Journal of Education, Learning Innovation and Transformation
https://ejournal.natacendekia.org/index.php/JOELIT
E-ISSN 3164-8886
Vol. 1, No. 1, June 2026, pp. 1-11

Discovery Learning as Guided Discovery in Islamic Jurisprudence Learning: Teacher Scaffolding and Student Participation

Naili Riskiana[1], Arditya Prayogi[2*], Riki Nasrullah[3]
[1,2]UIN K.H. Abdurrahman Wahid Pekalongan, Indonesia
[3]Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
[1]nailiriski@gmail.com, [2]arditya.prayogi@uingusdur.ac.id*, [3]rikinasrullah@unesa.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received : 31/7/2026
Revised : 09/8/2026
Accepted : 10/8/2026
Online : 14/8/2026

Keywords:
Discovery Learning;
Inquiry;
Scaffolding;
Fiqh Instruction.

ABSTRACT

Prior studies of discovery learning mainly report outcome gains in science and mathematics, while few explain how teacher guidance operates in Grade VII Fiqh, where inquiry must remain consistent with religious sources. This qualitative descriptive field study examined the six discovery-learning phases, student responses, and implementation conditions at SMP NU Karangdadap, Pekalongan Regency. Data came from classroom observation, semi-structured interviews with the principal and Fiqh teacher, and lesson documents. Evidence was coded deductively by phase and then grouped into response, supporting, and inhibiting themes through triangulation. All six phases—stimulation, problem statement, data collection, data processing, verification, and generalization—were observed, but participation was uneven. The practice was better characterized as guided discovery because the teacher framed problems, selected core sources, monitored groups, verified accuracy, and modeled conclusions. Teacher facilitation, varied media, facilities, collaboration, and leadership support enabled implementation, whereas lecture dependence, limited time, and resistance to independent learning constrained it. Fiqh discovery learning therefore requires staged scaffolding, explicit task products, selected sources, and realistic time allocation.

This is an open access article under the CC–BY-SA license

A. INTRODUCTION

Islamic Jurisprudence (Fiqh) learning in junior high schools (Madrasah Tsanawiyah) cannot simply be viewed as an activity that conveys the rules and regulations of worship. Material such as the procedures for Friday prayers requires students to understand the foundations, sequence, rationale, and application in religious life. National education goals also prioritize student engagement, the development of potential, spiritual strength, and skills as part of the educational process, not simply memorization (Law No. 20/2003; Pristiwanti et al., 2022). Therefore, Islamic Jurisprudence (Fiqh) learning requires learning experiences that provide space for students to ask questions, seek answers, test their understanding, and connect concepts to practice.

Problems encountered in grade VII of SMP NU Karangdadap demonstrate a gap between these goals and students' learning experiences. Initial observations showed that some students viewed religious studies as easy and unnecessary to study seriously. Unstructured lectures and discussions led to a decline in attention; some students were

passive, easily bored, and lacked the drive to demonstrate their abilities. This situation is not simply a matter of individual motivation. Classroom interaction patterns, assignment formats, learning resources, and the way teachers provide opportunities for reflection all determine whether students become recipients of information or agents of learning (Pane & Dasopang, 2017; Wahidin et al., 2021).

Discovery learning offers a shift in these roles. Students do not immediately receive concepts in their final form, but are guided to identify problems, gather information, process findings, check the accuracy of answers, and draw conclusions. This model is often understood as student-centered learning, but the emphasis on discovery does not mean teachers let students work without direction. Studies of inquiry and discovery learning models show that support, feedback, modeling, and guiding questions are necessary to keep students' explorations connected to learning objectives (Dobber et al., 2017; Lazonder & Harmsen, 2016; Roth, 2018). In classrooms with students of varying readiness, the quality of guidance is the difference between meaningful inquiry and mere idle activity.

