

Improving Student Activity and Learning Outcomes in Religiosity Education through the STAD Cooperative Learning Model

Rosalia Kidi

Ola Rongan Wilhelmus*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6958-2254>

Theological Education Study Program, Widya Yuwana College of Teacher Training and Education (STKIP), Madiun, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Religiosity Education that is still dominated by lecturing tends to position students as passive recipients of information, so their engagement and learning outcomes remain suboptimal. The same condition was found in Grade X at SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma Wlingi, marked by low participation, students' reluctance to ask questions and voice opinions, and group work that had not yet run effectively. This study therefore aimed to improve student activity and learning outcomes on the topic of Cultural, Religious, and Belief Fanaticism through the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) learning model. It was a classroom action research study with quantitative and qualitative approaches, conducted in two cycles. Data were collected through observation of student learning activity, student group work, and teacher activity, together with an objective test, and were analyzed descriptively. The results show that student group-work activity increased from 75.00% to 84.75%, teacher activity from 79.41% to 92.65%, and the mean objective test score from 80.77 to 92.31.

Copyright © 2026 Authors
This is an open access article under [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license](#).



ARTICLE INFORMATION

Keywords:

Student Teams;
Achievement Division;
Learning Outcomes;
Religiosity Education;
Fanaticism; Group Work

Article History:

Received: 15 October 2026
Revised: 19 October 2026
Accepted: 20 October 2026
Published: 20 October 2026

How to Cite in APA Style:

Kidi, R., Wilhelmus, O. R.
(2026). Improving Student
Activity and Learning
Outcomes in Religiosity
Education through the
STAD Cooperative Learning
Model. *JPAK: Jurnal
Pendidikan Agama Katolik*,
26(2), 418-429

Introduction

Education is a strategic means of improving the quality of human resources, because through it students develop knowledge, skills, attitudes, and character. [Indrawati et al. \(2024\)](#) affirm that education is the main foundation that determines the direction of national development. This view aligns with Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System, which defines education as a conscious and planned effort that enables students to develop their potential actively, including spiritual and religious strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and skills ([Pelawi et al., 2021](#)). In pursuing these aims, teachers play a central role. They are not merely transmitters of content but also educators, guides, facilitators, and motivators who influence students' learning success ([Sihombing et al., 2026](#)).

*Corresponding author: Rosalia Kidi  liabaok@gmail.com
 <https://doi.org/10.34150/jpak.v26i2>

Religiosity Education contributes to the spiritual and moral development of students by instilling universal values. Unlike Religious Education, which often emphasizes the teachings and practices of a particular religion, Religiosity Education focuses on the formation of conscience and the inner appropriation of values, regardless of differences in religious belief (Rukiyanto, 2021; Putri & Hendra, 2024). Religiosity is the inner dimension of the human person, related to the voice of conscience and the personal appropriation of religious values such as love, tolerance, honesty, care, and solidarity, which need to be deepened and lived in students' daily lives. Religiosity Education serves as a means of deepening, appropriating, and communicating faith among students of different religions and beliefs, so that they may become open persons who respect differences and cooperate for the common good (Heribertus, as cited in Alfianingtyas, 2015). Religion, by contrast, concerns institutions, rules, organization, and the content of the teachings of a particular religion (Mangunwijaya, as cited in Alfianingtyas, 2015). For adolescents, this approach to education is important for nurturing tolerance, honesty, responsibility, empathy, and compassion in everyday life (Goreta et al., 2021).

These values are essential in Indonesia's plural society. Their inadequate cultivation may lead adolescents to become fanatical toward their own culture, religion, and ethnic group. Fanaticism is an excessive conviction in the superiority of one's own social, cultural, and religious values, which closes a person to the positive values of others (Suroyo et al., 2006). Among adolescents, cultural fanaticism appears, for example, when foreign popular culture is admired excessively while one's own culture is regarded as less valuable or when one's own culture is deemed superior and other cultures are disparaged (Tim Majelis Pendidikan Katolik KAS, 2001). Religious fanaticism appears when adolescents consider only their own religion, belief, culture, and ethnic group to be the best and the true ones, while regarding others as wrong, inferior, and unworthy of acceptance. Such adolescents reject dialogue with other religions and beliefs and may even impose their own beliefs on others (Nurish, 2019). This attitude can give rise to prejudice, intolerance, social conflict, and even violence in society (Lesmana & Syafiq, 2022; Hakim, 2023).

