



ADPIKS
Asosiasi Dosen Peneliti
Ilmu Keislaman dan Sosial

Political Basis of Education: The Influence of Government Policy on National Education

Naylah Az Zahra¹, Rizky Fatma Khairani²

^{1,2}Universitas Islam Negeri Syekh Ali Hasan Ahmad Addary Padangsidempuan

e-mail: [1naylahhasibuan3@gmail.com](mailto:naylahhasibuan3@gmail.com); [2fnasution121@gmail.com](mailto:fnasution121@gmail.com)

Abstract

This study examines the political foundations of education by analyzing the influence of government policies on the national education system. Education policy is a strategic instrument used by governments to achieve national development goals, shape citizen character, and respond to social and global changes. This study employs a qualitative descriptive method using a literature review approach to trace the evolution of education policies in Indonesia from the colonial era to the reform era. The findings reveal that government policies have profoundly shaped the structure, curriculum, and accessibility of the national education system. In each political era, education was directed according to the prevailing ideology and political interests. Post-reform decentralization has opened greater space for local educational autonomy, although challenges of quality and equity persist. Understanding the political foundations of education is essential for developing education policies that are just, inclusive, and responsive to the needs of the nation.

Keywords: political foundations of education; government policy; national education; education reform; curriculum policy.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji landasan politik pendidikan dengan menganalisis pengaruh kebijakan pemerintah terhadap sistem pendidikan nasional. Kebijakan pendidikan dipahami sebagai instrumen strategis yang digunakan pemerintah untuk mencapai tujuan pembangunan nasional, membentuk karakter warga negara, serta merespons perubahan sosial dan global. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif dengan pendekatan studi kepustakaan untuk menelusuri perkembangan kebijakan pendidikan di Indonesia sejak masa kolonial hingga era reformasi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kebijakan pemerintah memiliki pengaruh yang sangat besar dalam membentuk struktur, kurikulum, serta aksesibilitas sistem pendidikan nasional. Pada setiap era politik, pendidikan diarahkan sesuai dengan ideologi dan kepentingan politik yang dominan. Desentralisasi pada era reformasi memberikan ruang yang lebih luas bagi otonomi pendidikan daerah, meskipun masih ditemukan tantangan dalam aspek kualitas dan pemerataan pendidikan. Pemahaman terhadap landasan politik pendidikan menjadi penting dalam merumuskan kebijakan pendidikan yang lebih adil, inklusif, dan responsif terhadap kebutuhan bangsa.

Kata kunci: landasan politik pendidikan; kebijakan pemerintah; pendidikan nasional; reformasi pendidikan; kebijakan kurikulum.



Introduction

The political foundation of education is one of the main foundations for understanding why a nation's education system is designed and implemented in a certain way. Politics and education are closely related and influence each other; political policy determines the direction, goals, and implementation of education, while education serves as a means for the government to realize the nation's vision and ideology.(Faratunnisa, Syahrani, and Afifah 2024).

In Indonesia, the relationship between politics and education has been evident since the Dutch colonial era, when education was used as a tool to maintain colonial power. After independence, education became a national priority, aimed at shaping a national identity based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution. Each change in political regime brought significant changes to education policy, from the Old Order, New Order, to the Reformation era.(Syarif and Maulana 2025).

Educational policies born from political decisions encompass not only curriculum and institutional structures, but also address more fundamental issues such as equitable access, the quality of educators, educational funding, and the relevance of education to national development needs. Therefore, understanding the political foundations of education is key to evaluating the existing education system and designing better policies for the future.(Nurhakim et al. 2025).

The relationship between politics and education is fundamentally reciprocal, with both influencing each other in a complex and often unidirectional dynamic. On the one hand, political power determines the direction, content, and structure of the education system through various policy instruments. On the other hand, education shapes citizens' political awareness, produces new elites who will later occupy positions of power, and instills values that long-term influence a nation's political culture. Understanding this reciprocal nature is what makes the study of the political foundations of education not merely view education as a passive object of political policy, but also as an actor that actively shapes the political landscape of a society.



