

## **Approaches to Fostering Religious Diversity in Schools: A Literature Review from Inclusive and Multicultural Education Perspectives**

**Inayah<sup>1\*</sup>, Ade Hidayat<sup>2</sup>, Widodo Winarso<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>123</sup> Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nur Jati Cirebon, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author

[inayah.pjjpai@gmail.com](mailto:inayah.pjjpai@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** Cultural, religious, and social diversity in Indonesian school environments demands educational approaches that can cultivate tolerance, empathy, and inclusive attitudes from an early age. This article aims to identify and analyze methods for fostering diversity in schools through a literature review from the perspectives of inclusive and multicultural education. The study adopts a qualitative library research design, with data collection conducted through a systematic review of Indonesian scholarly journal articles indexed in DOAJ and published in 2025. The search yielded five relevant journal articles. The data were analyzed using content analysis to categorize the strategies and approaches employed in managing diversity in schools. The findings highlight five dominant methods: inclusive curriculum design, social-emotional learning, integration of Pancasila and religious values, instructional supervision for teachers, and the use of interactive media. Each method contributes in a specific way to shaping an inclusive school climate that respects and values differences. In conclusion, diversity can be fostered effectively through pedagogical approaches that are reflective, adaptive, and grounded in local values. This study offers a theoretical contribution to the development of multicultural education in Indonesia while also providing practical recommendations for teachers and policymakers. Future research is encouraged to empirically test the effectiveness of these methods across diverse school contexts.

**Keywords:** *Diversity, inclusive education, multiculturalism, literature review.*

## INTRODUCTION

Diversity is an inherent and inevitable feature of Indonesian society, including within its educational settings. Students come from a wide range of cultural, religious, ethnic, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds, creating a complex dynamic in the educational process (Rita, 2025). In Indonesia's education policy framework, the right to education and non discriminatory access are emphasized, which strengthens the normative basis for schools to manage diversity responsibly (Mulina, 2024). As a social and cultural institution, the school holds the responsibility to nurture a spirit of unity in diversity, and this responsibility becomes more concrete through inclusive education policies that promote non discrimination and respect for learners' differences. This is where the implementation of diversity development methods becomes essential, enabling schools to function as safe, inclusive, and supportive spaces for all learners (Devi, 2024). Evidence from global education research shows that well planned inclusive education can reduce stigma and discrimination while improving students' academic and socio-emotional outcomes. In recent years, awareness of the importance of inclusive and multicultural education has grown significantly, and Indonesian scholarship increasingly frames multicultural education as a key approach to strengthening tolerance and social harmony in diverse school communities.

Religious diversity is an inherent feature of Indonesian schooling, and prior empirical work suggests that "*multicultural education*" at school level does not automatically translate into uniformly stronger tolerance outcomes (Rita, 2025). Using senior secondary schools in Gunungkidul and Kulon Progo, Muzayanah (2017) reports relatively high multicultural education and student tolerance indices, yet the two districts do not differ significantly, implying that tolerance formation may depend on *how* diversity is pedagogically fostered rather than the presence of diversity discourse alone (Muzayanah, 2017). This finding motivates closer scrutiny of concrete school based approaches that shape daily interaction patterns, classroom participation, and students' sense of recognition across religious groups.

More recent school based evidence emphasizes the centrality of teachers and classroom pedagogy in translating diversity ideals into practice. It is show that Islamic Religious Education teachers, when aligned with the Merdeka Curriculum agenda, can operationalize religious moderation through learning design, dialogue oriented instruction, and school activities that normalize

respectful difference, but these efforts hinge on enabling conditions such as teacher capacity, institutional support, and the availability of relevant learning resources (Suswakara, 2024). The implication is straightforward religious diversity work is not merely a curriculum statement it is a competence intensive practice that requires sustained pedagogical and organizational reinforcement.

Evidence from other religious education streams also indicates that policy and instructional design can actively cultivate tolerance, equality, and intergroup cooperation, though the insights remain fragmented across contexts (Satori & Komariah, 2011). In Catholic Religious Education, document measurable policy linked pathways that strengthen students' tolerant dispositions, highlighting the role of structured content, values framing, and classroom practices as intervention channels. However, taken together, existing studies tend to be siloed (by district, subject, or single religious-education domain), and they rarely integrate the two major lenses that are conceptually closest to the problem inclusive education (access, participation, and protection of minorities) and multicultural education (recognition, dialogue, and democratic coexistence). This leaves a clear gap, we still lack an integrative evidence map of *approaches* that schools can adopt to foster religious diversity across different institutional and classroom settings.

