learning system. Changes in content without changes in pedagogy, teacher capacity, assessment, technology, and school governance may produce only administrative renewal. Conversely, innovation that is disconnected from Islamic moral commitments can weaken the identity that Islamic education is expected to cultivate. The problem is consequently one of alignment: educational institutions need a curriculum architecture capable of connecting Islamic values, disciplinary knowledge, technological change, learner diversity, and real social problems.

The literature reviewed in the paper provides three important directions. The first is integration. Abdullah et al. (2021) discuss integrative and inclusive Islamic education curriculum development, while Syafiqurrohman (2020) emphasises integrative-inclusive moral education. Integrative curriculum thinking seeks to reduce fragmentation among subjects and between religious and general knowledge by organising learning around meaningful relationships. The source paper further associates integration with holistic, meaningful, and active learning, a perspective that is compatible with the broader logic of integrated learning described by Isrokatun et al. (2020). In Islamic education, integration is especially important because learners are expected to understand religious teachings not as isolated information but as a value framework for interpreting scientific, social, cultural, and technological realities.

The second direction is adaptation. Curriculum development is expected to remain responsive to changing conditions rather than wait for periodic national curriculum replacement (Busro, 2017). This requires flexibility at the level of institutions and classrooms. Saiyidah et al. (2025) identify competence, relevance, flexibility, and effectiveness as core principles of curriculum development, while Isnaini et al. (2026) connect the application of curriculum-development principles with learning effectiveness. Adaptation therefore involves more than reducing content. It includes the ability to contextualise learning, select appropriate methods and media, differentiate experiences according to learner needs, and revise institutional practices as technology and social expectations change.

The third direction is responsiveness to contemporary issues. The source paper identifies digital transformation, religious moderation, moral and ethical challenges, twenty-first-century skills, social and environmental responsibility, and learner diversity as issues that Islamic education curricula should address. Fitriana et al. (2025) highlight the role of Islamic religious education curriculum in shaping learners' understanding of self and others, while Zuairiyah et al. (2025) argue for an adaptive Islamic education curriculum that integrates tawhid, technology, and science. These concerns indicate that curriculum relevance cannot be judged only by whether prescribed content is completed. It should also be judged by whether learners are able to use Islamic knowledge and values to interpret and respond to contemporary life.

Despite these insights, the source literature tends to discuss integration, adaptation, and responsiveness as separate curricular concerns. This fragmentation leaves an important management question unresolved: how can educational leaders translate these principles into a coherent and sustainable curriculum system? The need for such synthesis is strengthened by recurring implementation problems identified in the source paper, including curriculum overload, conventional teacher-centred pedagogy, uneven professional competence, limited infrastructure, resistance to change, and the continuing dichotomy between religious and general knowledge (Julaeha, 2019; Nurhidaya et al., 2025; Zuairiyah et al., 2025). A curriculum can be conceptually progressive yet operationally weak when organisational support does not match its aspirations.

This article therefore aims to transform the source paper into a curriculum-management framework for Islamic education. It asks three questions: what constitutes an integrative Islamic education curriculum; what institutional conditions enable adaptive implementation; and how can curriculum management respond systematically to contemporary educational issues? Its contribution is an Integrative-Adaptive-Responsive (IAR) framework that connects curriculum content and pedagogy with teacher development, governance, technology, stakeholder participation, and evaluation. By doing so, the article positions curriculum reform as a continuous process of educational management rather than as a sequence of curriculum names or policy documents.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This article employed a narrative literature review and conceptual synthesis. Its analytical starting point was the academic paper entitled *Reformasi Kurikulum Pendidikan Islam: Pengembangan Kurikulum Integratif, Adaptif, dan Responsif terhadap Isu Kontemporer*, prepared at Universitas Islam Negeri Palopo in 2026. The source manuscript contained conceptual discussions, examples, and references on curriculum development, integrative learning, curriculum reform in Indonesia, adaptive Islamic education, teacher readiness, and contemporary educational issues. Rather than introducing field data, the present article reorganises those materials into a journal-oriented analytical argument.