The six stages used in this study—stimulation, problem statement, data collection, data processing, verification, and generalization—are conceptually comparable to the inquiry cycle of orientation, question formulation, investigation, interpretation, and communication (Pedaste et al., 2015). However, the literature does not treat discovery as a single, unassisted procedure. Roth (2018) questions simplistic claims that students discover concepts independently, whereas Lazonder and Harmsen (2016), Dobber et al. (2017), and van Uum et al. (2016) show that prompts, modeling, feedback, and task structure are central to productive inquiry. The strength of this literature is its explanation of guidance; its limitation for the present study is that it is dominated by science-oriented contexts and does not fully address subjects in which conclusions must also meet normative religious standards.

Empirical studies in mathematics, science, and elementary education generally associate discovery learning with achievement, active participation, problem-solving, or critical and creative thinking (Fajri, 2019; Jana & Fahmawati, 2020; Kristin, 2016; Noer, 2018; Salo, 2016; Yuliana, 2018). These studies demonstrate the model's potential, but many rely on outcome comparisons and give limited attention to what teachers actually do when students formulate weak questions, copy information, produce inaccurate answers, or resist group work. Consequently, positive score or activity gains cannot by themselves explain the quality of implementation at each phase or the boundary between learner autonomy and necessary teacher intervention.

Research in religious education provides a closer comparison but remains incomplete. Constructive simulation can improve the relevance of Christian Religious Education (Mugo et al., 2024), disciplinary reading can help students take evidence-based positions in religious education (Unstad & Fjørtoft, 2021), and teacher competence is a prerequisite for implementing innovative lesson frameworks (Saoke et al., 2022). Nevertheless, these studies focus respectively on simulation outcomes, textual positioning, and teacher awareness rather than the complete six-stage discovery process in a Fiqh classroom. Fiqh also combines procedural learning with normative accuracy, so peer agreement alone cannot validate conclusions about worship practices (Masykur, 2019). However, few qualitative classroom studies explain how all six discovery-learning phases are enacted in Grade VII Fiqh, what forms of scaffolding preserve source accuracy, and why participation remains uneven during implementation.

To address this gap, the article analyzes three connected aspects: the enactment of the six discovery-learning phases in seventh-grade Fiqh, the student-response patterns

visible during the activities, and the supporting and inhibiting conditions surrounding implementation. The study does not test causal effectiveness through score comparison. Its contribution is an evidence-based account of classroom process that distinguishes guided discovery from both unassisted exploration and lecture-dominated group work, while showing why verification and staged scaffolding are especially important in normative-procedural religious learning.

B. METHODS

This was a field-based qualitative descriptive study, not a systematic literature review. The design was selected because the research question concerns how discovery learning was enacted, how students responded during the process, and what contextual conditions supported or constrained it, rather than the statistical effect of an intervention (Anggito & Setiawan, 2018; Kaharuddin, 2021). The study was conducted at SMP NU Karangdadap, Pekalongan Regency, a private junior high school implementing varied learning models within the Independent Curriculum. A preliminary observation was conducted in November 2025 to sharpen the field focus, and primary data collection was conducted in January 2026.

Participants were selected purposively because of their direct roles in policy and classroom implementation. The two key informants were the principal and the Islamic Religious Education teacher responsible for Grade VII Fiqh. The principal provided information on school policy, facilities, leadership support, and implementation challenges; the teacher explained lesson planning, scaffolding at each phase, learning resources, assessment, time management, and student responses. Student voices were not collected through interviews; therefore, statements about students refer to observed behavior and adult informant accounts rather than self-reported experience. The data corpus also included lesson plans, student worksheets, Fiqh textbooks, photographs, videos or images of activities, and relevant school documents.

