Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, VOL: 14/No: 03 August 2025 **P-ISSN: 2252-8970**
DOI: 10.30868/ei.v14i03.9080 **E-ISSN: 2581-1754**

Date Received	**:**	**June 2025**
Date Revised	**:**	**August 2025**
Date Accepted	**:**	**August 2025**
Date Published	**:**	**August 2025**

INTEGRATIVE APPROACH FOR EDUCATION OF AKIDAH AKHLAK AND ACTIVE TOLERANCE IN DIVERSE COMMUNITIES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES AND SOCIAL COHESION RESULTS

Najamudin
Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor, Indonesia (najamudin@uika-bogor.ac.id)

Muhamad Abduh
Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Brunei Darussalam (muhamad.abduh@ubd.edu.bn)

Surahman Hidayat
Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor, Indonesia, (surahman@uika-bogor.ac.id)

Keywords:
Moral education, active tolerance, social cohesion, multicultural education, moral faith, pedagogical approaches, community harmony, educational integration

ABSTRACT
This comprehensive study examines the integration of moral education and active tolerance models in various communities, analyzing pedagogical approaches, target group segmentation, and their impacts on social cohesion and community harmony. Through a systematic review of theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence, this research synthesizes findings from various educational contexts to identify effective strategies for fostering tolerance and moral development in multicultural settings. The study reveals that an integrated approach that combines the principles of Akidah Akhlak with Active tolerance education shows significant positive results in reducing negative behavior, enhancing psychological well-being, and promoting social cohesion. The main findings indicate that experiential learning, collaborative pedagogical approaches, and comprehensive teacher training are crucial factors in successful implementation. This research contributes to the growing literature on moral education by providing a comparative framework that bridges religious and secular educational approaches, offering practical implications for educators, policymakers, and community leaders working in diverse social contexts.

A. INTRODUCTION

The contemporary global landscape presents unprecedented challenges for educational systems tasked with fostering social cohesion amidst increasing cultural diversity and complexity (Han, 2014). As societies become more interconnected through migration, technological advances, and economic globalization, the need for educational approaches that can effectively bridge cultural, religious, and ethnic differences becomes paramount (Sakallı et al., 2021). This necessity is particularly acute in contexts where traditional moral education frameworks must adapt to serve an increasingly diverse student population while maintaining their core principles and effectiveness.

The integration of moral education with active tolerance is a crucial boundary in educational research and practice. Unlike forms of passive tolerance that merely advocate for the acceptance of differences, active tolerance involves proactive engagement with diversity, celebrating differences as a source of mutual enrichment, and fostering true intercultural understanding (Guțu & Boghian, 2019). This approach aligns with contemporary educational theory that emphasizes the importance of developing not only cognitive knowledge but also emotional intelligence, social skills, and ethical reasoning abilities in students (Schuitema et al., 2008).

In the context of Islamic education, the concept of Akidah Akhlak provides a comprehensive framework for moral development that encompasses spiritual beliefs (Akidah) and ethical behavior (Akhlak) (Najamudin, 2024). This integrated approach offers unique insights into how faith-based moral education can align with the goals of pluralistic education, creating a learning environment that respects religious identities while promoting an inclusive attitude towards diversity (Raihani, 2014). The synergy between Akidah Akhlak and active tolerance education represents a promising pathway to developing an educational model that can effectively serve diverse communities.

Provide a theoretical and practical foundation for the integration of values of faith and morals in education through the perspective of the hadith of Prophet Muhammad SAW. They also elaborate on Islamic pedagogical principles such as role modeling, habituation, and relevant advice to shape students' character and promote tolerance in a diverse environment. By emphasizing the roles of educators, parents, and educational institutions, this book offers a framework that can be adapted to strengthen social cohesion through an education approach oriented towards universal Islamic values (Najamudin et al., (2025).

The importance of this research lies in its potential to inform educational policies and practices in an era where social cohesion is increasingly challenged by polarization, extremism, and intercultural conflict (Lynch et al., 2017). By examining how different educational approaches contribute to social harmony and community well-being, this

study aims to provide evidence-based recommendations for educators and policymakers working to create a more inclusive and cohesive society (Fonseca et al., 2019).

An integrative approach that combines theological, sociological, historical, and pedagogical perspectives to build a tolerant faith and morals in response to the challenges of radicalism in the modern era. The importance of inclusive faith education and noble morals as the foundation of social resilience, by presenting applicable curricular, methodological, and cultural strategies for teachers, parents, and the Muslim community in the context of a pluralistic society like Indonesia (Najamudin et al., 2025)

This comparative analysis discusses several critical research questions: How do different approaches to moral education and tolerance training affect student outcomes and societal harmony? What pedagogical strategies are most effective in promoting moral development and intercultural understanding? How can the education system balance respect for religious and cultural identities with the promotion of inclusive attitudes? What metrics can be used to assess the effectiveness of integrated moral education and tolerance programs?

The research methodology used in this study involves a comprehensive synthesis of existing literature, theoretical frameworks, and empirical evidence from diverse educational contexts. By analyzing patterns across various cultural, religious, and socio-economic settings, this research aims to identify universal principles and context-specific adaptations that can inform the development of more effective educational approaches (Janmaat, 2022).