Therefore, this article aims to identify, classify, and critically synthesize approaches to fostering religious diversity in schools through a literature review that explicitly bridges inclusive education and multicultural education perspectives. The intended novelty is an integrative typology that organizes prior findings into actionable approach families (for example: curriculum and learning materials, classroom pedagogy, school climate and safeguarding for minorities, teacher development, and school community engagement), while also assessing the strength and limitations of the available evidence. Scientifically, the article contributes by consolidating a fragmented field into a coherent framework that clarifies mechanisms, boundary conditions, and researchable propositions for future empirical work in Indonesia's plural schooling system. Practically, the synthesis provides guidance for teachers, school leaders, and policymakers to design diversity friendly learning programs that move beyond slogans and toward implementable, evidence aligned strategies.

## METHOD

In line with the study's aims, this research employs a qualitative library research design. Specifically, it seeks to identify, classify, and critically analyze approaches to fostering diversity in schools by systematically reviewing relevant academic literature. Accordingly, the review emphasizes conceptual clarity and analytical synthesis by mapping recurring strategies, implementation mechanisms, and contextual conditions discussed across the selected studies. The library research method is chosen for its suitability in constructing theoretical frameworks, synthesizing findings from prior studies, and formulating evidence based insights that can inform educational policy and practice (Zed, 2014). The data sources in this study are secondary in nature, comprising peer reviewed journal articles, academic books, and research reports from reputable institutions published within the last ten years (2020–2025). The main focus of data collection is on documents that discuss diversity in primary and secondary education, particularly within the frameworks of multicultural and inclusive education. Articles were retrieved using platforms such as Google Scholar, the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), and national university repositories.

Data collection was carried out through a systematic search of scholarly documents using keywords such as "*inclusive education*," "*multicultural education*," "*diversity in schools*," and "*student character development*." The selected documents were collected in PDF format and analyzed using content analysis techniques, which involved identifying key themes, categorizing methodological approaches across the literature, and comparing the effectiveness of the strategies discussed. The data analysis followed three stages: (1) data reduction, which involved selecting literature based on specific inclusion and exclusion criteria; (2) data display, where the findings were organized in tables and descriptive summaries to aid synthesis and interpretation; and (3) drawing conclusions, which entailed identifying recurring patterns, trends, and gaps in the implementation of diversity development methods in schools (Satori & Komariah, 2011).

As this study is based entirely on documentary analysis, it does not involve direct research subjects. However, the selected sources have undergone peer-review and academic scrutiny, and thus are considered representative of valid scholarly perspectives. The criteria for article selection included: (1) publication between 2020 and 2025, (2) relevance to the theme of diversity in

education, and (3) the presence of either empirical findings or a strong theoretical foundation. Articles lacking abstracts, references, or published by non academic or unverifiable sources were excluded from the analysis. Following the selection stage, the analysis proceeded through a qualitative thematic content analysis. Each included article was read in full and coded using a structured extraction sheet capturing (a) study context and educational level, (b) conceptualization of diversity (with a focus on religious diversity), (c) approach or intervention type (inclusive education and/or multicultural education), (d) reported mechanisms (how the approach works), (e) outcomes (e.g., participation, belonging, tolerance), and (f) implementation constraints. The codes were then grouped into higher order themes to produce a typology of approaches, and cross study comparisons were conducted to identify convergent findings, contradictions, and evidence gaps that informed the final synthesis.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

This section presents the main results of the literature review and discusses them critically by linking the reviewed studies to the theoretical lenses of inclusive and multicultural education. Specifically, it explains the five dominant methods most frequently reported in the selected articles (inclusive curriculum design, social emotional learning, integration of Pancasila and religious values, instructional supervision for teachers, and interactive educational media), while highlighting both their shared principles and key differences. The discussion also examines the pedagogical implications of each method, including the conditions that support successful implementation and the barriers commonly encountered at the school and classroom levels. Therefore, this section not only summarizes what previous studies have found, but also clarifies why such findings emerge and how they inform a more integrative framework for fostering diversity in Indonesian schools.

