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Abstract • In addition to offering insight into the discipline of sociology, sociology of education textbooks constitute a major source of sociological knowledge. This article examines the scholarly content of Indonesian sociology of education textbooks by focusing on the degree of commonality between their core content and sources, and between their core content and academic scholarship. The results of this examination reveal a low level of commonality among the core contents of the seven selected textbooks—a heterogeneity that reflects not so much the plurality of Indonesian society and educational institutions or the application of sociological theories and approaches required by the Indonesian curriculum, but rather the diversity of the textbooks’ sources and their authors’ scholarly publication records.
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Although the contents and contexts of textbooks have been subject to thorough scholarly criticism in recent years, no doubt remains as to the importance of textbooks as a main source of knowledge. Textbook research ranges from traditional analyses of content production and selection processes to the adoption, implementation, and use of the finished product by students and teachers. Picking up on this trend, this article focuses on the scholarly content of Indonesian sociology of education textbooks.

While many studies have been conducted on sociology textbooks, research into sociology of education textbooks is still limited. This article therefore presents the first ever results of work about sociology of education textbooks. In their 2007 study of Chinese sociology of education textbooks, Zefang Dong and Guoqiang Zhang identified three stages in the development of the sociology of education: a foundation period (1922–1949); a stagnation period (1949–1979); and a period of recovery and reconstruction (1979–present). In a parallel study published the following year, Xuan Dong found that most Chinese sociology of education textbooks provide no space for the discussion of symbolic interactionism, but focus exclusively on structural functionalism and conflict theory. This article is thus designed to fill in an important gap in current research on Indonesian textbooks.
Sociology of education as a discipline was first included in the curriculum of the Yogyakarta State Institute for Teacher Training and Education (IKIP) in 1967. It therefore constitutes a relatively new development in Indonesia's higher education system, and the number of Indonesian sociology of education textbooks is correspondingly limited. The first sociology of education textbooks written by Indonesian scholars were those created by St. Vembriarto (1982) and S. Nasution (1983). By the year 2000, only six sociology of education textbooks (in addition to translations of English texts, most prominently Philip Robinson's 1986 work, *Perspectives on the Sociology of Education: An Introduction*) had been published in Indonesia. That number has since increased considerably, as has the number of sociology and education departments in Indonesia's higher education institutions. Today, educators can choose between at least twenty-three Indonesian sociology of education textbooks.

Textbook research in Indonesia tends to focus on secondary school textbooks. Topics examined in recent studies include the role of the textbook in the formation of the Indonesian state; symbolic violence in electronic textbooks; multicultural values in history textbooks; civic education textbook reform; exclusivism and radicalism in (Islamic) religious education textbooks; gender bias in Islamic textbooks; militaristic discourse in history textbooks; and gender stereotypes in South Asian textbooks.

Departing from this trend, the present article focuses on higher education textbooks and seeks to ascertain the degree of uniformity between sociology of education textbooks. Inspired by Henry Tischler's approach to the textbook as "a reflection of the discipline," it examines the relationship between the content of a given textbook and the scholarship produced by its author by focusing on three central questions: How similar are the core topics presented in the textbooks? What type of sources are referenced? And finally, what is the connection between the textbooks' core content and the authors' sources and scholarly records?

The purpose of this article is thus twofold: to provide insight into the state of sociology of education in Indonesia and, in a broader sense, to offer a practical guide to didactic planning and practice in the domain of the sociology of education.

**Methodology**

The selection of the seven textbooks analyzed was based on two criteria: a length of over two hundred pages, which may be assumed to be the minimum length necessary to allow for the inclusion of all content central to the discipline; and the professional qualifications of the authors (a doctoral degree in a relevant field and professorial status at a university).
The selected sources comprise textbooks by Sudardja Adiwikarta (hereafter SA), Ravik Karsidi (RK), Abdullah Idi (AI), Didin Saripudin (DS), Damsar (D), Zainuddin Maliki (ZM), and Mahmud (M). This list includes both commercial (SA, AI, DS, D, M) and university (RK, ZM) publications.