From a historical perspective, the transformation of the Indonesian education system over time is actually a reflection of the transformation of political power that occurred at the national level. During the Old Order, education was colored by the rhetoric of revolution and anti-imperialism, reflecting Sukarno's confrontational political orientation towards Western powers. Then, during the New Order, education shifted to become an instrument of economic stabilization and modernization, reflecting Suharto's pragmatic developmental ideology. Furthermore, the Reformation era brought education towards decentralization and democratization, in line with the spirit of political openness after 1998. Each of these shifts in political orientation left traces that can be traced empirically in changes to curricula, institutional policies, and educational practices on the ground.

The issue of equal access to education is one of the most crucial arenas where political interests are clearly contested and directly impact the lives of millions of citizens. The still-glorious gap in access to education between the rich and the poor, between developed and underdeveloped regions, and between men and women in certain regions reflects how political decisions regarding the allocation of educational resources have not fully favored the groups most in need. Affirmative action programs such as the Smart Indonesia Card (Kartu Indonesia Pintar) and various government scholarships represent a political response to social pressure to address these disparities, although their effectiveness and sustainability depend heavily on the political commitment of the ruling government.

The quality of educators, as a key determinant of educational quality, is also inseparable from its political dimension. The teacher certification policy, launched through the 2005 Teachers and Lecturers Law, was the product of lengthy political negotiations between the government, teachers' professional organizations, and other interest groups in parliament. Improving teacher welfare through the professional allowances that accompany certification reflects political recognition of teachers' strategic role in national development and is a response to



the growing pressure from teachers' organizations as a significant pressure group in Indonesia's educational politics. However, the correlation between improving teacher welfare and improving the quality of classroom learning remains a contentious issue in national education policy discourse.

The relevance of education to national development needs is a political dimension of education that is increasingly prominent along with the intensification of global competition in the knowledge-based economy era. The demands of the industrial world and the ever-evolving job market put pressure on the education system to produce graduates who are not only academically proficient, but also possess practical competencies, critical thinking skills, creativity, and digital skills relevant to 21st-century needs. Policy responses to these demands are reflected in various initiatives such as strengthening vocational education, developing competency-based curricula, and partnership programs between educational institutions and the business world, which have become priorities on the education policy agenda of contemporary governments.

Based on the description above, the problem formulation in this study includes: (1) how is the relationship between politics and education in the context of national policy, (2) how does government policy influence the development of the Indonesian education system from time to time, and (3) how post-reform decentralization of education affects the quality and equality of national education. This study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the political basis of education and its relevance in facing contemporary educational challenges.

Research Methods

This study employed library research with a qualitative descriptive approach. Data were collected through a review of various scientific literature sources, including educational journals, educational policy textbooks, official government documents, and previous research relevant to the topic of the political foundations of education. (Zulmaneli, Nasihin, and Rusmita 2026).



The qualitative descriptive method was chosen because it is relevant to the need to understand and describe education policy phenomena in depth and context. This approach allows researchers to identify patterns, themes, and meanings behind various education policies implemented across various eras of government in Indonesia.

Data analysis was conducted thematically, examining the relationship between government policies and their impact on the national education system. The sources used were selected based on the relevance, credibility, and currency of the information they contain, thus providing an accurate and comprehensive picture of the dynamics of the political foundations of education in Indonesia.

Results and Discussion

Politics and Education: A Fundamental Relationship

Politics and education are two inseparable areas in national life. Conceptually, educational politics refers to the authoritative decision-making process regarding the goals, content, and implementation of education in a society. The state, as the primary political actor, has the authority to determine the direction and policies of national education through various legal instruments such as laws, government regulations, and curriculum policies.

The political foundation of education recognizes that education is not simply a process of transferring knowledge, but also an arena where values, ideologies, and social interests are contested and negotiated. The government uses education to shape citizens who align with the values and norms adopted by the state, strengthen national solidarity, and prepare the workforce needed by the economy.

In the Indonesian context, the political foundation of education is reflected in various policies established since independence. Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution serve as the ideological and constitutional foundation for all national education policies, explicitly mandating the goal of educating the nation as a state



responsibility.(Azwar et al. 2025).