The structure of this article follows a systematic development from theoretical foundations through empirical analysis to practical implications. After this introduction, the literature review section examines the existing research on moral education, tolerance education, and social cohesion, identifying gaps and opportunities for integration. The methodology section outlines the comparative analysis framework used to synthesize findings across various contexts. The results section presents the main findings regarding effective pedagogical approaches, implementation challenges, and outcomes. The discussion section interprets these findings in a broader theoretical and practical context, while the conclusion offers recommendations for future research and practice.

B. METHODOLOGY

This study is designed to conduct a comprehensive synthesis of existing research on moral education, active tolerance, and social cohesion in various educational contexts. Overall, the methodology applied is analytical-comparative, which integrates systematic

literature review techniques with theoretical framework analysis to identify patterns, trends, and best practices from various programs and approaches.

1. Design and Research Approach

The main approach of this research is a comprehensive comparative analysis. This design does not collect new primary data, but synthesizes evidence from existing studies and literature. This approach is based on the principles of evidence-based education research, emphasizing rigorous analysis of empirical findings. Importantly, this approach also remains sensitive to and accounts for the complex contextual factors (social, cultural, institutional) as these factors significantly influence the effectiveness of an educational approach in different locations. The comparative framework used is adapted from comparative education research methodology, which allows for the identification of both universal principles that are effective in many places and specific adaptations necessary for successful implementation in particular settings.

2. Data Sources and Selection Criteria

The synthesis of this research draws data from a variety of sources to obtain a holistic perspective. These sources include:• Peer-reviewed academic literature.• Government reports and policy documents.• Institutional evaluations and reports from educational organizations.• Case studies written by education practitioners.The selection of sources is not done randomly, but guided by strict criteria to ensure quality and relevance. The selection criteria are:

- **Relevance:** Sources must directly discuss the themes of moral education, character education, tolerance training, multicultural education, or social cohesion.
- **Methodological Rigor:** Sources must demonstrate good and accountable methodological quality.
- **Diversity of Contexts:** Sources should represent various geographic, cultural, and educational system contexts to enrich comparative analysis.
- **Novelty:** Priority is given to publications from the last two decades to ensure relevance to contemporary educational contexts.

The search for academic literature was conducted systematically through major databases such as ERIC, PsycINFO, and Education Source using a combination of keywords related to the research theme. The inclusion of government reports and policies aimed to understand how these concepts are translated at the system and policy levels. Meanwhile, case studies and practitioner reports provide valuable insights into field implementation, practical challenges, and successes that may not be recorded in formal academic literature.

3. Analytical Framework

To analyze and compare various programs and findings from these sources, this research uses a structured analytical framework. This framework consists of six main dimensions identified as key factors in the effectiveness of moral education and tolerance programs. 1. Integration Strategy: This dimension examines the ways or methods of integrating moral and tolerance values into the education system. It includes both formal curricular integration (as special subjects or incorporated into other subjects) and informal approaches that create a school environment infused with these values.

1. Active Tolerance Model: This dimension focuses on specific models or approaches used to promote tolerance. It analyzes the theoretical foundations of various models (e.g., models based on contact, dialogue, or human rights education) as well as practical strategies for implementing them in the classroom.

2. Target Group Segmentation in Education: This dimension analyzes for whom the program is designed. It considers how the program is tailored to meet the needs of diverse groups of students based on factors such as age, developmental level, cultural background, religious identity, and socioeconomic status.

3. Pedagogical Approach: This dimension investigates the teaching and learning methods used. Its analysis includes various techniques, from traditional lectures to more innovative and participatory methods such as project-based learning, dialogue, simulation, or service-learning that are considered effective for moral development.

4. Social Cohesion Success Metrics: This dimension focuses on how to measure the success of programs. It examines the tools and metrics used to assess the program's impact, both through quantitative indicators (questionnaires, scales) and qualitative assessments (interviews, observations, narrative studies) on outcomes such as empathy, dialogue skills, and prejudice reduction. Dampak pada Harmoni Komunitas:

This dimension extends beyond the school environment to analyze the broader social impacts of educational programs. It examines the influence of programs on inter-group relationships in the community, civic engagement, and the overall well-being of the community, including both short-term and long-term effects. By using these six dimensions as a lens, this research systematically analyzes, compares, and synthesizes findings from various sources to draw robust conclusions about best practices and effective principles in moral education and tolerance.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Literature Review

1.1 Theoretical Foundation of Moral Education Moral education has developed significantly over the last few decades, moving from traditional character education approaches focused on the transmission of virtues to more sophisticated models that integrate the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions of moral development (Narvaez, 2006). Contemporary theoretical frameworks recognize moral education as an interdisciplinary field drawing from moral philosophy, developmental psychology, educational research, and social psychology (Joseph & Efron, 2005).