Three qualitative guides were used. First, the observation guide operationalized the six discovery-learning phases: the stimulus and initial response; student question formulation; sources used during data collection; ways groups sorted and interpreted information; teacher and peer verification; and student conclusion-making. Cross-cutting indicators recorded teacher prompts, group participation, media use, time allocation, and off-task or resistant behavior. Second, the semi-structured interview guide covered the rationale for model selection, planning, forms of scaffolding, source selection, student readiness, school support, and constraints. Illustrative prompts included, 'How do you guide students when they cannot formulate questions?' and 'Which stages are difficult to complete within the available lesson time?' Third, a documentation checklist examined whether lesson plans, worksheets, textbooks, media, and activity records corresponded with the observed phases. The guides were derived from the research questions and the six-phase discovery-learning framework. Because they functioned as flexible qualitative guides rather than standardized scales, no psychometric test was applied; content adequacy was addressed through indicator-to-question alignment and refinement of the field focus after the preliminary observation.

Observation was used to record the lesson sequence, teacher–student interaction, group work, presentation, media use, and visible engagement or resistance. Interviews clarified the reasons behind actions observed in class and the institutional conditions that could not be inferred from observation alone. Documentation was then compared with the observation and interview records to determine whether planned activities, available

resources, and enacted practices were consistent. This combination ensured that the findings were grounded in field evidence rather than in a review of published studies.

Analysis proceeded iteratively through data reduction, display, and verification (Rijali, 2018; Sidiq & Choiri, 2019). In first-cycle coding, observation notes, interview records, and documents were assigned deductive labels corresponding to stimulation, problem statement, data collection, data processing, verification, and generalization. In second-cycle pattern coding, repeated indicators were grouped into student-response themes and into supporting or inhibiting conditions. A thematic matrix displayed the relationship among teacher actions, student activities, evidence sources, and interpretive meanings. Contrasting evidence—such as active group participation alongside sleepiness, off-task behavior, or dependence on direct explanation—was retained as a negative case rather than removed. Themes were checked through source, technique, and time triangulation, and conclusions were revised when observation, interview, and documentation evidence did not fully converge.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Learning Context and Forms of Discovery Learning Applied

Observation records, interviews with the principal and Fiqh teacher, and lesson documentation showed that discovery learning was used selectively rather than as a school-wide routine. In the observed Grade VII lesson on Friday prayer procedures, the teacher attempted to shift a previously teacher-centered pattern by combining source reading, group discussion, sequencing of worship procedures, presentation, and practice. The teacher functioned as a facilitator but remained visibly involved by visiting groups, clarifying tasks, checking the relevance of sources, and reviewing answers before presentation. Thus, the field data concern an enacted classroom process, not a synthesis of findings from the literature.

The observed autonomy was therefore bounded rather than unrestricted: students developed answers, but the task, primary materials, worksheet prompts, and accuracy checks were structured by the teacher. This finding agrees with Lazonder and Harmsen (2016) and Dobber et al. (2017), who identify guidance as a condition for productive inquiry, but it differs from outcome-oriented accounts that can make discovery appear successful merely because activity or scores increase (Jana & Fahmawati, 2020; Salo, 2016). In this Fiqh class, teacher intervention was not an incidental addition: it was the mechanism that kept questions answerable, sources relevant, and conclusions consistent with worship provisions. The practice is therefore more accurately interpreted as guided discovery.

The final coding matrix retained four category families: six implementation-phase codes; four student-response codes (participation, curiosity, collaboration, and confident or creative expression); five supporting-factor codes; and three inhibiting-factor codes. These numbers summarize the breadth of qualitative categories in the dataset, not the prevalence of attitudes among all students. Claims about participation were accepted only as observed classroom patterns and were not treated as statistical generalizations.

Table 1. Discovery Learning Implementation Matrix

Steps	Teacher Activity	Student Activity	Meaning of Observation
Stimulation	Asking about readiness; showing	Observing, responding, relating stimulus to material	There is a sense of curiosity and orientation to the topic

Steps	Teacher Activity	Student Activity	Meaning of Observation
	pictures/videos; asking initial questions		
Problem statement	Forming groups and directing the identification of problems regarding Friday prayer procedures	Ask questions and clarify things that are not understood	Problems become the focus of work, not just reading assignments
Data collection	Directing the use of LKS, textbooks, other books, and digital sources	Searching for relevant information and comparing sources	Source literacy and independence are beginning to emerge
Data processing	Visiting groups; giving directions when students are stuck	Discuss, sort, and organize answers	There is an exchange of ideas and negotiation of understanding
Verification	Checking results before presentation; correcting deviant answers	Presenting results, giving feedback, answering questions	The accuracy of the answers is tested by teachers and peers
Generalization	Give examples of how to summarize and emphasize concepts	Drawing up group conclusions and connecting them to practice	Understanding is formulated in student language with teacher reinforcement