The study was conducted as follows. Following a chapter count, the chapter headings were checked for similarities; headings that appeared in over half (at least four) of the textbooks were considered core topics. Topics unique to a single textbook were not considered. Finally, a content analysis of the core topics was conducted, with a focus on frequently cited authorities. References to scholarly sources were classified according to the nature of the source (book, article, master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, government act, popular source). Sources published in more than one format were counted only once. After establishing the authors’ credentials based on their publication records and professional biographies, as well as on additional information gleaned from textbook covers, university websites, and the Google Scholar and Scopus databases, a comparative analysis was conducted of the core topics, the sources, and the authors’ credentials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Sociology of Education: Sociological Analysis of Education Practice</td>
<td>Remaja Rosdakarya, Bandung</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK</td>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
<td>Universitas Sebelas Maret Press, Surakarta</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZM</td>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
<td>Gadjahmada University Press, Yogyakarta</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Sociological Perspectives in Education</td>
<td>Karya Putra Darwati, Bandung</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>An Introduction to Sociology of Education</td>
<td>Kencana, Jakarta</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
<td>Pustaka Setia, Bandung</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The primary sources.
Scholarly Content

Table 2 shows the visual didactic tools used in the analysis. These tools function both as complementary sources of scholarly content and as pedagogical instruments, and the number and type of tools employed vary from textbook to textbook.

Table 2 suggests that DS employs the largest number of didactic tools, lacking only discussion questions and suggested projects. It is also the only textbook that includes a glossary. M’s is the least complete, featuring only a table and bibliography. The other textbooks fall somewhere in between: only DS, SA, D, and ZM contain an index. As a learning tool, ZM is the most relevant, containing both discussion questions and suggested projects, as well as instructional goals presented at the beginning of each chapter.\(^ {15} \)

A textbook’s content is typically spread over several chapters, whose number may or may not indicate the scope of the discussion of the topics indicated in the chapter headings. The number of chapters ranges from five (ZM) to thirteen (AI); in between are M and D with seven chapters each; SA and DS with nine each; and RK with eleven. This diversity is unusual considering the high level of uniformity typical of sociology textbooks.\(^ {16} \)

The textbooks can be classified into two types according to their content and topic of discussion. Textbooks belonging to the first, “general”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aids</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>RK</th>
<th>ZM</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>DS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charts</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxes</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion questions</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested projects</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(+\text{ yes; } −\text{ no}\)
type (SA, AI, RK, and DS) reflect the content and substance of standard international sociology of education textbooks, as exemplified by American and English textbooks. In terms of scope, these books conform to the minimum international standard for sociology of education textbooks. The second, “specific” type (M, D, and ZM) departs from this mainstream model, reflecting the authors’ attempts to apply a sociological analysis of education to topics they consider essential. For example, four of M’s seven chapters deal with introductory topics, addressing, with varying emphasis, themes relating to the sociological paradigm or approach to education. These topics are indicated by the chapter titles: “The Nature of Sociology of Education”; “The Scientific Paradigm in the Sociology of Education”; “The Sociological Analysis of the Educational System”; and “Science in the Sociological Perspective.”

Whereas M presents only two substantive topics (“The Teacher in Sociological Perspective” and “Sociological Studies of School”) and includes only one chapter on “Social Science Research and the Social History of Islamic Educational Institutions” (a historical presentation of Islamic educational institutions in the Middle East and Southeast Asia), D is more extensive. In addition to two chapters on the meaning and scope of the sociology of education and the sociological approach to education, D includes individual chapters on socialization, the classroom, curriculum, the teacher, and education as capital. As the author himself explains, the unique nature of this textbook derives chiefly from its presentation of the sociology of education as rooted first and foremost in sociology (in contrast to most Indonesian textbooks, which place less emphasis on sociology) and from its recourse to contemporary theories when analyzing such classical topics as socialization, the classroom, curriculum, and the role of the teacher. Another example of a unique approach to content and topic analysis is provided by ZM. Following an introductory presentation of the development of perspectives on the sociology of education, the textbook examines, in three central chapters, education from three sociological perspectives: structural functionalism, structural conflict, and constructionism. This is followed by a presentation of sociological problems in education, multicultural education, and the role of education in social change. The purpose of this approach, as the author explains in his preface, is to elucidate the roots of social scientific theories and then to apply them to an analysis of educational phenomena within a changing society. Unlike most textbooks that discuss the core topics of the sociology of education, ZM contains the author’s original application of sociological theories to educational issues, the result being what the author describes as “a sociology of education text which is actually a sociologist’s writing on education.”