The review retained 15 directly relevant publications and books cited in the source manuscript. Most were published between 2019 and 2026, with one earlier curriculum-development text from 2017 retained because it supplied a foundational argument about continuous curriculum development. The sources were selected for direct relevance to at least one of four analytical areas: principles of curriculum development; integrative Islamic education; adaptive curriculum implementation; or curriculum responses to contemporary challenges. An unrelated radiology reference that appeared in the source bibliography was not used in the synthesis because it does not support the educational argument.

Analysis proceeded in four stages. First, the main propositions, problems, and recommendations in the source manuscript were identified. Second, these materials were coded under the three central categories already embedded in the paper's structure: integrative, adaptive, and responsive curriculum. Third, the categories were compared across the cited literature to identify recurring implementation conditions, particularly teacher competence, institutional flexibility, technology, stakeholder participation, and evaluation. Fourth, the categories were integrated into the IAR curriculum-management framework presented in the results and discussion section. The review is narrative rather than systematic; it does not claim exhaustive database coverage or statistical generalisation. Its purpose is conceptual reconstruction and management-oriented synthesis based on the materials contained in the source paper.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### ***Integrative Curriculum Development in Islamic Education***

The first finding is that integration should be understood as an organising principle for curriculum rather than as a simple addition of religious content to general subjects. Abdullah et al. (2021) position integrative-inclusive curriculum development as an effort to connect educational aims and learning experiences so that Islamic education can respond to heterogeneous learners and wider social needs. In the source paper, integration is associated with four curriculum principles: competence, relevance, flexibility, and effectiveness. These principles are mutually dependent. Competence clarifies what learners should know, do, and value; relevance connects these outcomes with social and technological realities; flexibility allows contextual adjustment; and effectiveness requires evidence that the intended learning outcomes are actually achieved (Saiyidah et al., 2025).

From a curricular perspective, the competence principle prevents Islamic education from being reduced to verbal knowledge. The paper uses worship as an example: learners should not only know procedures but should also be able to perform them appropriately and develop the disposition to practise them. The same logic applies to contemporary themes. Digital ethics, environmental responsibility, social tolerance, and critical literacy become meaningful curriculum outcomes only when they are expressed as a combination of knowledge, skill, and attitude. A curriculum organised in this way creates a bridge between Islamic normative knowledge and the learner's capacity to act in real situations.

Relevance extends this bridge to the external environment. The source paper argues that curriculum should respond to learner needs, the development of science and technology, and changing social expectations. Putra et al. (2025) similarly frame curriculum innovation in Islamic religious education as a strategic response to changing conditions while preserving Islamic values. Relevance therefore requires curriculum leaders to ask whether the content being taught helps learners interpret the realities they actually face. Topics such as social-media ethics, information verification, artificial intelligence, diversity, environmental stewardship, and changing forms of work are not peripheral when they shape the moral and intellectual environment of learners.

Integration also has a pedagogical dimension. The source paper characterises integrative learning as holistic, meaningful, active, and less visibly separated by subject boundaries. This is consistent with the general logic of integrated learning described by Isrokaton et al. (2020), in which concepts become more meaningful when learners encounter relationships across fields. For Islamic education, this can mean connecting Qur'anic and ethical principles with science, social studies, language, technology, and community problems. The purpose is not to dissolve disciplinary knowledge, but to help learners understand how different forms of knowledge contribute to a coherent interpretation of reality.

The main barriers to integration are organisational as much as conceptual. The source paper identifies curriculum overload, centralistic habits, conventional lecture-dominated pedagogy, uneven teacher professionalism, limited resources, and the persistent dichotomy between religious and general knowledge (Nurhidaya et al., 2025). Julaeha (2019) adds that curriculum complexity and weak implementation can undermine character education. These problems indicate that integration cannot be achieved by inserting interdisciplinary topics into lesson plans alone. It requires curriculum mapping, coordinated teacher planning, professional development, manageable learning loads, and institutional expectations that reward collaboration across subject boundaries.

For educational management, the implication is that integration should be planned at three levels. At the curriculum level, learning outcomes and content should deliberately connect values, knowledge, skills, and contemporary contexts. At the pedagogical level, teachers should use inquiry, problem-based learning, projects, discussion, and reflective

activities that allow learners to connect concepts. At the organisational level, school leaders should create time and structures for collaborative planning, review duplication among subjects, and ensure that assessment captures not only recall but also application, judgement, and character-related performance.