### **Classification of Methods in Developing Diversity**

Based on a review of five journal articles and academic books, the main findings indicate that strategies or methods for promoting diversity in school environments can be grouped into five dominant approaches that most frequently appear in the literature. To help readers grasp these patterns, Table 1 summarizes the classification of methods, provides a brief description of each approach, and lists the key sources underpinning this categorization.

Accordingly, the table serves as an initial conceptual map that links evidence from previous studies to the categories of diversity management strategies discussed in this article.

Table 1. Classification of Methods for Developing Diversity in Schools

No	Method Type	Brief Description	Source
1	Inclusive and Adaptive Curriculum	Adjusting content and learning strategies to accommodate cultural, ability, and other differences	Tahar & Saman, 2025
2	Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)	Focused on developing empathy, communication, and collaboration across differences	Khoiri et al., 2025
3	Pancasila and Multicultural Values	Integrating national and religious values as the foundation for tolerance and respect for diversity	Sari, 2025
4	Instructional Supervision for Teachers	Strengthening teachers' capacity to design learning plans that are sensitive to diversity	Fanani & Maisyaroh, 2025
5	Educational and Interactive Media	Using games, boardgames, or multimedia to stimulate understanding of diversity values	Dewi, 2025

The study by Tahar and Saman (2025) highlights the strategic role of an *Inclusive and Adaptive Curriculum* in addressing diversity in elementary schools through the Merdeka Curriculum initiative. Their research emphasizes that curriculum flexibility enables schools to tailor content, pedagogical strategies, and assessments to the social, cultural, and cognitive heterogeneity of students. This approach ensures that learners from various backgrounds are not only accommodated but also empowered, thereby mitigating academic and social marginalization within the classroom. The adaptive framework cultivates a more equitable learning environment where every student can thrive in accordance with their unique attributes.

In contrast, Khoiri et al. (2025) focus on *Social Emotional Learning (SEL)* as a pedagogical approach to promote empathy, cross-cultural communication, and collaborative competencies. Their findings demonstrate that SEL interventions foster emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills, which are essential in navigating social diversity. By embedding SEL into the daily school routine, educators cultivate a classroom culture that values emotional awareness and mutual respect. This, in turn, nurtures prosocial behavior and reduces the likelihood of exclusion or discrimination based on difference.

Sari (2025) takes a normative educational stance by exploring how the integration of *Pancasila and multicultural values* within the school system can serve as a moral foundation for tolerance and pluralism. The article argues that by embedding the principles of Pancasila such as belief in unity, democracy, and social justice alongside religious pluralism, schools can create a robust civic identity among students. This ideological framework helps build an inclusive national consciousness where diversity is viewed as a collective strength rather than a challenge to unity.

Meanwhile, Fanani and Maisyaroh (2025) examine how *Instructional Supervision for Teachers* serves as a crucial mechanism for professional development and curriculum responsiveness to diversity. Their research underscores the importance of equipping teachers with the competencies to design lesson plans that are inclusive and culturally sensitive. Effective supervision not only ensures fidelity in implementing inclusive strategies but also enhances the reflective capacities of educators to adapt content and methods in real time based on classroom dynamics.

Lastly, Dewi (2025) addresses the pedagogical potential of *Educational and Interactive Media* such as board games and digital tools in enhancing students' understanding of diversity. The study reveals that interactive media engages learners in experiential scenarios that mirror real world diversity challenges, prompting them to reflect critically and empathetically. These tools serve as low stakes environments where students can practice dialogue, decision making, and value clarification, all of which are essential for democratic citizenship in multicultural societies.

When examined collectively, these five studies share a commitment to advancing inclusive education, yet they differ in intervention level and in the mechanisms they prioritize. Tahar and Saman (2025) and Sari (2025) emphasize systemic and ideological levers (curriculum alignment and value-

based foundations), while Khoiri et al. (2025) and Dewi (2025) focus on proximal classroom mechanisms that shape students' socio-emotional and behavioral competencies (empathy, communication, collaboration, and interactive engagement). Fanani and Maisyaroh (2025) bridge these perspectives by positioning teacher capacity and instructional supervision as the mediating infrastructure that translates curricular intentions into consistent classroom practice. Despite their differences, the studies converge on a key insight it fostering diversity is not an automatic by product of heterogeneous student composition, but a consequence of deliberate design, sustained implementation, and measurable classroom routines.