All of the textbooks begin with an introduction that outlines the meaning, scope, and goal of the sociology of education as a discipline.
Some authors explain the position of sociology of education both in the context of sociology as a field of study and in the context of educational studies and teacher training. SA, RK, and M present this discipline as the meeting point between the fields of sociology and educational studies while emphasizing the importance of sociological comprehension for researching educational practice, which has contributed to the prominence of sociology of education within sociology itself.19

All the textbooks except RK and AI include a section or chapter on sociological paradigms or perspectives that have been used as theoretical frameworks to analyze educational practice and systems. Three grand social theories (structural functionalism, conflict, and symbolic interactionism) are employed to frame the theoretical core of the discipline of sociology of education. This approach resembles the standard method adopted in many sociology textbooks insofar as it focuses on the life and work of classical sociologists, such as Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, and Max Weber, and on the relevance of their views to understanding education, as expounded in recent studies in the field of the sociology of education.

Durkheim, who represents structural functionalism, is generally recognized as a founding father of the sociology of education and is one of the most frequently cited classical sociologists in the field. While the bibliographies of four of the seven textbooks list English translations of Durkheim’s works on education, most do not quote Durkheim directly, but rather describe his views via secondary sources such as Jeanne Ballantine’s The Sociology of Education and Philip Robinson’s Indonesian translation of Durkheim. Another commonly cited figure is Talcott Parsons, the author of a seminal study on the function of school in American society.

As in most sociology textbooks, discussions of conflict theory in the Indonesian textbooks consistently credit Karl Marx. The authors agree that although Marx did not contribute directly to the development of the sociology of education, his thought (in particular, the theoretical framework of his approach to education and society) significantly influenced later conflict analysis of education. Several of the authors (SA, DS, and M) explain Sam Bowless and Herb Gintis’s reputation as neo-Marxists based on their argument that schools play a major role in the social reproduction of class structure and on Louis Althusser’s structuralist Marxist arguments that education is an integral part of an ideological state apparatus designed to reproduce capitalism (the economic system) and hegemony (as political leadership) over time.

Most of the textbooks claim that Weber, like Marx, contributed only indirectly to the sociological analysis of education. While some of the authors (SA, DS, and M) approach Weber from the perspective of structural conflict and while others (ZM and AI) categorize him as engaging
the topic at the micro-level of analysis, they all agree that Weber’s contribution to the development of the sociology of education, which they generally consider to have been less than that of Durkheim, focused on the rationalist tendency within modern society and the concept of bureaucracy, which has influenced school systems all over the world. Closely related to this tradition is symbolic interactionism, which the authors usually associate with its founding figures Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead, whose micro-sociological analyses of various aspects of education (such as socialization in family, school, and society; and social and educative interaction in the classroom) they consider particularly influential. SA is unique in discussing the critical sociology of education (an influential sociological tradition sometimes referred to as belonging to the Frankfurt School, which originated in Germany in the 1920s and “strikingly influenced the development of educational systems and policies around the world”) and its two main representatives, Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich, whose works have been widely discussed in Indonesia.

Less space is accorded to prominent contemporary sociologists of education such as Basil Bernstein and Pierre Bourdieu, whom AI and RK do not even mention. SA mentions Bernstein once without any description, while D and ZM limit their discussion to Bourdieu (emphasizing his account of education as cultural capital and social reproduction). Only in M and DS are both figures discussed; DS categorizes Bernstein as a neo-functionalist sociologist. Although Bernstein did follow the Durkheimian tradition in some of his works, the authors tend to describe him as a structuralist sociologist of cultural transmission who attempted to bridge the gap between macro-level and micro-level analysis. Bourdieu is cited for his attempts to resolve the old action–structure dualism in the social sciences via his concept of habitus and his theory of practice.