### ***From Curriculum Change to Adaptive Curriculum Management***

The second finding is that the trajectory from KTSP through Curriculum 2013 to the Merdeka Curriculum can be read as an increasing search for flexibility, contextualisation, competence, and learner-centredness. The source paper describes KTSP as a decentralising curriculum that gave educational units more space to adjust learning to local potential, Curriculum 2013 as strengthening the integration of knowledge, attitudes, skills, and character, and the Merdeka Curriculum as expanding flexibility in learning content, teaching resources, and attention to learner interests. Aini et al. (2025) place these changes within the broader transformation of Islamic religious education curriculum in Indonesia. Rather than treating each curriculum as an isolated policy episode, the trajectory suggests a continuing managerial problem: how much autonomy can institutions use effectively, and what capacities are required to use that autonomy well?

Adaptation is the ability to answer that problem. A flexible curriculum does not automatically become adaptive. Institutions must be able to interpret policy, diagnose learner needs, select priorities, prepare teachers, allocate resources, and evaluate whether local adjustments improve learning. Busro (2017) argues that curriculum development should be continuous because social, technological, political, cultural, and ethical conditions change continuously. This principle shifts curriculum management from episodic compliance to ongoing organisational learning. Leaders need mechanisms for regular curriculum review rather than waiting for a national replacement cycle.

Teacher readiness is the most important operational condition. Zuairiyah et al. (2025) identify teacher resistance, limited digital infrastructure, and inadequate professional training as major obstacles to adaptive Islamic education curriculum. The source paper similarly notes that many teachers remain attached to conventional instructional approaches. Adaptation therefore depends on professional learning that is directly connected to curriculum problems: contextualising Islamic content, using digital media ethically, designing differentiated tasks, conducting project-based learning, assessing higher-order thinking, and supporting diverse learners. Training becomes meaningful when it is accompanied by mentoring, peer collaboration, classroom experimentation, and feedback.

Institutional participation is equally important. The source paper argues that adaptive curriculum development should involve schools, government, parents, communities, teachers, and learners rather than operate exclusively through top-down decisions. This participatory principle is especially relevant in culturally diverse contexts because curriculum decisions involve value priorities, local needs, language, community expectations, and different learner profiles. Participation does not mean that every stakeholder determines academic content independently. It means that curriculum managers create structured processes for identifying needs, discussing implementation constraints, and building shared responsibility for learning outcomes.

Adaptation also requires infrastructure and data. Digital learning cannot be treated as a methodological slogan when access, connectivity, devices, platforms, and teacher competence are uneven. Similarly, differentiated learning cannot be implemented reliably without information about learner readiness, interests, and support needs. Adaptive curriculum management therefore includes a practical cycle: diagnose context; prioritise learning outcomes; select and adapt content; prepare teachers and resources; implement contextual learning; collect evidence; and revise decisions. In this cycle, flexibility is disciplined by evidence rather than by improvisation.



The source paper's discussion of a 'love curriculum' adds a moral dimension to adaptation. It presents love not merely as emotion but as a spiritual and ethical orientation toward empathy, respect for diversity, and benevolent conduct. Although this concept requires stronger empirical and policy elaboration in future research, it highlights an important principle: adaptation should not be understood as unlimited accommodation to external trends. Islamic education adapts in order to remain educationally effective while preserving moral purposes. The criterion for adaptation is therefore dual relevance: relevance to changing circumstances and relevance to the ethical aims of Islamic education.

### ***Responsive Curriculum for Contemporary Educational Issues***

The third finding is that responsiveness provides the direction of adaptation. A curriculum may be flexible but still fail to respond to the most urgent problems affecting learners. The source paper identifies six contemporary areas that should be addressed systematically: the integration of Islamic values with science and technology; religious moderation; twenty-first-century skills; moral and ethical challenges; social and environmental awareness; and learner diversity. These areas are not separate additions to an already crowded curriculum. They function as contexts through which established Islamic learning outcomes can be interpreted and applied.

Digital transformation is the clearest example. The source paper argues that learners need to connect Islamic values with technological development rather than experience religion and technology as unrelated domains. Responsiveness in this area includes critical digital literacy, ethical communication, responsible use of information, and the ability to judge new practices through moral reasoning. Zuairiyah et al. (2025) reinforce this direction by proposing the integration of tawhid, technology, and science in adaptive Islamic education. Curriculum leaders should therefore ensure that digital competence includes not only technical operation but also ethical judgement, information verification, self-regulation, and responsibility for the social consequences of online behaviour.