Discovery Learning Stages in Jurisprudence Learning

Stimulation. The teacher opens the lesson by asking about the students' condition and readiness, then displays pictures related to the material. Videos, images, and initial questions are used to create a need to know what will be discussed. At this stage, the stimulus does not stop as a media sweetener. The teacher connects it with the task to be done so that students gain orientation about the direction of the search. This action is in line with the orientation function in inquiry, namely building context before students formulate problems (Pedaste et al., 2015).

Problem statement. The teacher formed groups and directed students to identify questions about Friday prayer procedures. The teacher summarized the expected shift in role as follows: 'Students should not just listen; they need to show thinking skills and the courage to ask questions' (teacher interview, January 2026). Observation nevertheless showed that questions did not emerge equally from every group; some students required examples and narrower prompts before they could formulate a workable problem. This finding supports Dah et al. (2023) on the value of question-formulation protocols, while also showing a limitation of simply instructing students to ask questions without staged assistance.

Data collection. Students search for information through worksheets, textbooks, other relevant books, and digital sources using cellphones. A variety of sources gives students the opportunity not to rely on one explanation. In the study of Jurisprudence, freedom of sources needs to be balanced with selection because the material is related to the accuracy of the provisions of worship. The teacher still plays a role in determining the main source and helping students distinguish information that is directly related to the assignment. These findings confirm that source literacy in religious education requires

conceptual tools and disciplinary direction, not just the ability to find information (Unstad & Fjørtoft, 2021).

Data processing. After obtaining information, students discuss and revise their answers. The teacher visits each group, checks progress, and provides solutions when the group is unsure. This intervention demonstrates the scaffolding function, providing assistance at points of difficulty, rather than providing complete answers. In discovery learning, data processing is a stage prone to degenerating into copying sources. Group discussions accompanied by teacher questions help students transform information into arguments, sequences, and decisions (Dobber et al., 2017; Großmann & Wilde, 2019).

Verification. The teacher checks each group's answers before presentation. Answers that are too far from the problem are corrected, while answers that are appropriate are forwarded to the class forum. Groups present their results, and other groups provide questions or feedback. Verification occurs through two channels: conceptual checking by the teacher and social testing through peer feedback. The class becomes more interactive because students have a reason to listen to other groups' presentations. Teachers report that the classroom atmosphere is more active and students are less bored during this stage.

Generalization. The teacher first models how to draw conclusions, then asks groups to formulate their results in their own words. This sequence demonstrates that generalization is not the teacher's activity of concluding the lesson with a lengthy summary. Students remain the ones formulating conclusions, while the teacher maintains conceptual accuracy. In the Friday prayer procedure, the conclusion focuses on the relationship between the knowledge gained and its application. This type of closure is crucial to ensure that the discussion activity remains oriented toward the goal of Islamic jurisprudence, namely understanding and practicing sharia provisions (Masykur, 2019; Prayogi et al., 2026).

Student Response: Uneven Activity, Collaboration, and Creativity

Classroom observation showed a visible shift in participation during group searching, discussion, and presentation. Students asked task-related questions, compared information, prepared explanations, and responded to other groups. In the Friday prayer lesson, they had to arrange procedures and connect textual information with practice rather than repeat a definition. This pattern is consistent with studies linking discovery tasks to active participation and problem-solving (Jana & Fahmawati, 2020; Salo, 2016). However, the present qualitative evidence does not establish that the model caused a measurable increase in achievement or activity; it shows when and how participation became visible within one classroom process.