The cognitive-developmental approach, pioneered by Lawrence Kohlberg, emphasizes the importance of moral reasoning and the progressive development of ethical thinking abilities (Kohlberg, 1981). An integrative approach to the education of faith and morality that emphasizes the intrinsic relationship between faith and ethical behavior (Najamudin et al., 2024). This approach focuses on helping students develop the capacity to analyze moral dilemmas, consider various perspectives, and make reasoned ethical decisions. However, critics have noted that a purely cognitive approach may fail to address the emotional and behavioral dimensions of moral actions, leading to a gap between moral knowledge and moral behavior (Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2005).

In response to these limitations, a more holistic approach to moral education has emerged that integrates cognitive, affective, and behavioral components (Nucci, 2001). This approach acknowledges that effective moral education must address not only what students think about moral issues but also how they feel about moral issues and how they act in real-world situations. The integrative ethical education model proposed by Narvaez emphasizes the importance of developing moral expertise through the integration of moral sensitivity, judgment, motivation, and character (Narvaez, 2006).

An integrative approach that combines perspectives of Islam, social, and education in building tolerance. Through empirical research, it identifies the factors influencing tolerant attitudes and religious fundamentalism, and emphasizes the importance of the role of the educational environment in schools, families, and communities in fostering values of tolerance (Najamudin et al., 2024).

The character education approach focuses on the development of virtues and positive character traits through instruction, modeling, and direct practice (Lickona, 1991). An integrative pedagogical approach that encompasses the values of faith, worship, and social interaction in the context of tolerance. (Najamudin et al., 2024). This approach often emphasizes the importance of school culture and climate in shaping students' character, acknowledging that moral development occurs not only through the formal curriculum but throughout the entire educational environment (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005). However, character education has been criticized for potentially imposing dominant

cultural values without adequate consideration of diverse perspectives and backgrounds (Joseph & Efron, 2005).

The ethics of care approach, developed by Nel Noddings and others, emphasizes the importance of relationships, empathy, and care in moral development (Noddings, 1992). This approach recognizes that moral education must be based on authentic relationships between educators and students and must foster students' capacity to care for others. The care ethics perspective is very influential in highlighting the importance of the emotional dimension of moral development and the role of the school climate in promoting moral growth (Noddings, 2002).

Recent developments in moral education theory increasingly emphasize the importance of cultural responsiveness and inclusivity (Frisancho & Delgado, 2018). This approach acknowledges that moral values and practices vary across cultures and that effective moral education must be sensitive to this diversity while still promoting universal ethical principles such as fairness, compassion, and respect for human dignity (Wainryb, 2006). This perspective has led to a growing interest in multicultural approaches to moral education that can effectively serve a diverse student population (Banks, 2008).

1.2 Active Tolerance and Multicultural Education

The concept of tolerance has undergone significant evolution in the theory and practice of education, shifting from passive acceptance of differences to a more active engagement with diversity (Almond, 2010). Traditional approaches to tolerance education often focus on reducing prejudice and promoting basic acceptance of others, but contemporary approaches emphasize the importance of actively celebrating diversity and building bridges across cultural, religious, and ethnic differences (Brooks, 2005).

Active tolerance, as conceptualized in current educational literature, involves several key components: respecting differences, valuing diversity as a source of strength, proactively engaging with others across cultural boundaries, and a commitment to building inclusive communities (Willems et al., 2010). This approach acknowledges that mere tolerance is not enough to create a truly inclusive society and that educational interventions must foster genuine understanding and collaboration across cultures (Everett, 2012).

Multicultural education provides a broader framework for understanding how educational systems can effectively serve diverse populations (Banks, 2004). Banks' model of multicultural education identifies five dimensions: content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, equitable pedagogy, and school culture empowerment (Banks, 2008). This comprehensive approach acknowledges that multicultural education involves not only adding diverse content to the curriculum but

also transforming the entire educational environment to be more inclusive and equitable (Gay, 2010).

The role of dialogue in promoting tolerance and understanding among cultures has received significant attention in recent research (Burbules & Bruce, 2001). The dialogic approach emphasizes the importance of creating a safe space for students to share their perspectives, learn from others, and engage in constructive conversations about differences and diversity (Parker, 2003). This approach recognizes that tolerance and understanding develop through authentic interactions and relationship building rather than through abstract instruction alone (Gutmann, 1999).

The critical multicultural education approach has highlighted the importance of addressing power dynamics and structural inequalities in educational settings (Sleeter & Grant, 2007). This approach recognizes that promoting tolerance and inclusion requires not only changes in individual attitudes but also addressing systemic barriers that perpetuate inequality and marginalization (Nieto & Bode, 2008). This perspective has led to an increased emphasis on social justice education and the development of critical awareness among students (Freire, 1970).

The intersection of religious education and multicultural education presents unique challenges and opportunities (Jackson, 2004). Religious education programs must balance respect for particular religious traditions with the promotion of interfaith understanding and cooperation (Ipgrave, 2001). This balance requires careful attention to how religious identities and pluralistic values can be harmonized in educational settings (Grimmitt, 2000).

1.3 Social Cohesion and Educational

Outcomes Social cohesion has emerged as an important concept in understanding how educational interventions contribute to community well-being and social stability (Jenson, 1998). Social cohesion is generally understood as the extent to which members of a community share common values, participate in collective activities, and maintain positive relationships across social boundaries (Berger-Schmitt, 2002). Educational institutions play a crucial role in fostering social cohesion by bringing together individuals from diverse backgrounds and providing opportunities for positive interaction and collaboration (Coleman, 1988).