The central conclusion and final result of this review is that fostering religious diversity in schools requires an integrated *"five-lever"* approach that simultaneously targets safety, participation, and intergroup respect. First, an inclusive and adaptive curriculum provides the structural conditions for recognition and equitable access by ensuring that content, learning activities, and assessment practices do not marginalize students from minority religious backgrounds (Tahar & Saman, 2025). Second, Pancasila and multicultural values supply the normative anchor that legitimizes respectful difference, counters exclusionary narratives, and frames interfaith coexistence as a civic virtue rather than a private preference (Sari, 2025).

Third, social emotional learning operates as the behavioral pathway through which students practice perspective-taking, emotion regulation, and constructive dialogue across religious lines, which is necessary for sustained participation and conflict prevention in diverse classrooms (Khoiri et al., 2025). Fourth, educational and interactive media strengthen engagement by creating psychologically safe learning spaces where students can rehearse interfaith understanding through low-stakes, collaborative experiences that reduce social distance and stereotyping (Dewi, 2025). Fifth, instructional supervision for teachers functions as the implementation guarantee, ensuring that diversity-friendly principles are consistently enacted, corrected, and improved through feedback, coaching, and pedagogical support (Fanani & Maisyaroh, 2025).

In practical terms, the synthesis implies a clear *"so what"* that single component interventions are unlikely to reduce religious exclusion and unequal participation, whereas coordinated interventions across these five levers are more likely to build schools where minority students feel safe and recognized, where classroom participation becomes more balanced, and where

respectful interfaith interaction becomes routine rather than incidental. Accordingly, this literature review contributes a coherent framework that can guide schools and policymakers in moving from broad commitments to diversity toward implementable strategies that directly shape everyday classroom dynamics and school climate.

### **Implications for Methods of Developing Diversity in Schools**

Across the reviewed literature, our synthesis identifies a five lever model for fostering diversity in schools inclusive curriculum design, social-emotional learning (SEL), integration of Pancasila and religious values, instructional supervision for teachers, and interactive educational media. This finding aligns with Banks' (2015) multicultural education framework, which argues that curriculum reform and pedagogy must be reorganized to reflect pluralism and anti-discrimination. However, our review also extends Banks' emphasis by showing that curriculum reform alone is insufficient unless it is coupled with implementation mechanisms that operate at the classroom and organizational levels, particularly teacher capacity building and school climate interventions. A plausible reason for this extension is contextual in many Indonesian schools, curricular ideals are often translated into practice through teachers' discretionary decisions, which makes the "*capacity and support*" layer a decisive bottleneck.

When compared with prior discussions of differentiated and flexible curriculum, our finding is consistent with Tomlinson's (2001) argument that differentiated learning provides a pathway for accommodating student variability. Yet, the literature we reviewed suggests a stronger conditionality than what is often assumed in purely pedagogical accounts. For example, while Tahar and Saman (2025) highlight that an inclusive curriculum can support diversity, our synthesis suggests that its effectiveness hinges on teacher readiness, time, and institutional scaffolding. This partially contrasts with studies or policy narratives that treat curriculum change as a direct solution. The likely reason is that curriculum is an upstream instrument; without downstream supports (training, supervision, resources), it remains symbolic rather than transformative, particularly in settings with large class sizes and uneven teacher preparation.

Our emphasis on SEL as a core pathway converges with Khoiri et al. (2025), who show SEL's effectiveness in strengthening empathy and social

awareness. However, our review also notes that SEL is often under prioritized in teacher education and daily instruction, producing a gap between “*proven efficacy*” and “*weak uptake*.” This divergence can be explained by structural incentives: SEL outcomes are harder to assess than cognitive outcomes, and teachers under performance pressure may default to content coverage. Moreover, where school culture does not explicitly support reflective dialogue and emotional literacy, SEL interventions become episodic rather than embedded routines.