Creativity was treated as an observed response, not as a tested learning outcome. Its indicators were the willingness to propose questions, consult more than one source, reorganize information into an understandable explanation, and demonstrate procedural understanding without merely reproducing the teacher's wording. This interpretation is more cautious than studies that infer increased creative thinking from test-score differences (Septiani et al., 2016): the current data support the claim that guided discovery opened space for creative expression, but not a causal claim that students' creativity increased. It also remains bounded by the normative character of Fiqh, because creativity concerns explanation and problem-solving rather than inventing new worship provisions (Katz-Buonincontro, 2020).

Group work becomes the primary channel for participation. Students share resources, compare answers, listen to one another, and assign presentation tasks. The teacher not only regulates group composition but also monitors to ensure discussions do not stray

from the topic. This role aligns with findings that inquiry learning requires social regulation, where teachers need to bridge differences in ability, maintain academic conversation, and organize collaboration (Dobber et al., 2017). Without monitoring, active groups risk being dominated by some students while others simply follow along.

The data also contained negative cases. Interview records described several students as 'playing alone,' 'feeling sleepy,' or 'waiting for direct explanations,' while observation showed that participation was concentrated in students who understood the task and group role. These findings contradict any assumption that student-centered syntax automatically produces active learning for every student. Instead, they indicate a transition problem: learners accustomed to receiving explanations may interpret loosely structured discussion as unregulated time. This result is consistent with Aditomo and Klieme (2020) and Lazonder and Harmsen (2016) regarding the need for guidance, but extends their argument by showing that expected products, group roles, and staged prompts are also behavioral supports for students with low readiness.

Supporting and Inhibiting Factors for Implementation

Table 2. Supporting and Inhibiting Factor Matrix

Category	Field Evidence	Implications of Implementation
Supporting Factor	Teachers actively monitor and provide assistance	Scaffolding keeps the search focused
Supporting Factor	Positive attitudes and curiosity of some students	Participation grows when problems are clear and challenging
Supporting Factor	LKS, textbooks, videos, pictures, projectors, and mobile phones	Diverse sources enrich search and presentation
Supporting Factor	Classroom, computer room, prayer room, projector, and laboratory	Facilities support discussion, media, and practice
Supporting Factor	Principal support and group work culture	Innovation is easier to maintain as school policy
Inhibiting Factor	Teachers still rely on lectures and are not consistent in managing the class.	Training needs to focus on question design and scaffolding
Inhibiting Factor	Limited learning time	The search, presentation, and generalization stages require realistic allocation
Inhibiting Factor	Some students reject the new learning pattern	Transitions need to be gradual, instructions explicit, and group roles clear

At the factor level, five supporting categories and three inhibiting categories were retained after comparing observation, interview, and documentary evidence. The coding summary is presented in Table 2. The category counts are analytic descriptors, not frequencies of students; their function is to show which conditions recurred across the field record and how each condition affected implementation.

The first supporting factor was active teacher facilitation. The teacher guided each phase, responded at points of difficulty, and checked whether group conclusions were defensible. This finding agrees with Dobber et al. (2017) on the teacher's conceptual,

metacognitive, and social regulation, but it also challenges a common interpretation of student-centered learning as reduced teacher involvement. In the observed Fiqh lesson, less teacher control over student talk was accompanied by greater teacher responsibility for task design, source accuracy, and timely feedback.

Media and facilities expand the choice of activities. Textbooks and worksheets provide a controlled foundation; videos, images, projectors, and digital resources help build context and enrich inquiry. A prayer room (musala) is also relevant for materials requiring practice. The availability of tools does not automatically result in discovery learning, but it reduces reliance on verbal explanations. The school supports the model by providing resources and policies that create space for teachers to implement practicum-based learning.

Opportunities for collaboration are a supporting factor because students do not have to solve problems alone. Peers help explain terms, compare sequences, and correct answers. Collaboration also provides space for students who lack confidence to participate through group assignments before speaking in front of the class. However, these benefits depend on the division of roles and oversight. Groups that lack a shared goal can easily devolve into off-task conversations.