The implementation of the political foundation of education based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution is concretely reflected in the structure of the national curriculum, which has undergone several changes throughout Indonesian history. Each curriculum change cannot be separated from the surrounding political context, where the ruling government always strives to instill certain values deemed relevant to the vision of national development at that time. Pancasila and Civics Education, for example, are consistently maintained as compulsory subjects at all levels of education, reflecting the state's commitment to making national ideology the foundation for character formation for citizens from an early age.

The political dimension of education is also evident in the decentralization policies implemented after the 1998 Reformation, where authority to manage education was distributed to regional governments as part of the democratization of governance. This shift reflects a shift in political orientation from the centralism of the New Order to pluralism and broader regional autonomy. However, educational decentralization also presents its own challenges in the form of capacity gaps between regions in providing quality education, raising fundamental questions about how the state guarantees equal access to education amidst the vast diversity of regional conditions.

The education budget policy of at least 20 percent of the state budget, mandated by the amended 1945 Constitution, is one of the most concrete manifestations of the state's political commitment to education as a national development priority. Determining this budget amount is not merely a technical financial decision, but rather reflects a political consensus reached through a long process of advocacy among education stakeholders. This significant budget allocation is expected to strengthen education infrastructure, improve teacher welfare, expand access to education, and encourage overall quality improvement. Although in practice, the effectiveness of budget use remains a matter of ongoing evaluation.



Indonesian education policy is also inseparable from the dynamics of the relationship between the state and civil society groups, including religious organizations that have historically played a crucial role in the implementation of national education. Educational institutions run by organizations such as Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah have long been strategic partners of the state in expanding access to education, particularly in areas not yet covered by the government education system. The state's recognition of the madrasah and pesantren education systems through various regulations reflects the ongoing political negotiation between the state's interest in building an integrated national education system and the aspirations of community groups seeking to maintain their educational identities and traditions.(Amin, Sari, and Sirozi 2023).

The political underpinnings of education also shape the language of instruction policy within the national education system, which is one of the most sensitive arenas for identity negotiations in a pluralistic nation like Indonesia. Establishing Indonesian as the sole language of instruction in formal education was a strategic political decision to strengthen national unity amidst the diversity of hundreds of regional languages that exist throughout the archipelago. However, this policy also sparked debate about the balance between the interests of national integration and the preservation of local linguistic richness, ultimately leading to the emergence of local content policies as a compromise between national interests and regional cultural aspirations.(Madinah et al. 2025).

In an increasingly connected global context, the political foundation of Indonesian education is now also facing pressure from international education agendas brought by various multilateral organizations such as UNESCO, the World Bank, and the OECD. The adoption of global education frameworks such as Education for All and the Sustainable Development Goals in the education sector reflects how national education policy is no longer solely determined by internal dynamics, but is also influenced by a global consensus on educational standards and goals. The challenge for Indonesia is to navigate these global pressures in such a way that national education policy remains relevant to local



needs and contexts, while also responsive to the demands of 21st-century competencies that are prerequisites for the nation's participation in global civilization.

Educational Policy during the Colonial and Post-Independence Periods

Political influence on education in Indonesia began long before independence. During the Dutch colonial period, education policies were designed to serve colonial interests. The education system was discriminatory and stratified based on social class and race, with only a select few indigenous people receiving access to formal education. The primary goal was not to educate the indigenous population, but rather to produce the administrative staff needed by the colonial government.

Following the proclamation of independence in 1945, the Indonesian government immediately formulated an education policy grounded in the spirit of nationalism and the ideals of independence. The country's constitution explicitly states that every citizen has the right to education, and the government is obligated to implement a national education system. This represented a fundamental shift in the political orientation of education, from discriminatory and exclusive to inclusive and democratic.

The early years of independence were marked by the government's strenuous efforts to build educational infrastructure from scratch. The construction of elementary schools throughout Indonesia was a priority, despite limited human and financial resources posing serious obstacles. Educational policy during this period was heavily influenced by nationalism and the desire to build a strong and sovereign national identity. (Rohayati, Rohmi, and Subhani 2025).