Religious moderation and learner diversity form a second area. The source paper positions Islamic education as a means of cultivating wasathiyah, tolerance, inclusion, and respect for difference. Fitriana et al. (2025) show that Islamic religious education curriculum contributes to how learners understand self and others. From a management perspective, responsiveness requires these values to appear consistently across learning materials, classroom interaction, school rules, student activities, counselling, and assessment. A curriculum that teaches respect in one lesson while organisational practices permit exclusion or stereotyping sends contradictory messages.

Twenty-first-century competencies form a third area. Critical thinking, creativity, communication, collaboration, and digital literacy are presented in the source paper as capacities needed for learners to respond to rapid social change. These competencies can be integrated with Islamic education without displacing religious content. For example, critical thinking can be developed through evidence-based discussion of contemporary ethical dilemmas; collaboration can be practised through community service and project learning; communication can be developed through reasoned presentation and respectful disagreement; and creativity can be directed toward solutions that serve social benefit. Responsiveness therefore changes not only what is taught but how learners work with knowledge.

Moral and ethical challenges are a fourth area. Social media, global cultural flows, and unrestricted information create situations in which learners encounter competing values without direct adult mediation. The source paper argues that Islamic education should strengthen akhlaq so that learners can filter information and make decisions based on Islamic values. This requires more than exhortation. Curriculum should provide structured opportunities for ethical reasoning, case analysis, reflection, role modelling, and discussion of

consequences. Assessment should also recognise moral reasoning and responsible behaviour where appropriate, rather than relying only on content recall.

Social and environmental responsibility form a fifth area. The source paper explicitly includes poverty, social injustice, climate change, and environmental degradation as issues that Islamic education should address through values such as ukhuwah, responsibility, and amanah. This orientation expands curriculum relevance beyond personal piety toward public responsibility. Learning projects can connect religious concepts with local environmental problems, social service, resource conservation, or community wellbeing. The managerial requirement is coordination: curriculum, co-curricular programmes, partnerships, and school operations should reinforce the same values rather than treating social responsibility as an occasional activity.

Finally, responsiveness requires attention to learner diversity. The source paper argues that curriculum should accommodate differences in background, ability, and learning needs. This principle is closely related to flexibility and inclusion. Responsive curriculum management should therefore review whether learning resources, teaching strategies, assessment, and support services allow different learners to participate meaningfully. Equality does not require identical learning experiences; it requires fair opportunities to achieve essential outcomes through appropriate support and reasonable variation in learning pathways.

### ***The Integrative-Adaptive-Responsive (IAR) Curriculum Management Framework***

The synthesis indicates that integration, adaptation, and responsiveness should operate as one management cycle. Integration determines coherence: Islamic values, knowledge, skills, and lived contexts should be connected. Adaptation determines organisational capacity: institutions need flexibility, competent educators, resources, participation, and evidence-based revision. Responsiveness determines priority: curriculum decisions should address the contemporary conditions that most affect learner development. When one dimension is missing, reform becomes incomplete. Integration without adaptation produces good concepts that teachers may not be able to implement; adaptation without responsiveness can produce flexible practices with no clear social direction; responsiveness without integration can add temporary issues without embedding them in the curriculum's moral and academic structure.

Table 1 translates the synthesis into five managerial domains. These domains are derived from the themes repeated across the source manuscript and its cited literature. They are intended as a practical guide for curriculum leaders rather than a validated measurement scale.