Regarding values education, our synthesis is broadly aligned with Sari (2025) in positioning Pancasila and religious values as an ethically resonant foundation for multicultural education in Indonesia. At the same time, we identify a recurring tension that some prior work also hints at these values are frequently delivered declaratively, resulting in compliance oriented instruction rather than dialogic and reflective engagement. This contrast is well explained through Freire’s (1970) critique of “*banking education*,” where transmission-based pedagogy can reproduce symbolic domination by silencing students’ lived experiences. In other words, even when the content is pro-tolerance, the method can be anti dialogue this mismatch is a plausible reason why value oriented programs sometimes yield limited behavioral change in participation and everyday intergroup interaction.

The role of instructional supervision in our framework is consistent with the logic advanced by Fanani and Maisyaroh (2025), who argue that reflective supervision can strengthen teachers’ diversity responsive competence. Our review, however, highlights why supervision often fails to deliver its theoretical promise: limited human resources, weak institutional structures, and supervisory practices that emphasize compliance rather than coaching. This explains why some schools report minimal changes despite formal supervision systems. Where supervision is reduced to checklist monitoring, it cannot correct unconscious bias, refine classroom routines, or build teachers’ socio-emotional and dialogic skills, which are essential for religious diversity management.

Finally, our findings on interactive educational media corroborate Dewi’s (2025) evidence that simulations and board games can increase engagement and facilitate internalization of diversity values. Nevertheless, the literature also suggests that media based strategies work best as complements rather than substitutes. The likely reason is mechanism based in media can

create low-stakes interaction and reduce social distance, but sustained inclusion requires consistent norms, teacher facilitation, and curriculum alignment. Without these supports, interactive activities risk becoming isolated events that do not reshape classroom participation patterns over time.

Taken together, the overarching conclusion of this discussion is that the variability in prior findings is not contradictory but conditional. Differences across studies are plausibly driven by (1) intervention level (policy/curriculum vs. classroom routines), (2) implementation capacity (teacher preparedness, supervision quality, resources), and (3) pedagogical mode (dialogic vs. Transmission based instruction). Therefore, this article's contribution is to reconcile these strands into an integrative framework that explains not only *what* strategies work, but also *why* their effectiveness varies across contexts, especially in managing religious diversity where belonging, safety, and equal participation are central outcomes.

### **Practical Implications of Diversity Development Methods in Schools**

The practical recommendations proposed in this study are consistent with a core pattern emerging from prior research diversity friendly schooling is most effective when interventions operate simultaneously at the institutional, classroom, and system levels. This aligns with Tahar and Saman's (2025) emphasis on inclusive curriculum design as a structural entry point, and it also complements Khoiri et al.'s (2025) evidence that social emotional competencies are essential for meaningful inclusion. However, our synthesis departs from studies that implicitly treat any single lever as sufficient. The reason is empirical and implementation-based: the reviewed evidence repeatedly indicates that curricular and values based reforms often fail when they are not translated into routine classroom practices, supported by teacher capacity, and reinforced through school governance and accountability mechanisms.

At the school level, our recommendation that principals embed diversity in school vision, culture, and governance is broadly consistent with studies that frame diversity as an institutional responsibility rather than an individual teacher initiative. Yet, this also contrasts with strands of literature and policy narratives that assume classroom level strategies alone can solve exclusion. The likely reason for this difference is the mechanism of school climate where school leadership does not normalize diversity as a core norm, teacher led

initiatives become fragmented and episodic, and minority students may still experience unequal participation even if individual teachers attempt inclusive practices. Establishing an inclusivity development team and structured school wide programs (e.g., culture week, cross cultural projects) is therefore justified as a governance tool that converts abstract commitments into coordinated routines, reducing the risk that diversity remains symbolic.

At the teacher level, the recommendation to apply differentiated instruction and Universal Design for Learning (UDL), combined with SEL practices, fits the behavioral pathway highlighted by Khoiri et al. (2025) and complements the curriculum focused orientation of Tahar and Saman (2025). However, the literature also suggests that teacher-driven inclusion can produce mixed outcomes depending on whether teachers have the pedagogical and emotional skills required to facilitate dialogue across difference. This explains why our review emphasizes not only strategy adoption but also teacher reflection on bias and instructional materials. In contexts where teaching remains transmission based, even “*diversity content*” can reproduce exclusion because students’ lived identities are not treated as legitimate knowledge resources. This is also why studies grounded in critical pedagogy often report weaker change when instructional practice is not dialogic the difference is not the value being taught, but the method of teaching and the relational climate created in the classroom.