In the 1950s, the Indonesian education system began to undergo more structured consolidation. The government established the Ministry of Education and Culture as the official institution responsible for the management and development of national education. A national curriculum was developed, integrating national values, Indonesian as the language of instruction, and general



knowledge previously accessible only to a limited audience. Efforts to eradicate illiteracy were also intensified through various literacy programs reaching remote villages, as the initial foundation for developing human resources for an independent and sovereign Indonesia.

Entering the Old Order era under President Sukarno, education became a powerful ideological instrument to strengthen national unity and counter the lingering influence of colonialism. The educational concept promoted during this period was heavily politically charged, with the teaching of Pancasila values, nationalism, and anti-imperialism becoming an integral part of the school curriculum. While this approach succeeded in instilling a spirit of nationalism, it also sparked debate about the balance between critical education and ideological indoctrination that could potentially limit students' freedom of thought.

The change of regime from the Old Order to the New Order in the mid-1960s brought significant changes to Indonesia's educational landscape. Under President Suharto, education was geared towards supporting national economic development and political stability. The six-year compulsory education program was introduced, and later expanded to nine years, as part of the state's commitment to equalizing access to basic education for all levels of society. The construction of a large number of Inpres Elementary Schools across the archipelago was one of the most visible achievements of this period's educational equality policy, although criticism of the quality and content of education, which was heavily influenced by the regime's interests, persisted among intellectuals. (Bunjamin and Hidayah 2025).

The Reformation Era, which began in 1998, opened a new chapter in the history of Indonesian education, marked by the spirit of decentralization and democratization that fundamentally changed education governance. Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System was a significant milestone, reaffirming the right of every citizen to a quality education. The education budget was mandated to be at least 20 percent of the national budget (APBN), an unprecedented fiscal commitment in Indonesian history. Regional autonomy also



granted greater authority to local governments to manage education according to their respective local needs and characteristics, although this also created disparities in quality between regions, which posed a challenge in itself.

Entering the 21st century, Indonesian education faces new and increasingly complex challenges along with the acceleration of globalization and the information technology revolution. The government responded to these challenges by launching various curriculum reform programs, including the 2013 Curriculum and later the Merdeka Curriculum, which sought to shift the learning paradigm from rote learning to a competency-based, character-based, and creativity-based approach. The integration of digital technology into the learning process has intensified, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced the entire education system to drastically adapt to distance learning models. The long journey of Indonesian education since independence until now reflects the nation's social, political, and cultural dynamics, which continue to evolve in its efforts to realize the ideal of educating the nation, as mandated by the nation's founders.

Education Policy during the Old Order Era (1945-1966)

During the Old Order under President Sukarno, education policy was heavily influenced by the NASAKOM (Nationalism, Religion, Communism) ideology, which served as the political foundation of the government at the time. Educational institutions served as a means of disseminating the state ideology, and the curriculum was designed to instill values consistent with Sukarno's political views.(Hutabarat, Sijabat, and Andini 2024).

The curriculum underwent three revisions during this period: in 1947, 1952, and 1960. Each curriculum change reflected shifting government political priorities. The 1947 curriculum, known as the Lesson Plan, emphasized the development of the character of an independent and sovereign Indonesian. The 1952 curriculum clarified the direction of national education by separating subjects based on their function. The 1960 curriculum further strengthened the



ideological content by incorporating MANIPOL/USDEK material as mandatory state doctrine.

Despite its ideological overtones, the Old Order's educational policies succeeded in producing a generation with a strong sense of nationalism and a sense of national identity. Efforts to build madrasas and formalize Islamic education also began to receive attention, with the official recognition of madrasas as educational institutions through Law No. 4 of 1950.(Haq 2025).

Education Policy during the New Order Era (1966-1998)

The change of regime from the Old Order to the New Order brought about major changes in Indonesian education policy. Under President Soeharto's leadership, national education was comprehensively regulated through Law No. 2 of 1989 concerning the National Education System. New Order education policy emphasized equal access, improved quality, and the relevance of education to national development needs.