While some of the textbooks complement their descriptions of each sociological theory with an evaluation of that theory’s strengths and weaknesses, most fail to provide a proper application even of classical sociological theories (not to mention contemporary approaches such as postmodernism, feminism, and critical race theory) to core sociology of education topics and fail to discuss the application to these topics of the macro-, meso- and micro-levels of sociological analysis.

As Table 3 shows, the core content of the textbooks reveals no real common denominator: no one chapter is included in all the textbooks. The textbooks reflect a diversity of views regarding what should constitute the core topics of the sociology of education. In other words, the authors do not share a common view of the discipline, a fact which contradicts the traditional interpretation of the role of the textbook as a medium that should reproduce “the dominant ideas of a disciplinary field.” Even the most common topic, “school,” which appears in five
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Yet, despite this apparent diversity, the substance of the texts is actually similar: a majority of the textbooks (DS, SA, RK, and M) approach the classroom and school as social systems, either placing them in relation to the surrounding community (DS) or linking them to a historical overview of the Indonesian school system and a discussion of formal education in Indonesia (SA). Likewise, all the authors adopt a structural-functionalist perspective on the school system, integrating multiple elements such as students, teachers, headmasters, and administrative staff. In examinations of the school as a formal organization (as opposed to the family as an informal educational milieu), this functionalist perspective is combined with an organizational analysis rooted in Weber’s conception of bureaucracy.

Weber is the only authority to appear in all five of the textbooks that discuss school and is thus the most frequently cited source on the subject. The functionalists Durkheim and Parsons are each referred to by three authors, and are cited, respectively, in the context of the division

Table 3. Chapter headings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“School”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Education and Society”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Teacher”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Socialization”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Education and Social Mobility”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Education and Social Change”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Education and Social Stratification”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Education and the Economy”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Education and Social Institutions”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ yes; − no
of labor (Durkheim) and the functions of the school in society (Parsons). Auguste Comte, Charles Bidwell, and Brian Davies are cited by two authors. Like Weber, Comte is referred to in the context of his law of the three (theological, metaphysical, and positive) stages of society, in which school is a manifestation of the positive stage of scientific explanation based on observation, experiment, and comparison. Bidwell and Davies, by contrast, are cited as examples of the theory of the school as a formal organization. These sociologists are all referred to via secondary sources, including Robinson’s Indonesian translations of their works. In sum, despite differences in chapter titles and emphasis, the authors share a similar theoretical perspective on the school, which may therefore be regarded as the topic that most clearly represents what is considered to be core knowledge in the domain of the sociology of education.

No such consensus exists regarding other topics. Chapters on “Education and Society” and “The Teacher” appear in four textbooks; chapters on “Socialization,” “Education and Social Mobility,” and “Education and Social Change” appear in three books; and chapters on “Education and Social Stratification,” “Education and the Economy,” and “Education and Social Institution” in two books. This diversity indicates a lack of consensus on the part of the authors as to what constitutes the core material of the discipline.

This lack of consensus emerges particularly clearly from a comparison of the authors’ presentations of the topic of education and society. Whereas AI emphasizes the contribution of education to the development of human resources and various other functions of education in society, RK focuses on the individual’s learning cycle, the functions of school, and the relationship of education to social change; DS, by contrast, focuses on a discussion of social groups, social interaction, the various functions of education, and the relationship between education and social milieu. SA presents the topic in yet another form in a unit on “Education, Society, and Culture” that is divided into three chapters: “Education and Social Institutions,” “Individual, Society, and Education,” and “Culture and Education.” Although the second of these discusses three sociological topics (the status and role of the individual in society, social stratification, and social change) in relation to education, its brief treatment of these essential topics fails to meet minimal sociology of education textbook standards.