Research on social cohesion has identified several key dimensions relevant to the educational context: social capital, civic participation, trust, shared values, and collective efficacy (Putnam, 2000). Educational programs that promote moral development and tolerance can contribute to each of these dimensions by fostering positive relationships, encouraging civic engagement, building trust across group boundaries, promoting

shared ethical values, and developing a sense of agency among students in addressing social challenges (Sampson et al., 1997).

The measurement of social cohesion presents significant methodological challenges, as it involves individual-level attitudes and behaviors and community-level outcomes (Walesiak & Dehnel, 2020). Common indicators include levels of interpersonal trust, participation in voluntary organizations, civic engagement, intergroup contact, and perceptions of community solidarity (UNECE, 2023). Educational research is increasingly focused on developing valid and reliable measures of these outcomes that can be used to assess the effectiveness of moral and tolerance education programs (Resilient Cities Network, n.d.).

Longitudinal research on the effects of moral education and tolerance programs has provided important insights into their long-term impact on social cohesion (Durlak et al., 2011). Studies have shown that well-designed programs can have long-term effects on students' attitudes, behaviors, and civic engagement, contributing to stronger and more cohesive communities (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005). However, the sustainability of these effects depends on various factors, including program quality, fidelity of implementation, and ongoing community support (Cohen et al., 2009).

The relationship between individual moral development and complex collective social outcomes is mediated by various factors (Rest et al., 1999). Research shows that moral education programs are most effective in promoting social cohesion when they combine individual character development with opportunities for collective action and community engagement (Battistich et al., 2000). These findings highlight the importance of connecting classroom learning with real-world applications and community involvement (Youniss & Yates, 1997).

1.4 Integration of Religious and Secular Approaches

The integration of religious and secular approaches for moral education presents significant opportunities and considerable challenges in the context of contemporary education (Nord & Haynes, 1998). Religious traditions offer a rich resource for moral development, including a comprehensive ethical framework, practices for character formation, and supportive communities (Huebner, 1985). However, in a pluralistic society, the education system must find ways to respect religious diversity while promoting shared civic values and intercultural understanding (Noddings, 1993).

The framework of Akidah Akhlak in Islamic education provides a very interesting case study for understanding how religious moral education can be integrated with the goals of pluralistic education (Al-Attas, 1980). Akidah refers to the fundamental beliefs and convictions that guide a person's worldview, while Akhlak represents the moral character and virtuous behavior that stem from these beliefs (Al-Ghazali, 1058-1111). This integrated

approach recognizes the intimate relationship between spiritual beliefs and ethical behavior, providing a holistic framework for moral development (Nasr, 2010).

Research on Islamic moral education has highlighted the strengths and challenges of integrating the principles of Aqeedah Akhlaq with a multicultural educational approach (Hashim, 2004). Its strengths include the comprehensive nature of the framework, its emphasis on individual character and social responsibility, and its foundation in a rich tradition of ethical reflection (Wan Daud, 1998). The challenges include the need to balance a specific religious identity with an inclusive attitude towards others, the risk of exclusive interpretations that could undermine tolerance, and the difficulty of adapting traditional approaches to contemporary multicultural contexts (Rosnani, 2007).

The theological resources within the Islamic tradition provide strong support for tolerance and intercultural understanding (Esposito & Mogahed, 2007). Quranic verses such as Al-Hujurat 49:13, which emphasizes the common origin of humanity and the value of diversity for mutual acquaintance, provide a theological basis for an inclusive attitude (Quran, Chapter 49, Verse 13). Similarly, the principle of "there is no compulsion in religion" (Al-Baqarah 2:256) supports freedom of religion and mutual respect (Quran, Chapter 2, Verse 256). These theological resources can be utilized to develop an Islamic approach to moral education that is authentically based on religious tradition and genuinely inclusive of diversity (Ramadhan, 2004).

Comparative research on religious and secular approaches to moral education has revealed similarities and differences in methods and outcomes (Arthur, 2005). Both approaches emphasize the importance of character development, ethical reasoning, and social responsibility, but differ in their underlying assumptions, motivational frameworks, and community contexts (Carr, 2000). Understanding these similarities and differences is crucial for developing an integrated approach that can effectively serve diverse populations (Halstead & Taylor, 2000).

The development of an interfaith approach to moral education represents an emerging field of research and practice (Ipgrave, 2001). This approach seeks to identify common ethical principles across religious traditions while respecting the uniqueness of each tradition (Knitter, 2002). Interreligious moral education programs have shown promise in promoting religious literacy and intercultural understanding, but they require careful design and implementation to avoid superficial treatment of complex theological issues (Jackson, 2004).

D. CONCLUSION

A comprehensive comparative analysis of moral education and active tolerance approaches in this diverse community has revealed important insights that have significant implications for theory, policy, and educational practice (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005). This research shows that an integrated approach that combines moral education with active tolerance training is significantly more effective than standalone programs in promoting individual character development and community harmony (Lickona & Davidson, 2005).