One of the most influential policies of this era was the 9-Year Compulsory Education program, launched in 1984. This program significantly increased enrollment in primary education, with the construction of thousands of new schools across Indonesia. The physical construction of schools became a primary focus of the New Order government, with substantial budget allocations for educational infrastructure.

However, the New Order's education policies also drew sharp criticism for their highly centralized and ideological nature. Education was tightly controlled by the central government, with curriculum control, the appointment of principals loyal to the regime, and textbook censorship. Education became a tool for legitimizing New Order power, with the regime's version of Pancasila values being widely indoctrinated.(Auf and Arifi 2026).

One of the most systematic indoctrination instruments implemented by the New Order regime was the Pancasila Understanding and Implementation Guidance (P4) program, which was mandatory for all elements of society,



including teachers and students at all levels of education. This program was designed to instill a single interpretation of Pancasila values in accordance with the regime's wishes, thereby closing off any alternative interpretations deemed potentially threatening to the stability of power. Educators deemed inconsistent with the regime's official ideology faced the risk of administrative sanctions or dismissal, creating an atmosphere of fear that ultimately stifled the tradition of critical thinking in schools and universities. This condition resulted in a generation of educated people who tended to be passive and conformist, poorly trained to question and critically evaluate public policy. (Suprayogi et al. 2024).

The New Order regime's control over higher education was no less repressive than over primary and secondary education. The Normalization of Campus Life and the Student Coordinating Board (NKK/BKK) policies, enacted in 1978, effectively curtailed the tradition of student activism that had previously served as a counterbalance to state power. Student organizations were restricted to non-political academic and extracurricular activities, while lecturers who spoke critically of government policies faced systematic institutional pressure. Universities, which should have been free spaces for the development of knowledge and critical thinking, were transformed into institutions subject to the political interests of the ruling regime.

Despite the criticisms of its ideological dimensions, the New Order's education policy actually achieved a number of quantitative achievements that cannot be ignored. The illiteracy rate was dramatically reduced from around 40 percent in the early 1970s to below 15 percent in the late 1990s, an achievement recognized by various international institutions, including UNESCO. Scholarship and educational assistance programs for low-income families were also initiated, although their distribution was far from equitable and often tainted by political favoritism. The expansion of vocational and professional education was also encouraged in response to the need for skilled labor to support the industrialization program that became the backbone of the New Order's economic development strategy.



The collapse of the New Order regime in 1998 opened the door to comprehensive educational reform, but also left a legacy of structural problems that were not easily resolved quickly. The legacy of strong centralism in education left behind a rigid education bureaucracy, an academic culture less conducive to innovation, and a sharp gap in quality between urban and rural schools. The post-New Order education reform process must confront this systemic legacy, where changes in formal regulations and policies often outpaced the transformation of the culture and mentality of the education bureaucracy that had been formed during more than three decades of New Order rule.

Decentralization of Education in the Reform Era

The collapse of the New Order in 1998 and the advent of the Reformation era brought a breath of fresh air to Indonesian education policy. The spirit of democratization and decentralization that characterized the Reformation era was reflected in fundamental changes to the national education system. Law No. 22 of 1999 concerning Regional Government granted regional governments greater authority to manage education affairs in their respective regions.

The most significant change occurred with the enactment of Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System, which replaced the 1989 National Education System Law. This new law introduced a more democratic, decentralized educational paradigm oriented toward the holistic development of student potential. A policy of allocating a minimum education budget of 20% of the national and regional budgets was also established, demonstrating the state's commitment to adequate education funding.

The decentralization of education in the Reformation era also brings its own challenges. Disparities in education quality between regions are increasingly evident, with regions with high fiscal capacity able to provide quality education, while underdeveloped regions still struggle with limited resources. This demonstrates that decentralization policies need to be balanced with strong equity policies to ensure that all citizens can enjoy quality education.(Hayida-o,



Siradjuddin, and Wayong 2025).