At the policy level, our recommendation to develop inclusive education training modules and embed diversity indicators in accreditation responds directly to the implementation constraints highlighted by Fanani and Maisyaroh (2025). Their argument that instructional supervision is a mediating lever is consistent with our conclusion that teacher capacity is the key “*translation mechanism*” between policy and classroom reality. Yet, our review also highlights why some systems report limited impact from supervision policies supervision is frequently compliance oriented rather than coaching oriented, and resource constraints reduce supervision to administrative monitoring. Hence, the recommendation for collaborative supervision techniques and incentives (grants, awards, peer sharing) is grounded in a practical explanation of divergent findings when accountability is purely procedural, schools comply without changing practice; when accountability is coupled with capacity building and positive incentives, schools are more likely to institutionalize inclusion as part of their quality culture.

Importantly, the recommendation to integrate Pancasila and religious values into diversity programs is aligned with Sari (2025), who positions Pancasila as a contextual ethical foundation for multicultural education in Indonesia. However, our review also notes a recurring contradiction in the literature values education is often delivered declaratively and does not reliably shift participation patterns or intergroup interaction. A plausible reason is that values based instruction can remain “*cognitive*” unless it is enacted through dialogic pedagogies, SEL routines, and interactive experiences that require students to practice perspective-taking and respectful disagreement. This is where Dewi’s (2025) findings on interactive media become relevant media can reduce social distance and increase engagement, but our synthesis emphasizes that media works best as a complement to curriculum and teacher facilitation. When games or simulations are used without reflective debriefing and school wide norms, they become isolated activities with limited durable effect.

Overall, the final implication is clear differences across previous studies are less about contradictions and more about conditions. Studies focusing on curriculum or values tend to report promise at the design level, while studies focusing on classroom mechanisms report stronger behavioral outcomes but often face scalability and sustainability constraints. Our study’s contribution is to reconcile these strands through a multi stakeholder strategy that explains why one sided reforms frequently underperform: inclusion requires alignment across leadership, pedagogy, supervision, and accountability. With synergy among principals, teachers, and policymakers, diversity in schools can move beyond slogans and become a durable cultural practice that protects minority belonging, equalizes participation, and strengthens respectful interfaith coexistence in everyday school life.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study explores a range of methods for developing diversity in schools through a literature based approach, emphasizing inclusive and multicultural education. It argues that managing diversity requires a systemic, structured, and value based framework rooted in local wisdom. Five key strategies are identified inclusive curriculum, social emotional learning (SEL), integration of Pancasila and religious values, instructional supervision for teachers, and the use of interactive educational media. Among these, SEL emerges as the most effective in fostering empathy and social skills, while

inclusive curriculum is the most widely adopted, signaling the importance of formal policy frameworks. However, implementation still faces challenges, such as low diversity literacy among educators, limited resources in remote regions, and the dominance of traditional transmissive teaching methods.

An effective diversity education approach must go beyond curricular reform to include the cultivation of students' socio emotional character, integration of local ethical values, continuous teacher development, and the creative use of experiential media. Diversity should not be seen as a threat, but as a powerful resource for shaping a tolerant and pluralistic generation. Schools play a pivotal role as spaces for early social learning where mutual respect and equal participation can be nurtured through intentional, sustained practice. This calls for collective action educators must innovate their classrooms, policymakers must mainstream inclusive strategies in educational reform, and wider society must treat diversity as a long term investment in peace, unity, and social justice. It is time for Indonesian education to move beyond curriculum design toward transformative practice that actively builds humane, inclusive school communities.

Future studies should move beyond conceptual discussions by (1) testing the effectiveness of the five lever framework using robust designs (e.g., quasi-experiments, longitudinal studies, or mixed-methods evaluation) to identify which combinations of strategies produce the strongest impacts on students' tolerance, sense of belonging, and participation. Researchers should also (2) examine implementation mechanisms and constraints, including teacher readiness, supervision quality, school leadership commitment, and resource disparities across urban rural and public private settings. In addition, (3) future work should develop and validate practical measurement tools (e.g., classroom observation rubrics, student belonging and safety scales, and indicators of religion based exclusion) so that diversity outcomes can be assessed consistently across schools. Finally, (4) researchers should explore contextual adaptations by focusing on religious diversity dynamics in different regions of Indonesia and by investigating how local cultural and faith-based values can be translated into dialogic, non declarative pedagogies that genuinely shift everyday interaction patterns in classrooms.