The advantages of experience-based learning methods, collaborative pedagogical approaches, and comprehensive teacher preparation emerge as consistent findings across all contexts examined (Schuitema et al., 2008). These findings challenge traditional didactic approaches to moral education and highlight the importance of authentic relationship-based learning experiences (Kolb, 1984). The crucial role of community engagement and partnerships in achieving lasting outcomes underscores the social nature of moral development and tolerance (Coleman, 1988). Educational programs operating separately from the broader community context show limited effectiveness compared to programs that build strong partnerships with families, religious organizations, and community groups (Epstein, 2011).

This research also reveals significant challenges and obstacles for implementation, including the theory-practice gap, the lack of educator competence, and socio-cultural influences that can undermine school-based interventions (Fullan, 2007). Addressing these challenges requires ongoing commitment, comprehensive professional development, and a community-wide approach that goes beyond individual schools (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). These findings have important implications for education policy, highlighting the need for long-term investments in teacher preparation, curriculum development, and community partnerships (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Evidence for positive community-level outcomes supports the view of moral education and tolerance training as investments in social cohesion and community well-being rather than merely educational costs (Fonseca et al., 2019).

Future research should focus on longitudinal studies of program effects, investigation of implementation mechanisms, development of better measurement tools, and exploration of innovative approaches to moral education and tolerance training (Shadish et al., 2002). Such research will contribute to the theoretical understanding and practical effectiveness of these important educational interventions (Chen, 2015). The ultimate goal of moral education and tolerance training is the development of individuals who can contribute to a fair, peaceful, and inclusive society (Dewey, 1916). The evidence presented in this research shows that this goal can be achieved through well-designed educational programs, implemented comprehensively, and adequately supported

(Freire, 1970). The challenge for educators, policymakers, and society is to commit to the ongoing efforts required to realize this potential (Noddings, 2002).

REFERENCES

Al-Attas, SMN (1980). *Konsep Pendidikan dalam Islam: Kerangka Kerja untuk Filsafat Pendidikan Islam*. Gerakan Pemuda Muslim Malaysia.

Al-Ghazali, A. H. (1058-1111). *Ihya Ulum al-Din (Kebangkitan Ilmu Agama).* Berbagai penerbit.

Almond, B. (2010). Pendidikan untuk toleransi: perbedaan budaya dan nilai-nilai keluarga. *Jurnal Pendidikan Moral*, 39(2), 131-143.

Arthur, J. (2005). Kemunculan kembali pendidikan karakter dalam kebijakan pendidikan Inggris. *Jurnal Studi Pendidikan Inggris*, 53(3), 239-254.

Bank, JA (2004). *Pendidikan Multikultural: Teori dan Praktek* (edisi ke-5). Allyn & Bacon.

Bank, JA (2008). *Pengantar Pendidikan Multikultural* (edisi ke-4). Allyn & Bacon.

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., Solomon, D., & Lewis, C. (2000). Efek Proyek Perkembangan Anak pada penggunaan narkoba siswa dan perilaku bermasalah lainnya. *Jurnal Pencegahan Primer*, 21(1), 75-99.

Berger-Schmitt, R. (2002). Mempertimbangkan Kohesi Sosial dalam Penilaian Kualitas Hidup: Konsep dan Pengukuran. *Penelitian Indikator Sosial*, 58(1-3), 403-428.

Berkowitz, MW, & Bier, MC (2005). *Pendidikan Karakter: Orang Tua sebagai Mitra*. Kemitraan Pendidikan Karakter.

Booth, A., Papaioannou, D., & Sutton, A. (2012). *Pendekatan Sistematis untuk Tinjauan Literatur yang Sukses*. Publikasi SAGE.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Menggunakan analisis tematik dalam psikologi. *Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Psikologi*, 3(2), 77-101.

Bray, M., Adamson, B., & Mason, M. (2007). *Penelitian Pendidikan Komparatif: Pendekatan dan Metode*. Springer.

Brooks, DC (2005). Toleransi belajar: Dampak kursus politik komparatif pada tingkat kepekaan budaya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu Politik*, 1(2), 223-240.

Bryk, AS, & Raudenbush, SW (1992). *Model Linier Hierarkis: Aplikasi dan Metode Analisis Data*. Publikasi SAGE.

Burbules, NC, & Bruce, BC (2001). Teori dan penelitian tentang pengajaran sebagai dialog. Dalam V. Richardson (Ed.), *Buku Pegangan Penelitian tentang Pengajaran* (edisi ke-4, hlm. 1102-1121). Asosiasi Penelitian Pendidikan Amerika.

Carr, D. (2000). *Profesionalisme dan Etika dalam Pengajaran*. Routledge.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Membangun Teori Grounded* (edisi ke-2). Publikasi SAGE.

Chen, HT (2015). *Evaluasi Program Praktis: Evaluasi Berbasis Teori dan Perspektif Evaluasi Terpadu* (edisi ke-2). Publikasi SAGE.

Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, NM, & Pickeral, T. (2009). Iklim sekolah: Penelitian, kebijakan, praktik, dan pendidikan guru. *Catatan Perguruan Tinggi Guru*, 111(1), 180-213.