The central government's efforts to address the widening disparity in education quality between regions following decentralization have been realized through various affirmative action programs and fiscal transfers specifically targeted at disadvantaged regions. The Special Allocation Fund for Education, the School Operational Assistance program, and various educational infrastructure assistance schemes are policy instruments designed to bridge the capacity gap between rich and poor regions in providing education. However, the effectiveness of these fiscal transfers is often hampered by the weak capacity of local governments in planning, managing, and accounting for education budgets, so that available funds do not always translate into tangible improvements in the quality of education services at the school level.(Rahayu, Asbari, and Nurhayati 2023).

The issue of education governance in the era of decentralization is also characterized by the phenomenon of overlapping authority between the central government, provincial governments, and district or city governments, which often causes confusion and inefficiency in managing the education system. The division of authority stipulated in various regulations does not always run smoothly in practice, especially when political interests at the local level clash with policies established by the central government. The phenomenon of the politicization of the education bureaucracy in the regions, including the practice of appointing school principals and education office officials based on considerations of political affiliation rather than professional competence, is one of the negative impacts of decentralization that is most often complained about by education practitioners in the field.

In the context of educational decentralization, the role of provincial governments as bridges between the central government and district or city governments is becoming increasingly strategic but also increasingly complex. Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, which transferred authority for managing secondary education from districts or cities to provinces, represents a policy correction intended to address fragmentation and inequality in



the management of this level of education. This shift in authority carries significant organizational and financial consequences, including the transfer of assets, personnel, and budgets, a process that has not always run smoothly in all regions. The experience of implementing this policy provides valuable lessons about the complexities of education governance reform in a decentralized government system.

The dimensions of educational quality in the context of decentralization are also closely related to the national standardization policy implemented by the central government as an instrument to maintain the cohesion and minimum quality of the education system throughout Indonesia. The National Education Standards, which encompass eight standards ranging from content standards to assessment standards, are a regulatory framework intended to ensure that decentralization does not lead to uncontrolled fragmentation of quality. The National Examination, which later transformed into the National Assessment, is one evaluation instrument that reflects the central government's efforts to maintain control over educational achievement standards, although its measurement approach and philosophy continue to evolve along with the development of thinking about a more comprehensive concept of educational quality. (Mustabsyirah and Yuspiani 2025).

Facing the challenges posed by educational decentralization, a number of policy innovations have been developed to create a more optimal balance between regional autonomy and national quality assurance in education delivery. An asymmetric approach to educational decentralization is being considered, where the level of autonomy granted to regions is tailored to the capacity and readiness of each region to manage its education system independently and responsibly. Strengthening the role of supervision and guidance by the central and provincial governments in the implementation of education in regions with limited capacity is also part of the policy strategy to ensure that the spirit of decentralization does not sacrifice the right of every child of the nation to a quality education, regardless of where they were born and raised.



Political Implications on Curriculum and Quality of Education

One of the most obvious aspects of political influence on education is curriculum policy. Every change of government is almost always accompanied by changes or adjustments to the curriculum, reflecting shifting priorities and political orientations. Since independence, Indonesia has undergone more than ten curriculum changes, from the 1947 Curriculum to the Merdeka Curriculum introduced during the Joko Widodo era.

These frequent curriculum changes, on the one hand, reflect the government's efforts to continually adapt education to the needs of the times. However, on the other hand, they also pose challenges for teachers and students, who must adapt regularly. Stability of curriculum policy is crucial for optimal implementation and measurable evaluation of the results.

The quality of national education is also significantly influenced by government policy. Budget commitments, teacher professional development policies, national exam standards, and scholarship programs are clear examples of how political decisions directly impact the quality of education received by students. Therefore, sound education policy must be based on a deep understanding of educational needs, not simply short-term political interests.(Supardi et al. 2025).

The development of the teaching profession as a pillar of national education quality requires consistent and sustainable political commitment beyond the cycle of government changes. The teacher certification policy, which has been in place for more than a decade, demonstrates that improving teachers' financial well-being alone does not automatically result in the expected improvement in pedagogical competence unless accompanied by a systematic professional development program based on real needs in the field. A more comprehensive reform of teacher development policy requires an approach that goes beyond simply fulfilling administrative certification requirements to building a teacher professional ecosystem that encourages lifelong learning, collaboration



among educators, and innovative, student-centered learning practices.