The lack of consensus extends to the treatment of primary sources as well: the authors differ in their choice of which authorities to cite in their respective sections on education and society. The only authority to be referenced by more than two authors is the German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies, whose categorization of society into Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft is cited by three authors (SA, AI, and DS). The following most cited sociologists are Weber and Robert Merton (two authors: SA and
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DS); Weber is cited with reference to the concepts of social status and formal and informal groups, while Merton is cited in connection with his explanation of function (latent and manifest functions, function and dysfunction) and its relation to education. No prominent sociologist, let alone sociologist of education, is satisfactorily referenced regarding the relationship between education and society. The presentation of this topic thus suffers from a lack of relevant primary source references to support the ideas and arguments presented in the text.

The chapter titles on the topic of the teacher also differ considerably: “Teaching Professionalism and Globalization” (AI); “The Role of the Teacher in School and Society” (RK); “The Teacher in Sociological Perspectives” (M); and “The Teacher” (D). While AI focuses on the importance of teaching professionalism and various challenges posed by globalization, RK emphasizes the professional status of the teacher and the roles that the teacher is expected to play in relation to students, fellow teachers, and society.

D and M likewise address the issue of the teaching profession and the varying roles of the teacher, in addition to the issue of teacher certification. While all authors except RK refer to the Indonesian Teacher and Lecturer Act to support their presentations of the teaching profession and related issues, none of them cite contemporary research evidence, sociological or otherwise, on the teaching profession and the teacher’s role in Indonesia (or elsewhere). This shortcoming, itself the result of insufficient sociological analysis, suggests a lack of appreciation for the subject of the teacher and a belief that it is not equal in importance to other core subjects in the domain.

In addition, the above discussions of the role of the teacher contain exceedingly few references to theoretical approaches from the field of sociology or the sociology of education. No one sociological view is cited by more than one author, and only two authors (M and D) cite prominent sociologists in their discussions of the teacher (Weber and Merton, respectively). The textbooks thus fail to present a proper sociological study of the teacher, whether regarding the teacher’s position and role in school and society or regarding the teaching profession itself.

Following John Hewitt’s argument that “textbooks ought to strive to make intellectual contributions,” Indonesian textbook authors have attempted to shape the discipline of sociology of education in Indonesia with personal intellectual contributions via the inclusion of topics of personal interest to them. Thus, RK discusses the topic of social participation in education; AI that of the national exam; DS the resocialization of street children; ZM multicultural education; and M the social history of Islamic educational institutions. This tendency has resulted in diversification but also fragmentation, as the various intellectual contributions appear in a random fashion and are isolated from each other.
In sum, only three core topics (school; education and society; the teacher) appear in four or more of the textbooks. Other topics generally considered essential appear in less than half of them. As a result of this low level of commonality with regard to core topics, these textbooks do not live up to the ideal model of the textbook as a coherently, scientifically founded reflection of the discipline, and depart from the accepted model of sociology textbooks as characterized by “uniformity, but with some small variation.” While the frequent citation of classical sociologists may reflect the degree of the latter’s influence on the textbook authors, it may also indicate the authors’ failure to keep pace with contemporary scholarship.

Scholarly Sources

The amount of source material referenced by the authors can be said to be satisfactory: five of them cite over one hundred sources, while SA and RK provide fifty-nine and seventy-eight references, respectively. The highest number of sources is cited by M (167), followed by DS (147), D (122), ZM (112), and AI (106). Sources include books, chapters, articles, government acts, and newspapers.

Nearly all the authors rely on books as their main source material. Textbook bibliographies include titles from various fields of study (although some of these are irrelevant to the sociology of education). The highest book to total reference ratio (in percentage) belongs to D with 90.98 percent (111 books), who is followed by M with 88.62 percent (148 books); RK with 82.05 percent (64 books); SA with 79.60 percent (47 books); ZM with 76.78 percent (86 books); AI with 74.22 percent (79 books); and DS with 71.42 percent (105 books). All in all, books constitute more than 70 percent of the textbooks’ sources.