Preventing fanaticism among students living in Indonesia's highly plural social and cultural setting requires religiosity education of higher quality. Such education should not stop at abstract concepts of religiosity. It should also give students more room to engage in dialogue, to listen, to understand one another, and to cooperate with peers of different social, cultural, ethnic, religious, and belief backgrounds for the sake of the common good. In practice, however, this education has not yet provided sufficient space for such meaningful interactions. This problem is closely related to teaching methods that remain monotonous and teacher-centered, which leave students bored, poorly motivated, and minimally involved in discussion, dialogue, and group work (Lebao & Nitit, 2025; Putri & Hendra, 2024).

The researcher found a similar problem during a school internship at SMKS (Private Vocational High School) Farmasi Katolik Citra Farma, Wlingi, East Java, in 2025. Student participation in Religiosity Education was low. Students were reluctant to ask questions and express opinions, group cooperation was not yet

effective, and some students preferred to talk with friends rather than attend to the teacher's explanation. These conditions were closely related to the teacher-centered lecture method.

One alternative for overcoming teacher-centered learning is the cooperative learning model STAD. This model places students in small groups that are heterogeneous in academic ability and background. Through group work, students not only understand the material but also learn to ask questions, express opinions, cooperate, and respect differences, thereby fostering brotherhood and solidarity (Wulandari, 2022; Novita et al., 2025; Kurniasih & Sani, 2015). STAD is a type of cooperative learning that emphasizes cooperation within small groups of four to five students, heterogeneous in gender, cultural and religious background, and academic ability (Slavin, as cited in Kurniasih & Sani, 2015). Students are guided to understand and deepen the religiosity material through discussion, question-and-answer sessions, observation, and quizzes, and the best-performing groups are rewarded. Group discussion, question-and-answer sessions, and observation motivate students to exchange opinions openly and to deepen their understanding together. Individual quizzes ascertain how far students, individually and collectively, have mastered the material (Nurdyansyah, as cited in Arsyad & Fahira, 2023; Kurniasih & Sani, 2015). Group rewards increase motivation and engagement and encourage students to support one another in reaching the learning goals (Hasniyanti et al., as cited in Lodo et al., 2025). Applying STAD in Religiosity Education is therefore expected to improve student activity and learning outcomes and, at the same time, to foster a spirit of dialogue, cooperation, mutual respect, and tolerance in students' daily lives, both at school and in the wider community.

Accordingly, this study aims to describe the implementation of the STAD steps in Religiosity Education on the topic of Cultural, Religious, and Belief Fanaticism; to evaluate the improvement of student activity, both individual and group; to examine the improvement of student learning outcomes based on an objective test; and to assess the improvement of teacher activity under the STAD model. The findings are expected to offer teachers guidance for implementing active, collaborative, and student-centered learning through STAD.

Method

This classroom action research used a quantitative approach supported by a qualitative approach and was carried out in two cycles. The design followed the spiral model of Kemmis and McTaggart (1988), in which each cycle consisted of four stages: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting.

The intervention applied the STAD cooperative learning model to the topic of Cultural, Religious, and Belief Fanaticism. Each cycle lasted 2×45 minutes and comprised material presentation, teamwork, an individual quiz, analysis of test results, and group rewards. For group work, students were divided into four groups, heterogeneous in term of gender, religion, and culture (Slavin, as cited in Kurniasih & Sani, 2015). The study was conducted at SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma Wlingi, Blitar Regency, East Java, in the 2026/2027 academic year. The subjects were 13 Grade X students. The researcher acted as both teacher and researcher, and the Religiosity Education teacher served as the collaborating teacher.

Data were collected through observation, an objective test, and group discussion. The instruments were an observation sheet for student activity in groups, an observation sheet for teacher activity completed by the collaborating teacher, a 10-item multiple-choice test, and discussion questions for the groups. Data were analyzed using descriptive quantitative analysis complemented by qualitative description. Data analysis is the process of arranging, organizing, and grouping data into patterns, categories, and basic units of description (Nasution, 2018). The objective test results were analyzed both individually and by group. Learning mastery was calculated as $KB\% = (n/N) \times 100$; student group activity as $n = (\Sigma X/N) \times 100\%$; and the mean score as $Mean = \Sigma X/N$.

Results

This section presents both data and discussion regarding the respondents' profiles, the evaluation of student activities within group, student learning outcomes, and the teaching outcomes of the teacher who also served as the researcher.