Scholarship programs as an instrument of education policy also require more in-depth evaluation to ensure their optimal function as a tool for equalizing educational opportunities for all levels of society. Various government-managed scholarship programs, from the Smart Indonesia Scholarship to the Education Fund Management Institution, have had a tangible impact in expanding access to higher education for groups previously lacking the financial means to pursue their studies. However, challenges in terms of the effectiveness of recipient selection, the relevance of funded fields of study to national development needs, and post-scholarship accountability mechanisms remain a key area of improvement that requires serious attention from policymakers to ensure the substantial political and financial investment in these scholarship programs yields optimal development impact.

The standardization of educational assessment through various national evaluation instruments is a policy arena that is most often contested between the central government's interest in maintaining national standards and the aspirations of regions and schools to have autonomy in assessing their students' progress. The transformation from the National Examination to the National Assessment, which includes the Minimum Competency Assessment and Character Survey, reflects a shift in the political paradigm of education from a memorization-based selection orientation to a more fundamental measurement of literacy and numeracy competencies. This paradigm shift in assessment has far-reaching implications for classroom learning practices, where the pressure to prepare students for memorization-based exams is expected to be reduced, thus giving teachers more space to develop more meaningful and contextual learning.

Ultimately, improving the quality of national education requires a political consensus that transcends partisan interests and short-term electoral cycles. Education, as a long-term investment for the nation, requires policies designed with a long time horizon, with results only becoming significantly felt after one or even two generations. Therefore, building institutional mechanisms that can



protect strategic education policies from the turmoil of shifts in political power is becoming an increasingly urgent need, for example by strengthening the role of independent institutions in the education sector, more meaningful involvement of the academic community and education practitioners in policy formulation, and developing a culture of policy evaluation based on empirical evidence and oriented towards the long-term interests of the nation's future generations.

Reference

- Amin, Khoirul, Ana Kurnia Sari, and Muhammad Sirozi. 2023. "Kelompok Kepentingan (Interest Group) Dalam Dinamika Politik Pendidikan Islam Di Indonesia." *Tarbawy : Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 10(2):89–97. doi: [10.32923/tarbawy.v10i2.3671](https://doi.org/10.32923/tarbawy.v10i2.3671).
- Auf, Muhammad Azmi, and Ahmad Arifi. 2026. "Analisis Profil Kompetensi Lulusan Iain Dalam Kebijakan Pendidikan Islam Era Orde Baru (1990 – 2000)." *AL IRFAN: JURNAL ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN PENELITIAN* 01(02):198–206. doi: [10.64877/alirfan.v1i2.44](https://doi.org/10.64877/alirfan.v1i2.44).
- Azwar, Zelia Ellen, Syalsyabhilla Gaustussuada G, Hafiz Razi Wibowo, and Zaenul Slam. 2025. "Urgensi Pancasila Sebagai Dasar Negara Dalam Konstitusi Indonesia." *Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Akademik* 2(6):1201–12. doi: <https://doi.org/10.61722/jmia.v2i6.7062>.
- Bunyamin, and Arina Rohmatul Hidayah. 2025. "Shifting From Religious Populism To Authoritarian Populism: Two Decades of Identity Politics Dynamics in Indonesia." *KOMID: Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Dakwah* 3(1):31–60. <https://ejournal.iaipd-nganjuk.ac.id/index.php/komid/article/view/2251>.
- Faratunnisa, A. N., Syahrani, A., & Afifah, N. (2024). Kajian makna sistem dalam fondasi pendidikan nasional Indonesia. *Jurnal Saraweta*, 2(2), 108–119. <https://ejournal.staiddimaros.ac.id/index.php/saraweta/article/view/98>.
- Haq, Ihsan Abdul. 2025. "Pendidikan Islam Di Masa Awal Kemerdekaan Indonesia : Peran Sejarah Dalam Membentuk Identitas Pendidikan Nasional." *Tarikh: Journal of Islamic History and Civilization* 1(2):118–34. doi: <https://doi.org/10.61630/tjihc.v1i2.8>.
- Hayida-o, Saadah, Siradjuddin, and Moh. Wayong. 2025. "Perbandingan Sistem Dan Efektivitas Pembiayaan Pendidikan Sebelum Dan Sesudah Otonomi Daerah." *Integrative Perspectives of Social and Science Journal (IPSSJ)* 2(3):4312–23. <https://ipssj.com/index.php/ojs/article/view/563>.
- Hutabarat, Yona Venelia, Daniel Sijabat, and Rica Kharoma Andini. 2024. "Indoktrinasi Pendidikan Pada Masa Orde Lama : Menanamkan Nilai Pancasila Dan Manipol / Usdek." *HUMANITIS: Jurnal Humaniora, Sosial Dan Bisnis* 2(1):23–32. <https://humanisa.my.id/index.php/hms/article/view/23>.
- Madinah, Nur, Adezoya Shifa Sabilila, Khanifah, Adam Sayid Panggeda, and Abdul