Despite their heavy reliance on books as source material, only five textbooks cite English-language sociology of education textbooks. The highest number of English-language sources is to be found in SA with twelve (25.53 percent of total references) followed by DS with 10 (6.89 percent). The figures for the other authors are much lower: ZM, AI, and M cite four, two, and one English-language source, respectively. The two remaining authors appear to have relied on the Indonesian translation of Robinson’s book Perspectives on the Sociology of Education, which they cite but do not include in their respective bibliographies.

Among the English-language textbooks, the most cited are Ballantyne’s The Sociology of Education (on the US educational system) and Olive Bank’s The Sociology of Education (on the British educational system), which are referenced in three textbooks (SA, DS, and ZM). While these sources can be assumed to have influenced the content and style of Indo-
nesian textbooks, the lack of non-Indonesian textbook references has resulted in an extreme diversification of the textbooks’ core content.

Citations from scientific journals are surprisingly scarce. While five textbooks contain at least one reference to a scholarly article (not counting AI’s reference to one of his own articles, which was published in an Indonesian journal), only three textbooks cite more than two. The highest number of article citations (10) occurs in DS; these include studies from the American Sociological Review, Sociology of Education, British Journal of Sociology of Education, Harvard Educational Review, Sociological Focus, Urban Education, Educare, and the Indonesian Jurnal Administrasi Negara (Journal of State Administration). RK is next with four articles (from World Development, Public Administration Review, Prisma, and Jurnal Warta of Surakarta Muhammadiyah University), followed by M with three (from the British Journal of Sociology, British Journal of Educational Studies, and Administrative Science Quarterly). Finally, D and ZM cite two articles each from the American Sociological Review (D) and from Educational Studies and Multicultural Education (ZM). This scarcity of article citations (all the more lamentable given that a large number of high-quality studies have been published in peer-reviewed journals) suggests that the authors have not kept pace with current scholarship, with the result being that the material in Indonesian textbooks lacks sufficient foundation in academic research. As Caroline H. Persell reminds us, the ideal textbook should “distill knowledge and theories that are held widely in a discipline” and contain views that “have been subjected to peer review and approval” based on publications in peer-reviewed journals or other scientific, peer-reviewed forums.

The situation is similar with respect to master’s theses and doctoral dissertations. Although many potentially relevant theses and dissertations are available in Indonesian (and of course in English), they tend to be neglected. Only four textbooks cite at least two theses or dissertations: M cites three dissertations; DS cites two dissertations and one thesis; and D cites two dissertations, while RK and AI cite one dissertation and one thesis, respectively. This neglect of theses as textbook sources may indicate a lack of empirical research on the part of the authors.

Six textbooks include governmental acts or regulations among their sources. The largest number of such citations occurs in SA, which references five Indonesian governmental acts and one governmental regulation: the Constitution of 1945; the National Education System Act of 2003; the Teacher and Lecturer Act of 2005; the Higher Education Act of 2012; the Non-Formal Education Act of 1991; and the Early Childhood Education Regulation of 2009. The high number of legal citations reflects the author’s focus on the social and practical dimensions of education, including government educational policy.

The remaining textbooks fall far behind in this regard: M, D, RK, and AI cite three acts each, while DS cites just two. In addition to quoting
them in the main text, AI, uniquely, provides excerpts from two governmental sources as appendices (the National Education System Act and the National Education Standard Regulation of 2005).

Nonscientific publications fare no better: popular sources such as newspapers and magazines, which often contain important information on national and local educational issues and practices, are rarely cited. The main exception is AI, who cites four national daily newspapers (Kompas, Republika, Media Indonesia, and Sumatera Express); by contrast, RK and DS cite just one (Kompas). Only three authors (AI, DS, and SA) cite online sources, an unfortunate lack, considering the wealth of information on educational issues and policies available on the internet.

In sum, while all seven textbooks draw on a variety of sources, they rely most heavily on books, which constitute over 70 percent of the source material. These include both Indonesian and English-language texts (the latter mostly cited by SA); the next most common source is the journal article (most frequently referenced by DS).

Scholarly Record

Table 4 shows the textbook authors’ educational backgrounds and academic credentials. While only D holds an undergraduate degree in sociology (as opposed to educational studies or teacher training or, in ZM’s case, Islamic theology and philosophy), all of them hold master’s and/or doctoral degrees in sociology or social science.