The central obstacle was incomplete implementation skill. The teacher acknowledged continued dependence on lecture and difficulty maintaining consistent classroom management. Short explanation can provide orientation or correct a misconception, but it contradicts the intended model when it replaces student searching, processing, or verification. This finding supports Saoke et al. (2022) on the importance of teacher competence, while adding a more specific implication: training should not stop at naming the model or memorizing its syntax. It should rehearse stimulus design, workable problem formulation, source selection, guiding questions, negative-case management, and process assessment.

Time constraints impact the completeness of syntax. Discovery learning requires time to search, discuss, verify, present, and conclude. If all activities are compressed into one meeting without prioritization, teachers tend to rush the processing phase or take over the conclusion. A more realistic solution is to limit the focus to one core problem, provide selected initial sources, set a time limit for each stage, and move the search for supporting materials to a pre-meeting task.

Student resistance suggests that changing the model requires the development of learning habits. Students accustomed to receiving explanations need examples of how to ask questions, how to use sources, and how to present results. Assistance can be gradually reduced once students understand the working pattern. Gradual support is more beneficial for students with low prior knowledge than letting them make discoveries without assistance (Großmann & Wilde, 2019).

Discovery Learning as Guided Discovery in Jurisprudence Learning

Taken together, the field evidence indicates that discovery learning in Grade VII Fiqh is more appropriately designed as guided discovery. This interpretation agrees with research showing that inquiry benefits from scaffolding, yet it differs from contexts in which guidance may be withdrawn once students begin exploring. In normative-procedural Fiqh, some form of teacher verification remains necessary through the final stage because an attractive group explanation can still be religiously inaccurate. The teacher therefore structures the stimulus, narrows the problem space, identifies primary sources, monitors processing, verifies accuracy, and models generalization, while students retain the main intellectual work of questioning, comparing evidence, explaining, and concluding.

Four principles can be derived from the research findings. First, the stimulus needs to be directly related to observable worship experiences or situations, not stand-alone images. Second, the problem must be open-ended enough to raise questions but limited enough to be resolved within class time. Third, learning resources need to be tiered: worksheets and textbooks as a foundation, followed by additional sources to enrich the explanations. Fourth, verification must combine peer dialogue and teacher reinforcement because the accuracy of Islamic jurisprudence material cannot be left to group consensus alone.

Student creativity also needs to be placed in a balanced way. Student creativity is not the freedom to generate new religious provisions, but rather the ability to formulate questions, seek reasons, explain in understandable ways, connect concepts and practices, and offer problem-solving strategies that remain relevant to the sources. This interpretation maintains pedagogical openness without obscuring the normative character of the subject.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Discovery learning in seventh-grade Islamic jurisprudence (Fiqh) at NU Karangdadap Middle School is implemented through six stages: stimulation, problem statement, data collection, data processing, verification, and generalization. In the Friday prayer procedure, students observe stimuli, formulate questions, seek information from worksheets, books, and digital sources, process answers in groups, present results, receive feedback, and draw conclusions. This practice is better understood as guided discovery because the teacher continuously provides structure, monitors groups, checks the accuracy of answers, and models how to draw conclusions. The process creates space for student participation, curiosity, collaboration, self-confidence, and the emergence of ideas, but responses are not uniform.

The implementation of the model is supported by teacher facilitation, positive student attitudes, varied media, school facilities, group work, and the support of the principal. Barriers include inconsistent teacher skills, limited time, and student resistance to new learning patterns. Teachers are advised to limit problems to a single, solvable focus, prepare tiered resources, divide time by stage, provide guiding questions, and gradually reduce support. Schools need to provide training based on classroom practice, not just syntax socialization. Further research needs to involve student voice and use learning outcome data to test the impact of the model without compromising the quality of the process.

REFERENCES

Aditomo, A., & Klieme, E. (2020). Forms of inquiry-based science instruction and their relations with learning outcomes: Evidence from high- and low-performing education systems. *International Journal of Science Education, 42*(4), 504–525. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1716093

Anggito, A., & Setiawan, J. (2018). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif.* CV Jejak.