Coleman, JS (1988). Modal sosial dalam penciptaan modal manusia. *Jurnal Sosiologi Amerika*, 94, S95-S120.

Cooper, H. (2010). *Sintesis Penelitian dan Meta-Analisis: Pendekatan Langkah demi Langkah* (edisi ke-4). Publikasi SAGE.

Creswell, JW (2018). *Desain Penelitian: Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Campuran* (edisi ke-5). Publikasi SAGE.

Creswell, JW, & Plano Clark, VL (2018). *Merancang dan Melakukan Penelitian Metode Campuran* (edisi ke-3). Publikasi SAGE.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Kualitas guru dan prestasi siswa. *Arsip Analisis Kebijakan Pendidikan*, 8(1), 1-44.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *Buku Pegangan Penelitian Kualitatif SAGE* (edisi ke-5). Publikasi SAGE.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Demokrasi dan Pendidikan*. Macmillan.

Durlak, JA, Weissberg, RP, Dymnicki, AB, Taylor, RD, & Schellinger, KB (2011). Dampak peningkatan pembelajaran sosial dan emosional siswa: Meta-analisis intervensi universal berbasis sekolah. *Perkembangan Anak*, 82(1), 405-432.

Epstein, JL (2011). *Kemitraan Sekolah, Keluarga, dan Komunitas: Buku Pegangan Anda untuk Tindakan* (edisi ke-3). Corwin Press.

Esposito, JL, & Mogahed, D. (2007). *Siapa yang Berbicara untuk Islam? Apa yang benar-benar dipikirkan oleh satu miliar Muslim*. Pers Gallup.

Everett, HS (2012). Sekolah agama dan toleransi: studi komparatif tentang pengaruh sekolah agama pada sikap toleransi siswa. *Penemuan UCL*.

Fink, A. (2019). *Melakukan Tinjauan Literatur Penelitian: Dari Internet ke Kertas* (edisi ke-5). Publikasi SAGE.

Fonseca, X., Lukosch, S., & Brazier, F. (2019). Kohesi sosial ditinjau kembali: definisi baru dan bagaimana mencirikannya. *Inovasi: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Sosial Eropa*, 32(2), 231-253.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogi Orang Tertindas*. Grup Penerbitan Internasional Continuum.

Frisancho, S., & Delgado, GE (2018). Pendidikan moral sebagai pendidikan moral antarbudaya. *Pendidikan Antarbudaya*, 29(1), 18-39.

Fullan, M. (2007). *Arti Baru Perubahan Pendidikan* (edisi ke-4). Pers Perguruan Tinggi Guru.

Gay, G. (2010). *Pengajaran Responsif Budaya: Teori, Penelitian, dan Praktek* (edisi ke-2). Pers Perguruan Tinggi Guru.

Glaser, BG, & Strauss, AL (1967). *Penemuan Teori Grounded: Strategi untuk Penelitian Kualitatif*. Perusahaan Penerbitan Aldine.

Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (2012). *Pengantar Tinjauan Sistematis*. Publikasi SAGE.

Greene, JC (2007). *Metode Campuran dalam Penyelidikan Sosial*. Jossey-Bass.

Grimmitt, M. (2000). *Pedagogi Pendidikan Agama: Studi Kasus dalam Penelitian dan Pengembangan Praktik Pedagogik yang Baik di RE.* Penerbitan McCrimmon.

Guțu, V., & Boghian, I. (2019). Model Psiko-pedagogis Bidimensi untuk Pendidikan Toleransi. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 11(4), 1-21.

Gutmann, A. (1999). *Pendidikan Demokratis*. Princeton University Press.

Halstead, JM, & Taylor, MJ (2000). *Pengembangan nilai, sikap, dan kualitas pribadi: Tinjauan penelitian terbaru*. Yayasan Nasional untuk Penelitian Pendidikan.

Han, H. (2014). Menganalisis kerangka teoritis pendidikan moral melalui filsafat sains Lakatos. *Jurnal Pendidikan Moral*, 43(1), 32-53.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Modal Profesional: Mengubah Pengajaran di Setiap Sekolah*. Pers Perguruan Tinggi Guru.

Hashim, R. (2004). *Dualisme Pendidikan di Malaysia: Implikasi untuk Teori dan Praktek*. Oxford University Press.

Huebner, D. E. (1985). Spiritualitas dan pengetahuan. Dalam E. Eisner (Ed.), *Belajar dan Mengajarkan Cara Mengetahui* (hlm. 159-173). Universitas Chicago Press.

Ipgrave, J. (2001). Dialog murid-murid di kelas sebagai alat pendidikan agama. *Makalah Occasional Unit Penelitian Agama dan Pendidikan Warwick*, 2, 1-42.

Jackson, R. (2004). *Memikirkan Kembali Pendidikan dan Pluralitas Agama: Masalah dalam Keragaman dan Pedagogi*. RoutledgeFalmer.

Janmaat, JG (2022). Pendidikan dan toleransi: Tinjauan penelitian terbaru. Dalam *Buku Pegangan Keterlibatan dan Pendidikan Sipil* (hlm. 1-20). Penerbitan Edward Elgar.