**Table 1. Integrative-Adaptive-Responsive Curriculum Management Framework**

| Domain                   | Integrative focus                                                     | Adaptive focus                                            | Responsive focus                                                | Management indicators                                                      |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Curriculum design        | Connect values, knowledge, skills, and cross-disciplinary themes      | Allow contextual selection and sequencing                 | Embed digital ethics, moderation, sustainability, and diversity | Curriculum map; aligned outcomes; contextual themes                        |
| Pedagogy & assessment    | Use meaningful, active, and holistic learning                         | Differentiate methods, media, tasks, and support          | Use contemporary problems for inquiry and ethical reasoning     | Project/inquiry learning; varied assessment; authentic tasks               |
| Educator capacity        | Build interdisciplinary and value-based teaching competence           | Provide continuous professional learning and mentoring    | Develop digital, inclusive, and contemporary-issue literacy     | Training plan; peer learning; supervision; reflective practice             |
| Governance & resources   | Align policy, timetable, staffing, and resources with curricular aims | Use participatory review and flexible resource allocation | Prioritise emerging learner and community needs                 | Needs analysis; stakeholder forum; resource plan; review cycle             |
| Evaluation & improvement | Assess coherence between aims, teaching, and outcomes                 | Use evidence to revise local implementation               | Track whether curriculum addresses current risks and needs      | Outcome data; learner feedback; implementation review; improvement actions |

The framework changes the meaning of curriculum leadership. Leaders are not only transmitters of national curriculum policy; they are coordinators of alignment. They need to ensure that curriculum planning, teacher development, technology, student support, community partnership, and evaluation move in the same direction. This is especially important when institutions are given greater curriculum flexibility. Autonomy without coordination can

increase inconsistency, while control without flexibility can suppress contextual innovation. The IAR approach therefore requires bounded autonomy: teachers and institutions receive meaningful room for adaptation within shared learning outcomes, Islamic values, quality standards, and evidence-based review.

Implementation can begin with a curriculum diagnosis. Educational institutions can map where religious and general knowledge remain disconnected, which parts of the curriculum are overloaded, which contemporary issues are insufficiently addressed, what competencies teachers need, and which learner groups require additional support. The diagnosis should lead to a prioritised improvement plan rather than a wholesale redesign. Curriculum teams can then revise selected learning outcomes, identify interdisciplinary themes, design contextual projects, prepare teachers, and establish indicators for monitoring. This incremental strategy responds to the source paper's concern that curriculum change can become superficial when it focuses on names and documents rather than substantive implementation.

The framework also clarifies the relationship between curriculum reform and educational quality. Reform is successful when learners experience more coherent knowledge, more relevant learning, stronger ethical judgement, and better capacity to respond to changing conditions. These outcomes depend on organisational conditions that are often treated as external to curriculum: teacher workload, time for collaboration, access to technology, leadership support, professional development, and communication with families and communities. In practice, these are curriculum conditions because they determine whether intended learning can occur.

This conceptual synthesis has limitations. It is based on the literature already assembled in the source academic paper and does not represent an exhaustive systematic review. Several references in the original paper have incomplete bibliographic information, and the literature is dominated by Indonesian sources. The IAR framework has also not been tested empirically in a specific madrasah, school, or university. Future research should operationalise the five managerial domains, develop measurable indicators, and examine implementation through qualitative case studies, surveys, or mixed-method designs. Comparative research could also explore how the framework functions across madrasahs, Islamic schools, public schools, and higher education institutions.

## **CONCLUSION**

Islamic education curriculum reform should be understood as a continuous management process rather than as a succession of curriculum documents. The literature in the source paper indicates that sustainable reform requires three linked dimensions. Integration connects Islamic values with disciplinary knowledge, science, technology, skills, and lived social problems. Adaptation gives institutions and teachers the capacity to contextualise policy, respond to learner needs, use appropriate methods and media, and revise implementation as conditions change. Responsiveness ensures that flexibility is directed toward meaningful contemporary priorities, including digital ethics, religious moderation, twenty-first-century competencies, moral challenges, social and environmental responsibility, and learner diversity.

The proposed Integrative-Adaptive-Responsive (IAR) framework translates these dimensions into five domains of curriculum management: curriculum design, pedagogy and assessment, educator capacity, governance and resources, and evaluation and improvement. Its central implication is that curriculum quality depends on alignment. Reform becomes sustainable when educational leaders connect policy with teacher competence, resources, stakeholder participation, learning design, and evidence-based evaluation. The framework provides a conceptual basis for managing Islamic education curriculum reform while preserving Islamic moral purposes and strengthening educational relevance. Empirical testing is needed, but the synthesis offers a structured direction for future curriculum leadership, institutional development, and research.



## **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

All authors contributed to the conceptual development, literature synthesis, drafting, critical review, and revision of the manuscript.