Dah, N. M., Noor, M. S. A. M., Kamarudin, M. Z., & Ibrahim, M. M. (2023). Facilitation of student questioning in the Malaysian secondary science classroom using the Investigable Questioning Formulation Technique (IQFT) protocol. *Asia-Pacific Science Education, 9*(1), 9–43. https://doi.org/10.1163/23641177-bja10063

Dobber, M., Zwart, R., Tanis, M., & van Oers, B. (2017). Literature review: The role of the teacher in inquiry-based education. *Educational Research Review, 22*, 194–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.09.002

Fajri, Z. (2019). Model pembelajaran discovery learning dalam meningkatkan prestasi belajar siswa SD. *Jurnal IKA PGSD, 7*(2), 64–73.

Großmann, N., & Wilde, M. (2019). Experimentation in biology lessons: Guided discovery through incremental scaffolds. *International Journal of Science Education, 41*(6), 759–781. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1579392

Hilda, A., Putri, S., Salwa, D. M., Rinjani, D., Abasiyah, Z. P., Andini, R. F., ... & Prayogi, A. (2026). Negotiating religious moderation in digital narratives: A digital netnography of the Cidahu shelter house conflict on YouTube. *Societa: Journal of Society and Change*, *1*(1), 75-92.

Jana, P., & Fahmawati, A. A. N. (2020). Model discovery learning untuk meningkatkan kemampuan pemecahan masalah. *AKSIOMA: Jurnal Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika, 9*(1), 213–220. https://doi.org/10.24127/ajpm.v9i1.2157

Kaharuddin. (2021). Kualitatif: Ciri dan karakter sebagai metodologi. *Equilibrium: Jurnal Pendidikan, 9*(1), 1–8.

Katz-Buonincontro, J. (2020). A review of articles using observation methods to study creativity in education (1980–2018). *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 54*(3), 508–524. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.385

Kristin, F. (2016). Analisis model pembelajaran discovery learning dalam meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa SD. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar PerKhasa, 2*(1), 90–98.

Lazonder, A. W., & Harmsen, R. (2016). Meta-analysis of inquiry-based learning: Effects of guidance. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(3), 681–718. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315627366

Masykur, M. R. (2019). Metodologi pembelajaran Fiqih. *Al-Makrifat: Jurnal Kajian Islam, 4*(2), 31–44.

Maulana, M. S., Pratiwi, D., & Prayogi, A. (2026). Silent Luxury di Alam Tropis: Mangrove Forest Bathing sebagai Produk Wellness Tourism Berbasis Pengalaman Sensorik. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Pariwisata*, *2*(1), 29-45.

Mugo, A. M., Nyaga, M. N., Ndwiga, Z. N., & Atitwa, E. B. (2024). Evaluating learning outcomes of Christian religious education learners: A comparison of constructive simulation and conventional method. *Heliyon, 10*(11), e32632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e32632

Nabila, S., Ramadhani, Z. I., Zakis, N. F. P., Prabawan, R. J., Arinda, A. R., Akmalia, F., ... & Prayogi, A. (2026). Moderasi Beragama dalam Perbedaan Idulfitri Komunitas Muslim Buano Utara: Studi Netnografi. *Islamuna: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, *2*(1), 1-11.

Noer, S. H. (2018). Guided discovery model: An alternative to enhance students' critical thinking skills and critical thinking dispositions. *Jurnal Riset Pendidikan Matematika, 5*(1), 108–115. https://doi.org/10.21831/jrpm.v5i1.16809

Pane, A., & Dasopang, M. D. (2017). Belajar dan pembelajaran. *Fitrah: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu-Ilmu Keislaman, 3*(2), 333–352. https://doi.org/10.24952/fitrah.v3i2.945

Pedaste, M., Mäeots, M., Siiman, L. A., de Jong, T., van Riesen, S. A. N., Kamp, E. T., Manoli, C. C., Zacharia, Z. C., & Tsourlidaki, E. (2015). Phases of inquiry-based learning: Definitions and the inquiry cycle. *Educational Research Review, 14*, 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.02.003

Prayogi, A., Nasrullah, R., Abidin, R., Prasetya, D., & Marina, R. (2026). Reexamining the Lecture Method in Learning: A Contemporary Pedagogical Perspective. *GURUPEDIA: Journal of Teacher and Education*, *2*(1), 116-124.