- Mukhlis. 2025. “Eksplorasi Kebijakan Bahasa Dan Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia.” *JB: Jurnal Bahasa Indonesia* 3(1):51–60. <https://doi.org/10.59966/jbi.v3i1.1797>.
- Mustabsyirah, and Yuspiani. 2025. “Analisis Kebijakan Desentralisasi Sistem Pendidikan Nasional Dan Dampaknya Terhadap Pendidikan Madrasah.” *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran* 8(3):1692–1704. <https://doi.org/10.30605/jsgp.8.3.2025.6523>
- Nurhakim, Haditsa Qur’ani, Arif Rahman Hakim, Basuki, Mamat Rahmat, Supiana, and Qiqi Yulianti Zakiah. 2025. “Perumusan, Formulasi, Dan Adopsi Kebijakan Pendidikan.” *Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Kependidikan* 07(04). [10.46773/muaddib.v7i4.2655](https://doi.org/10.46773/muaddib.v7i4.2655)
- Rahayu, Sri, Masduki Asbari, and Wakhida Nurhayati. 2023. “Delayed Gratification: Menahan Sedikit Kesenangan Untuk Kebahagiaan Besar Jangka Panjang.” *Literaksi: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan* 1(02):114–18. doi: [10.70508/literaksi.v1i02.64](https://doi.org/10.70508/literaksi.v1i02.64).
- Rohayati, Saufi, Sopiatal Rohmi, and Armin Subhani. 2025. “Perkembangan Pendidikan Dasar Di Indonesia Sejak Kemerdekaan Hingga Kini.” *Eduversity: Journal of Future Interdisciplinary Education* 1(1). <https://gumpublisher.id/index.php/ijfie/article/view/3>
- Supardi, Anis Fauzi, Nurdina Fitri, and Mila Nuroniyah. 2025. “Analisis Kebijakan Politik Pendidikan Di Indonesia.” *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan* 13(02):222–31. <https://journal.unpak.ac.id/index.php/JMP/article/view/12156>
- Suprayogi, Eni Rahmawati, Hafidz Rafi’uddin, and Giri Harto Wiratomo. 2024. “Problematisasi Antara Internalisasi Dan Indoktrinasi Nilai Pancasila Dalam Pembelajaran Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan.” *JURNAL MORAL KEMASYARAKATAN* 9(1):98–106. <https://doi.org/10.21067/jmk.v9i1.10347>
- Syarif, Fathusy, and Adam Maulana. 2025. “Rekonstruksi Epistemologi Pendidikan Islam Pada Masa Kolonial Belanda Dan Implikasinya Terhadap Dikotomi Pendidikan Di Indonesia.” *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan (JIP)* 3(6):617–34. <https://jutepe-joln.net/index.php/JURDIKAN/article/view/967>
- Zulmaneli, Fikri Nasihin, and Ida Rusmita. 2026. “Peran Manajemen Perpustakaan Dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pendidikan.” *JURNAL PELITA ILMIAH PENDIDIKAN* 2:1–10. <https://jurnalpelitanegribelantaraya.com/index.php/rengas/article/view/350>