Table 1. Respondent profile

Code	Institution	Sex	Religion	Ethnic origin
R1	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Islam	Javanese
R2	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Islam	Javanese
R3	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	L	Islam	Javanese
R4	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Islam	Kalimantan
R5	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	L	Islam	Javanese
R6	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Islam	Kalimantan
R7	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	L	Catholic	Javanese
R8	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Islam	Javanese
R9	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Catholic	NTT
R10	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Catholic	NTT
R11	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	L	Islam	Javanese
R12	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Protestant	NTT
R13	SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma	P	Islam	Javanese

Source: Researcher Data (2026)

The respondents were four male and nine female students of Islamic, Catholic, and Protestant backgrounds. They also came from different cultural backgrounds of Java, Kalimantan, and East Nusa Tenggara (NTT). This diversity provided a fitting setting for Religiosity Education that emphasizes tolerance, mutual consideration, respect, and peaceful coexistence. It also prompted the researcher to apply the STAD model, which, as Slavin (as cited in Kurniasih & Sani, 2015) explains, is a cooperative learning model that places students in heterogeneous groups to foster cooperation and mutual assistance in learning.

Student Group Activity

In Cycle I, the mean score for student group activity fell into the “good” category (75) but did not meet the school’s success indicator of 80% (table 2).

Table 2. Student group activity, Cycle I

Group	Score
1	$21/28 \times 100 = 75$
2	$21/28 \times 100 = 75$
3	$22/28 \times 100 = 79$
4	$20/28 \times 100 = 71$
N=4	Mean = $\frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{300}{4} = 75$

Source: Researcher Data (2026)

Observation showed that group cooperation was not yet effective. Some members remained passive, lacked confidence in expressing opinions, and relied on others to complete the tasks. Uneven distribution of roles also allowed a few students to dominate the discussion. This indicates that individual accountability, a core element of STAD, had not yet been fully realized in Cycle I. Telaumbanua (2021) explained that STAD fostered motivation and learning mastery through collaborative learning and each member’s responsibility for the group’s success.

In Cycle II, the mean score rose to the “very good” category (84.75), as shown in table 3.

Table 3. Student group activity, Cycle II

Group	Score
1	$23/28 \times 100 = 82$
2	$24/28 \times 100 = 86$
3	$25/28 \times 100 = 89$
4	$23/28 \times 100 = 82$
N=4	Mean = $\frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{339}{4} = 84,75$

Source: Researcher Data (2026)

The increase from a mean of 75 in Cycle I to 84.75 in Cycle II was supported by improvements based on the Cycle I reflection. The teacher used a manila-paper scoreboard on which stars were posted as rewards for the quality of discussion, presentation, and participation in question-and-answer sessions. This fostered healthy competition and motivated every member to contribute. The teacher also gave the groups more intensive guidance and reinforced each member’s responsibility in group activities. Lukitawati (2022) explains that STAD can increase student activity through discussion, interaction among group members, and responsibility for completing group tasks.

Student Learning Outcomes

In Cycle I, the mean objective test score fell into the “good” category (80.77), as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Objective test results, Cycle I

Code	Score
R1	$80/100 \times 100 = 80$
R2	$80/100 \times 100 = 80$
R3	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R4	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R5	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R6	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R7	$70/100 \times 100 = 70$
R8	$40/100 \times 100 = 40$
R9	$70/100 \times 100 = 70$
R10	$80/100 \times 100 = 80$
R11	$80/100 \times 100 = 80$
R12	$100/100 \times 100 = 100$
R13	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
Jumlah (N=13)	Mean = $\frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{1050}{13} = 80,77$

Source: Researcher Data (2026)

The mean score met the school's success indicator of 80. Three students, however, failed to reach the minimum score of 80, thus classical learning mastery was not achieved. The results suggest that most students understood the material on Cultural, Religious, and Belief Fanaticism through STAD, through this understanding was uneven. This disparity was related to differences in students' ability to grasp the material, their confidence in asking questions and voicing opinions, and ineffective group cooperation that was not yet effective. Therefore, learning improvement was therefore continued in Cycle II.

In Cycle II, the mean score rose to the "very good" category (92.31), as shown in [table 5](#).