## **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abdullah, F., Adib, H., & Misbah, M. (2021). Pengembangan kurikulum PAI berbasis integratif inklusif. *Eduprof: Islamic Education Journal*, 3(2), 165-182. <https://doi.org/10.47453/eduprof.v3i2.91>
- Aini, N., Siddiqy, H. A., Meydina, S. R., Wikowati, S., & Maimun. (2025). Transformasi kurikulum pendidikan agama Islam di Indonesia. Penerbit KBM Indonesia.
- Astuti, M., Mutiara, J., & Mustafiyanti, M. (2023). Pengertian pengembangan kurikulum pendidikan agama Islam. *ALFIHRIS: Jurnal Inspirasi Pendidikan*, 2(1), 46-52. <https://doi.org/10.59246/alfihris.v2i1.623>
- Busro, M., & Siskandar. (2017). Perencanaan dan pengembangan kurikulum. *Media Akademi*.
- Fitriana, R., Ramadhani, R., Ubaidillah, M. F., & Anam, R. K. (2025). Peran kurikulum pendidikan agama Islam dalam membentuk pandangan siswa tentang 'diri' dan 'orang lain'. *As-Sulthan Journal of Education*, 2(2), 376-385.
- Gultom, N. H., Zulhammi, Z., & Hasibuan, H. (2025). Efektivitas Kurikulum Merdeka dalam meningkatkan kualitas pembelajaran pendidikan agama Islam (Analisis implementasi di Madrasah Tapanuli Utara). *Edu Society: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 5(2), 1539-1550. <https://doi.org/10.56832/edu.v5i2.1561>
- Isnaini, D. M., et al. (2026). Analisis implementasi prinsip pengembangan kurikulum PAI terhadap efektivitas pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD FKIP Universitas Mandiri*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.36989/didaktik.v12i02.13628>
- Isrokatun, I., Hanifah, N., Maulana, M., & Suhaebar, I. (2020). Pembelajaran matematika dan sains secara integratif melalui situation-based learning. UPI Sumedang Press.
- Julaeha, S. (2019). Problematika kurikulum dan pembelajaran pendidikan karakter. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Islam*, 7(2), 157. <https://doi.org/10.36667/jppi.v7i2.367>
- Mubin, N., Basri, B., Nur, M. A., & Ma'ruf, R. A. (n.d.). Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka pada pendidikan agama Islam untuk peningkatan mutu pembelajaran. *JiIP: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*. <https://www.jiip.stkipyapisdompmpu.ac.id/jiip/index.php/JiIP/article/view/8568>
- Nurhidaya, M., Hamdan, & Cahyadi, A. (2025). Kurikulum pendidikan Islam di Indonesia (Problematika, tantangan dan lintasan sejarah kurikulum di Indonesia). *Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)*, 2(1), 356-365. <https://doi.org/10.62567/micjo.v2i1.398>
- Putra, A. E., Anggraeni, T. B., Rohili, T., Iswanto, Kurniawan, A. T., Priyantoro, D. E., et al. (2025). Inovasi kurikulum pendidikan agama Islam: Teori, model, dan pengembangan di Indonesia. *CV Literasi Nusantara Abadi*.
- Saiyidah, L. H., Pahrudin, A., & Jatmiko, A. (2025). Analisis hakikat, prinsip, dan landasan pengembangan kurikulum pendidikan agama Islam: Kajian literatur. *Paedagogie*, 20(2), 323-332. <https://doi.org/10.31603/paedagogie.v20i2.15310>
- Syafiqurrohman, M. (2020). Implementasi pendidikan akhlak integratif-inklusif. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, dan Agama*, 12(1), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v12i01.240>
- Zuairiyah, Z., Tsaniyah, R. I., Hidayah, N., Saputri, I. A., Sahara, M. L., & Achmad, S. (2025). Rekonstruksi kurikulum pendidikan Islam adaptif: Integrasi tauhid, teknologi dan sains untuk mewujudkan generasi Qur'ani modern. *Journal of Instructional and Development Researches*, 5(4), 370-383. <https://doi.org/10.53621/jider.v5i4.554>

**Copyright Holder :**

© Mardatillah et al. (2026).

**First Publication Right :**

© Praefectura: Journal of Transformational Leadership and Educational Management

**This article is under: CC BY 4.0**