Prayogi, A., Nasrullah, R., Fatimah, U., A'yun, Q., Setiawan, S., Hami, W., & Pujiono, I. P. (2026). Edukasi Hidup Sehat dan Penanaman Apotek Hidup bagi Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat (JPKM)*, *4*(1), 10-18.

Prayogi, A., Riandita, L., Nasrowi, B. M., & Nasrullah, R. (2026, June). Pergeseran Otoritas Guru di Tengah Maraknya Bimbingan Belajar. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Ilmu Komputer, Sosial Sains, Teknik dan Multi-Disiplin Ilmu* (Vol. 2, pp. 38-42).

Pristiwanti, D., Badariah, B., Hidayat, S., & Dewi, R. S. (2022). Pengertian pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling, 4(*6), 7911–7915.

Rijali, A. (2018). Analisis data kualitatif. *Alhadharah: Jurnal Ilmu Dakwah, 17*(33), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.18592/alhadharah.v17i33.2374

Roth, W.-M. (2018). Discovery learning: Zombie, phoenix, or elephant? *Instructional Science, 46*(1), 169–183. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-018-9450-8

Salo, Y. A. (2016). Pengaruh metode discovery learning terhadap keaktifan belajar siswa: Studi kuasi eksperimen kelas VII SMPN 6 Banda Aceh. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan, 16*(3), 297–304. https://doi.org/10.17509/jpp.v16i3.4825

Saoke, V. O., Ndwiga, Z. N., Githaiga, P. W., & Musafiri, C. M. (2022). Determinants of awareness and implementation of five-stage lesson plan framework among Christian Religious Education teachers in Meru County, Kenya. *Heliyon, 8*(11), e11177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11177

Sartutnun. (2022). *Discovery learning: Solusi jitu ketuntasan belajar*. Pusat Pengembangan Pendidikan dan Penelitian Indonesia.

Septiani, W., Isrok'atun, & Kurniadi, Y. (2016). Pengaruh model pembelajaran discovery learning terhadap keterampilan berpikir kreatif siswa pada materi sifat-sifat cahaya. *Jurnal Pena Ilmiah, 1*(1), 101–110.

Sidiq, U., & Choiri, M. M. (2019). *Metode penelitian kualitatif di bidang pendidikan*. CV Nata Karya.

Siregar, M., Sufaidi, A., Prayogi, A., & Esfahani, A. B. (2025). Eco-Hermeneutics and Scriptural Interpretation: Reimagining Sacred Texts for an Environmental Theology of Care. *Green Philosophy: International Journal of Religious Education and Philosophy*, *2*(1), 18-26.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. (2003).

Unstad, L., & Fjørtoft, H. (2021). Texts, readers, and positions: Developing a conceptual tool for teaching disciplinary reading in religious education. *Learning and Instruction, 73*, 101431. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101431

van Uum, M. S. J., Verhoeff, R. P., & Peeters, M. (2016). Inquiry-based science education: Towards a pedagogical framework for primary school teachers. *International Journal of Science Education, 38*(3), 450–469. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1147660

Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2017). Preparing pre-service history teachers for organizing inquiry-based learning: The effects of an introductory training program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 63*, 206–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.12.019

Wahidin, U., Ahmad, A., & Sholihin, M. (2021). Implementasi pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam berbasis multimedia di pondok pesantren. *Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 10*(1), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.30868/ei.v10i01.1203

Yuliana, N. (2018). Penggunaan model pembelajaran discovery learning dalam peningkatan hasil belajar siswa di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 2*(1), 21–28.