Table 5. Objective test results, Cycle II

Code	Score
R1	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R2	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R3	$100/100 \times 100 = 100$
R4	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R5	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R6	$100/100 \times 100 = 100$
R7	$100/100 \times 100 = 100$
R8	$80/100 \times 100 = 80$
R9	$80/100 \times 100 = 80$
R10	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R11	$90/100 \times 100 = 90$
R12	$100/100 \times 100 = 100$
R13	$100/100 \times 100 = 100$

Code	Score
N: 13	Formula : 1. $KB\% = \frac{n}{N} \times 100$ 2. $Mean = \frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{1200}{13} = 92,31$

Source: Researcher Data (2026)

In Cycle II, all students reached the minimum score of 80, which falls in the “very good” category, so the learning success indicator was met. The improvement in learning outcomes paralleled the rise in student activity and in the quality of group work. Nurdyansyah as cited in [Arsyad & Fahira \(2023\)](#) explains that group work in STAD gives students opportunities to discuss, review answers, express opinions, and ask one another questions. Through more effective discussion, students who struggled with the material received help from their peers and could overcome their difficulties.

Teacher Activity

Observation of the teacher’s activity, in her role as researcher, was carried out by the collaborating teacher. In Cycle I, the mean score was into the “good” category (79.41%), as shown in [table 6](#).

Table 6. Teacher Activity Observation Sheet, Cycle I

STAD steps (Student Teams Achievement Division)		Cycle I			
		Indicator	1	2	3 4
Introduction	1.	The teacher opens the Religiosity lesson with prayer and checks attendance.			✓
	2.	The teacher motivates students on the importance of respecting cultural, religious, and belief differences in daily life.			✓
	3.	The teacher states the topic and learning objectives clearly.			✓
Material presentation	4.	The teacher explains the meaning of cultural fanaticism, examples of fanatical attitudes, and their effects on social life and interreligious relations.			✓
	5.	The teacher explains the diversity of religions and beliefs in Indonesia and the importance of tolerance.			✓
	6.	The teacher gives real-life examples of respect for cultural, religious, and belief differences.			✓
Teamwork	7.	The teacher forms heterogeneous groups of 3–5 students.			✓
	8.	Students discuss to understand the			✓

STAD steps (Student Teams Achievement Division)	Indicator	Cycle I			
		1	2	3	4
	material and complete tasks and questions on tolerance and fanaticism.				
	9. Students help group members who have not yet understood the material.		✓		
Quiz	10. Students take the quiz individually without help from peers.			✓	
	11. The teacher assesses the quiz results to measure students' understanding.				✓
Individual development score	12. The teacher calculates each student's score improvement based on the quiz results.			✓	
	13. The teacher recognizes students' effort and progress.			✓	
Group reward	14. The teacher rewards the best-performing group.		✓		
	15. The teacher motivates the other groups to be more active and cohesive.			✓	
Closing	16. The teacher and students conclude the lesson on respecting cultural, religious, and belief diversity and rejecting fanaticism.				✓
	17. The teacher asks a student to lead the closing prayer.				✓
Rating scale: 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good.					
Score = $(\Sigma X/N) \times 100\% = 54/68 \times 100\% = 79.41\%$.					
Source: Researcher Data (2026)					

These results show that the teaching activity of the teacher, who was also the researcher, had not yet met the established success indicator of 79.41%. Among the causes were that the teacher's guidance of each group still needed strengthening, direction during the discussions was not yet optimal, and the motivation and rewards given to the groups were insufficient.

In Cycle II, the mean score of the teacher's activity, observed by the collaborating teacher, rose to the "very good" category (92.65%), as shown in [table 7](#).

Table 7. Teacher Activity Observation Results, Cycle II

STAD steps (Student Teams Achievement Division)		Indicator	Cycle I			
			1	2	3	4
Introduction	1.	The teacher opens the Religiosity lesson with prayer and checks attendance.				✓
	2.	The teacher motivates students on the importance of respecting cultural, religious, and belief differences in daily life.				✓
	3.	The teacher states the topic and learning objectives clearly.				✓
Material presentation	4.	The teacher explains the meaning of cultural fanaticism, examples of fanatical attitudes, and their effects on social life and interreligious relations.				✓
	5.	The teacher explains the diversity of religions and beliefs in Indonesia and the importance of tolerance.			✓	
	6.	The teacher gives real-life examples of respect for cultural, religious, and belief differences.				✓
Teamwork	7.	The teacher forms heterogeneous groups of 3–5 students.			✓	
	8.	Students discuss to understand the material and complete tasks and questions on tolerance and fanaticism.				✓
	9.	Students help group members who have not yet understood the material.				✓
Quiz	10.	Students take the quiz individually without help from peers.				✓
	11.	The teacher assesses the quiz results to measure students’ understanding.			✓	
Individual development score	12.	The teacher calculates each student’s score improvement based on the quiz results.			✓	
	13.	The teacher recognizes students’ effort and progress.				✓
Group reward	14.	The teacher rewards the best-performing group.				✓
	15.	The teacher motivates the other groups to be more active and cohesive.				✓