All of the authors hold professorships in relevant disciplines: RK and DS in sociology of education; D and AI in sociology; M in Islamic education; ZM in political and social science; and SA in education. In addition to their scholarly achievements, nearly all the authors have also filled senior university leadership positions. RK, M, and ZM currently serve as rectors at their respective universities; D has served as a social and political sciences faculty dean; AI has served as a postgraduate program director; and DS has served as a quality assurance unit director.

The authors have all published extensively. Of the seven, M is the most prolific, having authored fourteen books, followed by D with ten books, AI and ZM with nine each, RK with four, DS with three, and SA with one. Almost all of M’s books deal with education. In addition to his sociology of education textbook, he has written an anthropology of education textbook (2010) as well as books on educational research methods, educational psychology, Islamic educational thought, the social history of Islamic educational institutions, civilization, and education, and Muhamadiyah and educational dualism. D has published five books in various subdomains of sociology, including economic, political, rural, and urban sociology. AI has authored and coauthored books on curriculum develop-
opment, educational philosophy, educational ethics, the revitalization of Islamic education, and the reconstruction and modernization of Islamic educational institutions, as well as on topics relating to his dissertation in sociology, such as the social history of Bangkanese Malay and Chinese.

ZM’s books generally address topics in the domains of sociology of religion (such as priyayi religion) and political sociology (bureaucracy, the military, political parties, and studies of individual politicians). He is also the author of a political sociology textbook and the book *The Reconstruction of Modern Social Theory*. RK’s four books include the published edition of his doctoral dissertation on job transformation and three books on social empowerment and training management. The last of these, *Education Development Strategies in Indonesia: Points of Thoughts* (2015), deals with sociology of education policy and presents the author’s approach to education as a scholar and university rector. Of the seven authors, DS can claim the strongest credentials in the field of sociology of education: he is the author of a three-volume middle school social sciences textbook (2007) and has coauthored a three-volume secondary school history textbook (2000) as well as a scholarly book, *Society and Education: A Sociological Perspective* (2008).

---

### Table 4. Authors’ academic backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Bachelor’s</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Geography, Institute for Teacher Training and Education, Bandung</td>
<td>Sociology, Wayne State University</td>
<td>Sociology, Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>History Education, Institute for Teacher Training and Education, Bandung</td>
<td>Sociology, Padjadjaran University, Bandung</td>
<td>Sociology, National University of Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Islamic Education, State Institute for Islamic Studies, Palembang</td>
<td>Education, University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Sociology, Gadjahmada University, Yogyakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sociology, Andalas University, Padang</td>
<td>Sociology, University of Indonesia, Jakarta</td>
<td>Sociology, University of Bielefeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZM</td>
<td>Theology/Philosophy, State Institute for Islamic Studies, Surabaya</td>
<td>Social Science, Airlangga University, Surabaya</td>
<td>Social Science, Airlangga University, Surabaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK</td>
<td>Educational Studies, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta</td>
<td>Rural Sociology, Bogor Agriculture University, Bogor</td>
<td>Development Counseling, Bogor Agriculture University, Bogor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Islamic Education, State Institute for Islamic Studies, Bandung</td>
<td>Social Science, Padjadjaran University, Bandung</td>
<td>Social Science, Padjadjaran University, Bandung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the authors have also written or cowritten book chapters. D’s contributions address a variety of topics including Minangkabau society and culture, the implementation of good governance, traditional indigenous or *adat* land rights and social capital, and aspects of economic sociology. RK is a coauthor of a chapter about higher education reform in Indonesia (2012). SA’s contributions include a chapter on curriculum orientation.