Jenson, J. (1998). *Memetakan Kohesi Sosial: Keadaan Penelitian Kanada*. Jaringan Penelitian Kebijakan Kanada.

Johnson, RB, & Onwuegbuzie, AJ (2004). Penelitian metode campuran: Paradigma penelitian yang waktunya telah tiba. *Peneliti Pendidikan*, 33(7), 14-26.

Joseph, PB, & Efron, S. (2005). Tujuh dunia pendidikan moral. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(7), 525-533.

Rajut, PF (2002). *Memperkenalkan Teologi Agama*. Buku Orbis.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Filsafat Pembangunan Moral: Tahapan Moral dan Gagasan Keadilan*. Harper & Baris.

Kolb, DA (1984). *Pembelajaran Pengalaman: Pengalaman sebagai Sumber Pembelajaran dan Pengembangan*. Prentice-Hall.

Lickona, T. (1991). *Mendidik untuk Karakter: Bagaimana Sekolah Kita Dapat Mengajarkan Rasa Hormat dan Tanggung Jawab*. Buku Bantam.

Lickona, T., & Davidson, M. (2005). *Sekolah Menengah Cerdas & Baik: Mengintegrasikan Keunggulan dan Etika untuk Sukses di Sekolah, Pekerjaan, dan Seterusnya*. Kemitraan Pendidikan Karakter.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, EG (1985). *Penyelidikan Naturalistik*. Publikasi SAGE.

Lynch, I., Swartz, S., & Isaacs, D. (2017). Pendidikan moral anti-rasis: Tinjauan pendekatan, dampak, dan landasan teoretis dari tahun 2000 hingga 2015. *Jurnal Pendidikan Moral*, 46(2), 129-144.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, GB. (2016). *Merancang Penelitian Kualitatif* (edisi ke-6). Publikasi SAGE.

Maxwell, JA (2013). *Desain Penelitian Kualitatif: Pendekatan Interaktif* (edisi ke-3). Publikasi SAGE.

Merriam, SB, & Tisdell, EJ (2016). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Panduan untuk Desain dan Implementasi* (edisi ke-4). Jossey-Bass.

Miles, MB, Huberman, AM, & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber Metode* (edisi ke-4). Publikasi SAGE.

Najamudin, N. (2024). Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Multikultural dalam Mata Pelajaran Aqidah Akhlak. *Gerbang Penelitian*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377483351_Implementation_of_Multicultural_Educatio n_in_the_Subject_of_Aqidah_Akhlak

Najamudin, & Anwar, S. (2024). Integrasi Akidah dan Akhlak: Pondasi Kuat untuk Kehidupan Bermakna. Yogyakarta: Selat Media Patners.

Najamudin, & Anwar, S. (2024). Toleransi Dalam Perspektif Agama, Sosial, dan Pendidikan. Tasikmalaya: EDU PUBLISHER.

Najamudin, & Hidayat, S. (2025). Hadits Tarbawi. Banyumas: Arta Media Nusantara.

Najamudin, & Hidayat, S. (2025). Toleransi dalam Bingkai Pendidikan, Agama, dan Sosial. Banyumas: Arta Media Nusantara.

Najamudin, & Hidayat, S. (2025). Akidah Akhlak. Banyumas: Arta Media Nusantara.

Narvaez, D. (2006). Pendidikan etika integratif. Dalam *Buku Pegangan Perkembangan Moral* (hlm. 703-733). Pers Psikologi.

Nasr, S. H. (2010). *Filsafat Islam dari Asal-usulnya hingga Sekarang: Filsafat di Negeri Nubuatan*. Universitas Negeri New York Press.

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2008). *Menegaskan Keragaman: Konteks Sosial Politik Pendidikan Multikultural* (edisi ke-5). Allyn & Bacon.

Noddings, N. (1992). *Tantangan untuk Peduli di Sekolah: Pendekatan Alternatif untuk Pendidikan*. Pers Perguruan Tinggi Guru.

Noddings, N. (1993). *Mendidik untuk Keyakinan Cerdas atau Ketidakpercayaan*. Pers Perguruan Tinggi Guru.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Mendidik Orang Bermoral: Alternatif Peduli untuk Pendidikan Karakter*. Pers Perguruan Tinggi Guru.

Nord, WA, & Haynes, CC (1998). *Mengambil agama dengan serius di seluruh kurikulum*. Asosiasi untuk Pengawasan dan Pengembangan Kurikulum.

Nucci, L. (2001). *Pendidikan dalam Domain Moral*. Cambridge University Press.

Parker, WC (2003). *Mengajarkan Demokrasi: Persatuan dan Keberagaman dalam Kehidupan Publik*. Pers Perguruan Tinggi Guru.

Patton, MQ (2015). *Metode Penelitian & Evaluasi Kualitatif: Mengintegrasikan Teori dan Praktek* (edisi ke-4). Publikasi SAGE.

Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Tinjauan Sistematis dalam Ilmu Sosial: Panduan Praktis*. Penerbitan Blackwell.