STAD steps (Student Teams Achievement Division)	Indicator	Cycle I			
		1	2	3	4
Closing	16. The teacher and students conclude the lesson on respecting cultural, religious, and belief diversity and rejecting fanaticism.				✓
	17. The teacher asks a student to lead the closing prayer.				✓
Rating scale: 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good.					
Score = $(\Sigma X/N) \times 100\% = 63/68 \times 100\% = 92.65\%$.					
Source: Researcher Data (2026)					

The increase in score was supported by improvements made on the basis of the Cycle I reflection. The teacher managed the lesson better, strengthened students' learning motivation, guided the discussions more intensively by moving from group to group, used more engaging learning media, and awarded stars to groups that cooperated well. Kewuel (2010) asserts that in cooperative learning the teacher's role is to facilitate the learning process, while students are encouraged to cooperate and to learn from their peers. Better lesson management and teacher guidance therefore also contributed to more active and collaborative learning.

Conclusion

Applying the STAD learning model to the topic of Cultural, Religious, and Belief Fanaticism improved both the learning process and the learning outcomes of Grade X students at SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma Wlingi. The model was implemented through the steps of objective delivery and motivation, material presentation, heterogeneous grouping, teamwork, an individual quizzes, and group rewards, and it was refined in Cycle II on the basis of the Cycle I reflection.

The improvement in the learning process is shown by the rise in student group-work activity from 75.00% to 84.75%, in teacher activity (the teacher also being the researcher) from 79.41% to 92.65%, and in the mean objective test score from 80.77 to 92.31.

Recommendations

Religiosity Education teachers are advised to adopt STAD as one alternative for collaborative learning and to carry out every stage consistently: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. Teachers should also provide intensive guidance and strengthen students' learning motivation, so that students participate actively, complete learning tasks responsibly, and achieve better learning outcomes. Other researchers are advised to apply STAD to different topics, educational levels, and subjects, to test how far it can likewise improve the learning process and educational outcomes in those contexts.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the principal, the Religiosity Education teacher who served as collaborating teacher, the Grade X students, and everyone at SMKS Farmasi Citra Farma Wlingi who granted permission, gave assistance, took part as respondents, and accompanied the researcher throughout this study.