## REFERENCES

- Anwar, A. (2024). Multikulturalisme dan tantangannya dalam pendidikan dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 15(2).
- Banks, J. A. (2015). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- CAST. (2018). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2* [Graphic organizer]. CAST.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2020). *What is SEL?* CASEL.
- Dewi, N. M. T. S. (2025). Pengembangan game edukasi berorientasi masalah mengenai materi keberagaman flora dan fauna. *Repository Undiksha*.
- Fanani, M. A., & Maisyaroh, M. (2025). Strategi penerapan supervisi instruksional sebagai upaya peningkatan kualitas pengajaran guru. *Proceedings Series of Educational Studies (PSES)*.
- Fauzi, I. (2023). Implementasi model pembelajaran kolaboratif dalam meningkatkan toleransi siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 9(1).
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder & Herder.
- Haris, A., Mardani, D. A., Kusnandar, E., & Mas'ad, M. A. (2024). Strengthening religious moderation through the Merdeka curriculum: The role of Islamic religious education teachers at public senior high school. *EDUKASI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama dan Keagamaan*, 22(3). doi:10.32729/edukasi.v22i3.1958
- Hidayat, R. (2024). Peran guru sebagai agen inklusivitas dalam pendidikan dasar. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Indonesia*, 8(2).
- Judijanto, L. (2025). Membangun generasi berkarakter melalui pendidikan berbasis budaya positif: Sebuah tinjauan. *PESHUM: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora*, 7(1).
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2023). *Statistik pendidikan Indonesia 2023*. Pusdatin Kemendikbudristek.
- Khoiri, N., Patimah, S., Firdianti, A., Rahelli, Y., & B, S. (2025). Kajian teoritis: Pendekatan sosio emosional dalam pengelolaan kelas di sekolah dasar. *COLLASE (Creative of Learning Students Elementary Education)*, 8(2), 330–341.
- Kurniawan, D. (2023). Strategi pembelajaran diferensiasi berbasis kearifan lokal. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(3).

- Lubis, S. (2024). Membangun kesadaran multikultural melalui media edukasi inovatif. *Jurnal Komunikasi Pendidikan*, 10(1).
- Maulida, R. (2024). Evaluasi kurikulum inklusif pada sekolah pinggiran. *Jurnal Pendidikan Inklusif*, 6(2).
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Muzayanah, U. (2017). Indeks pendidikan multikultural dan toleransi siswa SMA/K di Gunungkidul dan Kulonprogo. *EDUKASI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama dan Keagamaan*, 15(2).
- Nurhalimah, S. (2024). Integrasi nilai Pancasila dalam pendidikan karakter. *Jurnal Filsafat dan Pendidikan*, 11(1).
- Prasetyo, G. (2023). Efektivitas supervisi akademik berbasis reflektif. *Jurnal Kependidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 12(1).
- Sari, P. P. (2025). Keadilan berdasarkan sila kedua Pancasila dalam menghapus pengelompokan mayoritas-minoritas di sekolah. *Lentera Ilmu*.
- Suswakara, I., Atasoge, A. D. W., Wahyuningrum, P. M. E., & Para, E. R. (2024). Fostering religious tolerance in Catholic religious education: A study of policy impact in Indonesia. *EDUKASI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama dan Keagamaan*, 22(2), 221–244.
- Suryani, D. (2023). Penggunaan media simulatif untuk meningkatkan empati siswa. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan*, 17(2).
- Tahar, M., Saman, A., & Syawaluddin, A. (2025). Implementasi kurikulum Merdeka dalam mendorong kualitas pembelajaran di sekolah dasar negeri se-Kecamatan Rappocini Kota Makassar. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 10(1). doi:10.23969/jp.v10i01.23691
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* (2nd ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wahyuni, N. (2023). Model pembelajaran tematik untuk penguatan nilai sosial di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Guru dan Pembelajaran*, 5(1).
- Wati, S. A. (2025). *Pendidikan inklusif: Konsep dan pentingnya dalam pendidikan anak usia dini*. Prenada Media.
- Zed, M. (2014). *Metode penelitian kepustakaan*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.