Phillips, D., & Schweisfurth, M. (2014). *Pendidikan Komparatif dan Internasional: Pengantar Teori, Metode, dan Praktek*. Akademisi Bloomsbury.

Putnam, RD (2000). *Bowling Alone: Keruntuhan dan Kebangkitan Komunitas Amerika*. Simon & Schuster.

Raihani, R. (2014). Pendidikan Islam dan Masyarakat Multikultural: Deskripsi pendidikan untuk keanekaragaman budaya di dua sekolah Islam di Indonesia. *JICSA (Jurnal Peradaban Islam di Asia Tenggara),* 3(1), 1-25.

Ramadhan, T. (2004). *Muslim Barat dan Masa Depan Islam*. Oxford University Press.

Reed, JG, & Baxter, PM (2009). *Penggunaan Perpustakaan: Buku Pegangan untuk Psikologi* (edisi ke-3). Asosiasi Psikologi Amerika.

Jaringan Kota yang Tangguh. (n.d.). *Buku Pegangan Kohesi Sosial*. https://resilientcitiesnetwork.org/downloadable_resources/UR/Social-Cohesion-Handbook.pdf

Istirahat, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, MJ, & Thoma, SJ (1999). *Pemikiran Moral Pascakonvensional: Pendekatan Neo-Kohlbergian*. Lawrence Erlbaum Rekanan.

Rosnani, H. (2007). *Wacana Intelektual di Akhir Milenium Kedua: Keprihatinan Seorang Pendidik Muslim-Melayu.* Universitas Islam Internasional Malaysia Press.

Sakallı, Ö., Tlili, A., Altınay, F., Karaatmaca, C., & Altınay, Z. (2021). Peran pendidikan toleransi dalam manajemen keragaman: Perspektif teori aktivitas sejarah budaya. *SAGE Terbuka*, 11(4). https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/21582440211060831

Sampson, RJ, Raudenbush, SW, & Earls, F. (1997). Lingkungan dan kejahatan kekerasan: Studi multilevel tentang kemanjuran kolektif. *Sains*, 277(5328), 918-924.

Sanger, M., & Osguthorpe, R. (2005). Memahami pendekatan pendidikan moral. *Jurnal Pendidikan Moral*, 34(1), 57-71.

Schuitema, J., Bendungan, GT, & Veugelers, W. (2008). Strategi pengajaran untuk pendidikan moral: Sebuah tinjauan. *Jurnal Studi Kurikulum*, 40(1), 69-89. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00220270701294210

Shadish, WR, Cook, TD, & Campbell, DT (2002). *Desain eksperimental dan kuasi-eksperimental untuk inferensi kausal umum*. Houghton Mifflin.

Slavin, RE (2008). Perspektif tentang penelitian berbasis bukti dalam pendidikan—Apa yang berhasil? Masalah dalam mensintesis evaluasi program pendidikan. *Peneliti Pendidikan*, 37(1), 5-14.

Sleeter, CE, & Grant, CA (2007). *Membuat Pilihan untuk Pendidikan Multikultural: Lima Pendekatan untuk Ras, Kelas, dan Gender* (edisi ke-6). Wiley.

Pasak, R. E. (1995). *Seni Penelitian Studi Kasus*. Publikasi SAGE.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Dasar-dasar Penelitian Kualitatif: Teknik dan Prosedur untuk Mengembangkan Teori Grounded (*edisi ke-2). Publikasi SAGE.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). *Buku Pegangan SAGE tentang Metode Campuran dalam Penelitian Sosial & Perilaku* (edisi ke-2). Publikasi SAGE.

Al-Qur'an, Bab 2, Ayat 256. Berbagai terjemahan dan penerbit.

Al-Qur'an, Bab 49, Ayat 13. Berbagai terjemahan dan penerbit.

UNECE. (2023). *Konsep dan Pengukuran Kohesi Sosial*. Komisi Ekonomi Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa untuk Eropa. https://unece.org/statistics/publications/social-cohesion-concept-and-measurement

Wainryb, C. (2006). Perkembangan moral dalam budaya: Keragaman, toleransi, dan keadilan. Dalam *Buku Pegangan Perkembangan Moral* (hlm. 211-240). Pers Psikologi.

Walesiak, M., & Dehnel, G. (2020). Pengukuran kohesi sosial di tingkat provinsi di Polandia menggunakan data metrik dan bernilai interval. *Keberlanjutan*, 12(18), 7664.

Wan Daud, W. M. N. (1998). *Filsafat dan Praktek Pendidikan Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas: Eksposisi Konsep Asli Islamisasi.* Institut Pemikiran Islam Internasional.

Willems, F., Denessen, E., Hermans, C., & Vermeer, P. (2010). Pendidikan kewarganegaraan di sekolah agama: Analisis toleransi di sekolah Katolik dari sudut pandang etis kebajikan. *Jurnal Keyakinan & Nilai*, 31(2), 215-227.

Yin, RK (2018). *Penelitian dan Aplikasi Studi Kasus: Desain dan Metode* (edisi ke-6). Publikasi SAGE.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Pengabdian Masyarakat dan Tanggung Jawab Sosial pada Pemuda*. Universitas Chicago Press.