In terms of their contributions to peer-reviewed journals, the authors differ considerably. Only two (DS and RK) have published in international journals. In this respect as well, DS has the strongest credentials, having coauthored eight articles published in prominent journals including the *New Educational Review* and the *American Journal of Applied Sciences*. These articles, published between 2015 and 2018, address topics closely related to the sociology of education or to educational studies. RK has coauthored four articles on community development and empowerment, which were published in Scopus-indexed journals between 2015 and 2017. The other authors have all contributed to nationally accredited Indonesian journals. SA published a study of the effects of irrigation on farm families in the Indonesian journal *Prisma* in 1984, while ZM, AI, and M have all published on their respective research interests in other nationally accredited journals, none of which, however, fall within the domain of the sociology of education.

In sum, the authors’ scholarly records indicate that, while they do hold credentials in sociology or social sciences, most of them (with the exception of DS) are not specialists in the field of the sociology of education. Likewise, while all have published academic books, DS can claim the largest number of articles relevant to the field published in internationally respected journals. It might be noted that the frequency of journal article citations in a given textbook generally reflects its author’s publication record. In other words, the more articles an author has published, the more articles he references in his textbook.

**Conclusion**

In this article, I have suggested that Indonesian sociology of education textbooks, in contrast to their American and European counterparts and to sociology textbooks in general, reflect extremely diverse views about the nature of the core content of the discipline. This contradicts the assumption that textbooks, as reflections of the discipline based on common, authoritative bodies of knowledge, should ideally demonstrate a high level of commonality in their core content. The lack of commonality in the examined sources suggests that Indonesian sociology of education textbooks fall short of this ideal.
Echoing Nicholas Babchuk and Bruce Keith’s findings on sociology textbooks, this article has shown that the textbooks in question, although based on a large variety of sources, draw most heavily on books as their main source of information. By contrast, the use of monographs or master’s theses and doctoral dissertations is marginal, a fact which may help explain the low level of commonality in the textbooks’ core content.

The authors’ overwhelming reliance on books reflects the nature of their own scholarly publication records, in which books predominate. Again, echoing Babchuk and Keith, who claim that authors with scholarly records tend to base their presentations on academic books, the present study reveals a direct link between the type of source most cited by a given author and the type of publication that author has most frequently produced—in this case, academic books. The infrequent use of journal articles as sources likewise corresponds to the relatively small number of articles published by the authors. In other words, the study suggests a direct link between a textbook’s scholarly content and sources and its author’s scholarly publication record: content depends largely on sources, which in turn vary according to the author’s pattern of publication.

These results challenge Bruce Keith and Morgen Ender’s suggestion that the lack of commonality regarding sociological concepts is a result of “the multiple perspectives of varied authors” reflecting “multiple communities within a single discipline.” Although it is certainly true that multiple perspectives exist within the discipline of the sociology of education, and that Indonesian society, with its six official religions (Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism) and hundreds of ethnic groups and languages, is a culturally diverse society, the textbooks examined present neither multiple theoretical perspectives or sociological approaches, nor emergent educational issues related to individual ethnicities, religious groups, or local communities. The lack of commonality must therefore be ascribed to other reasons, including the authors’ previous scholarly focus on topics beyond the scope of the sociology of education, and their reliance on books that fall outside the domain.

The present article suggests that, by integrating the above-mentioned multiple theoretical perspectives into a discussion of educational issues that takes into account the diversity of Indonesian society and the educational decentralization policy of the Indonesian government, it may be possible to formulate a coherent body of knowledge reflecting the field of the sociology of education in Indonesia.
Zulkifli is a professor of sociocultural anthropology, former dean of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, and vice rector for academic affairs at Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University in Jakarta.

Notes


4. The IKIP (Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan or Institute for Teacher Training and Education) was established in several Indonesian cities; these institutes were later transformed into universities.


15. While visual and instructional tools are necessary complements to textbooks and thus help students and lecturers to understand the text, they do not necessarily reflect the scope and nature of the textbook’s content.


26. A study by Nicholas Babchuk and Bruce Keith from 1995 showed that journal article citations tend to make up at least 10 percent of the total references in sociology textbooks. Babchuk and Keith, “Introducing the Discipline,” 218.


28. *Priyayi* refers to the Javanese nobility or official administrative class.

29. The Minangkabau are the dominant ethnic group in West Sumatra.

30. *Adat* refers to indigenous tradition or customary law.


33. Ibid.
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