References

- Alfianingtyas, R. (2015). *Implementasi pendidikan religiositas dalam pembentukan komitmen keberagamaan siswa Muslim di SMP Kanisius Gayam Yogyakarta*. Skripsi. Yogyakarta: Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga.
- Arsyad, M., & Fahira, E. F. (2023). *Model-model pembelajaran dalam Kurikulum Merdeka*. Eureka Media Aksara.
- Goreta, G., Patampang, C., & Leppang, J. (2021). Religiusitas sebagai bagian dari pendidikan karakter siswa. *Research and Development Journal of Education*, 7(1), 553–557. <https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v7i1.16977>
- Hakim, N. (2023). Permasalahan izin pendirian tempat ibadah dan problematika toleransi keagamaan di Indonesia. *Gema Keadilan*, 10(2), 72–79. <https://doi.org/10.14710/gk.2023.20347>
- Indrawati, M., & Sari, Y. I. (2024). Memahami warisan budaya dan identitas lokal di Indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pendidikan IPS*, 18(1), 77–85. <https://ejournal.unikama.ac.id/index.php/JPPi/article/view/9902>
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1988). *The action research planner* (3rd ed.). Deakin University Press.
- Kewuel, H. K (2010). Pendidikan Agama Katolik: Antara konsep dasar dan teknis pendukung perubahan kurikulum dalam sistem pendidikan nasional. *JPAK: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Katolik*, 3(2), 20–29. <https://ejournal.widyayuwana.ac.id/jpak/article/view/87>
- Kurniasih, I., & Sani, B. (2015). *Ragam pengembangan model pembelajaran untuk peningkatan profesionalitas guru*. Kata Pena.
- Lebao, Y. A. N., & Nitit, K. W. (2025). Penerapan metode diskusi dalam pembelajaran PAK guna meningkatkan hasil belajar peserta didik kelas XB SMAS PGRI Swasthika Lewoleba. *Pubmedia Jurnal Penelitian Tindakan Kelas Indonesia*, 2(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.47134/ptk.v2i2.1424>
- Lesmana, R. P. D., & Syafiq, M. (2022). Fanatisme agama dan intoleransi pada pengguna media sosial. *Character: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 9(3), 36–49. <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/character/article/view/46146>
- Lodo, M. L., Jodho, M. N., Gowe, M. B., Meo, V., & Sayangan, Y. V. (2025). Analisis strategi pembelajaran berbasis model kooperatif tipe STAD dalam meningkatkan motivasi belajar Bahasa Indonesia di SD. *Jurnal Citra Magang dan Persekolahan*, 3(4), 285–292. <https://doi.org/10.38048/jcmp.v3i4.5948>
- Lukitawati, E. (2022). Implementasi pembelajaran kooperatif model Student Team Achievement Division untuk meningkatkan aktivitas dan prestasi belajar siswa. *JAMP: Jurnal Administrasi dan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 5(3), 276–284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um027v5i32022p276>
- Nasution, L. M. (2018). Analisis data penelitian. *Hikmah*, 15(2), 137–148. <https://ejournal.staisumatera-medan.ac.id/index.php/hikmah/article/view/35>
- Novita, N., Rahmat, T., Imamuddin, M., & Firmanti, P. (2025). Pengaruh model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) terhadap motivasi belajar dan kemampuan pemahaman konsep matematika.

- Jurnal Riset Rumpun Matematika dan Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam*, 4(1), 135–148.
<https://prin.or.id/index.php/JURRIMIPA/article/view/4955>
- Nurish, A. (2019). Dari fanatisme ke ekstremisme: Ilusi, kecemasan, dan tindakan kekerasan. *Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya*, 21(1), 31–40.
<https://ejournal.brin.go.id/jmb/article/view/10452>
- Pelawi, J. T., Idris, & Fadhlani, M. (2021). Undang-undang nomor 20 tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional dalam upaya pencegahan pernikahan dini (di bawah umur). *Jurnal Education and Development Institut Pendidikan Tapanuli Selatan*, 9(2), 562–566. <https://journal.ipts.ac.id/index.php/ED/article/view/2792>
- Putri, A. E., & Hendra Dwi Asmara, A. (2024). Deskripsi pemahaman toleransi beragama siswa Katolik kelas XII SMA Kolese De Britto. *CREDENDUM: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama*, 6(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.34150/credendum.v6i2.779>
- Rukiyanto, B. A. (2021). *Pendidikan religiusitas untuk perguruan tinggi*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sihombing, A. N., Tarigan, M. Q. M., & Pohan, I. S. (2026). Peran guru sebagai fasilitator dalam meningkatkan motivasi belajar peserta didik. *Al-Maidah Journal of Islamic Education (TARBIYAH)*, 2(1).
<https://jurnal.almaidah.or.id/index.php/TARBIYAH/id/article/view/816>
- Suroyo, A., Darmiarti, F. M. S., Santosa, A. J. B., Pratama, F. J., Windarto, B. B., & Suhardiyanto, H. J. (2006). *Agama dan kepercayaan membawa pembaruan: Untuk SMA/SMK kelas 1 - Buku siswa*. Kanisius.
- Telaumbanua, A. (2021). Implementasi model pembelajaran Cooperative Learning STAD untuk meningkatkan motivasi belajar mahasiswa Pendidikan Teknik Bangunan IKIP Gunungsitoli pada mata kuliah Manajemen Konstruksi. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan dan Pengajaran (JRPP)*, 4(1), 173–177.
<https://doi.org/10.31004/jrpp.v4i1.1903>
- Tim Majelis Pendidikan Katolik KAS. 2001. *Agama Membawa Pembaruan: Untuk SMU/K Kelas 1*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Wulandari, I. (2022). Model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe STAD (Student Teams Achievement Division) dalam pembelajaran MI. *Jurnal Papeda: Jurnal Publikasi Pendidikan Dasar*, 4(1), 17–23.
<https://doi.org/10.36232/jurnalpendidikandasar.v4i1.1754>