

SCENARIO BASED ASSESSMENT OF RELIGIOUS MODERATION AND ETHICAL REASONING IN S2 PAI UNZAH

Muhammad Hawal Sholeh¹, Ainur Rofiq Sofa², Muhammad Ichsan³

^{1,2}Universitas Islam Zainul Hasan Genggong Probolinggo

³Universitas Hafshawaty Zainul Hasan

Email: ¹abasmaulana223@gmail.com, ²bungaaklirik@gmail.com, ³ichsan29061997@gmail.com

Keywords:

*Scenario-Based
Assessment, Religious
Moderation, Ethical
Reasoning, Islamic
Education, Graduate
Assessment*

Abstract

This article proposes scenario-based assessment for evaluating religious moderation and ethical reasoning in the S2 PAI Program at Universitas Islam Zainul Hasan Genggong. Values-related learning outcomes are often assessed through attitude checklists or general statements that do not reveal how students reason when principles, interests, and consequences conflict. Using qualitative descriptive library research, the study integrates authentic assessment, ethical decision-making, oral assessment, religious moderation, and Islamic education literature. The findings indicate that carefully constructed scenarios can elicit students' abilities to identify stakeholders, recognize value tensions, interpret relevant Islamic sources, evaluate evidence, anticipate consequences, and justify proportionate educational action. Assessment should combine written analysis with oral deliberation and use an analytic rubric covering conceptual accuracy, inclusiveness, contextual sensitivity, ethical justification, and reflective awareness. Scenarios must avoid stereotyping groups and should permit multiple defensible conclusions. The study concludes that scenario-based assessment offers stronger evidence of value-informed judgment than declarative attitude measures when tasks are authentic, criteria are transparent, and lecturers moderate discussion ethically.

INTRODUCTION

Religious moderation is frequently included in Islamic education outcomes, yet its assessment remains challenging. Agreement with general statements does not necessarily demonstrate the ability to respond wisely to real disagreement, misinformation, exclusion, or tension between institutional rules and individual rights. Graduate students need to show how they analyze and act within complex educational situations (Husnia & Sofa, 2026).

Scenario-based assessment presents a concrete situation containing actors, evidence, uncertainty, and ethical tension. Students are asked to interpret the problem, consider alternatives, and justify a response. Unlike recall questions, scenarios reveal reasoning processes and the relationship among knowledge, values, context, and action. They are therefore suitable for outcomes that require professional judgment (Gulikers et al., 2004).

In PAI, ethical reasoning should be rooted in Islamic sources while remaining responsive to educational realities and human dignity. Students may need to balance

protection of faith, freedom from coercion, school harmony, parental expectations, and the developmental needs of learners. The quality of assessment depends on whether these tensions are represented fairly rather than reduced to simplistic correct-versus-wrong choices (Parawansah & Sofa, 2024).

This article aims to develop a scenario-based assessment framework for religious moderation and ethical reasoning in S2 PAI UNZAH. The model is conceptual and does not claim empirical implementation. It identifies scenario design principles, rubric dimensions, oral deliberation procedures, bias controls, and follow-up learning strategies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Scenario-based and authentic assessment

Scenario-based assessment uses realistic or plausible situations to elicit application of knowledge and judgment. Effective scenarios contain relevant details, incomplete information, competing values, and consequences. They should require analysis rather than cueing students toward an obvious socially desirable answer (Wiggins, 1990).

Authenticity is strengthened when the task resembles decisions encountered by lecturers, school leaders, curriculum developers, or researchers. Students may prepare a written response, policy recommendation, mediation plan, or instructional intervention. The product should be directed to a credible audience and constrained by available resources (Villarroel et al., 2018).

Religious moderation and ethical reasoning

Religious moderation in education involves balanced, non-violent, just, and contextually wise religious practice. Assessment should examine whether students can maintain principled commitment while respecting difference, avoiding dehumanization, and preventing harm. This requires reasoning rather than merely endorsing tolerance vocabulary (Husnia & Sofa, 2026).

Ethical reasoning includes recognizing a moral issue, identifying stakeholders, considering duties and consequences, evaluating alternatives, and justifying a decision. In Islamic education, these processes can be informed by Qur'anic and Hadith principles, maqasid, scholarly interpretations, educational evidence, and the lived context of learners.

Oral deliberation and reflective judgment

Written analysis can be polished without showing how students respond to challenge. Oral assessment allows lecturers to probe assumptions, introduce new facts, and ask students to compare alternatives. It can reveal depth of understanding, flexibility, and the ability to communicate respectfully under questioning (Joughin, 1998).

Oral deliberation should not reward confidence alone. Structured prompts, time allocation, and analytic criteria reduce bias. Students may also submit a post-deliberation reflection explaining whether new information changed their decision. This captures intellectual humility and willingness to revise (Brookfield & Preskill, 2016).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed qualitative descriptive library research. Sources on authentic and scenario-based assessment, ethical decision making, oral assessment, religious moderation, and Islamic education were analyzed thematically. The analysis focused on

scenario authenticity, ethical complexity, evidence use, scoring criteria, discussion procedures, and bias. These themes were synthesized into a graduate assessment model.

Credibility was supported through theoretical triangulation between assessment scholarship and Islamic educational values. No student responses were collected, and no claim is made about the current effectiveness of assessment at UNZAH. Future empirical work is needed to validate scenarios, test rubric reliability, examine cultural sensitivity, and compare scenario performance with other indicators of graduate competence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Constructing ethically complex scenarios

The first result is that scenarios should involve genuine tension among legitimate considerations. One example is a school response to a viral religious message that divides students; another is a curriculum dispute involving local tradition, parental concern, and national standards. The scenario should provide enough information for analysis without prescribing a single conclusion.

Designers should state the role assumed by the student, the audience, available authority, time constraints, and expected product. Additional information can be released during oral questioning to test whether the student can update a decision. Scenarios should be reviewed by content, assessment, and diversity experts before use.

Assessing the structure of ethical reasoning

The rubric should assess the reasoning pathway rather than agreement with the lecturer's preferred solution. Core dimensions include problem identification, stakeholder mapping, source interpretation, evidence quality, alternative analysis, proportionality, inclusion, and consequence awareness. High-level performance integrates these dimensions into a coherent decision.

Students should distinguish factual claims from value judgments and acknowledge uncertainty. They also need to explain why rejected alternatives are less appropriate. This requirement makes moderation observable through analytical fairness and proportionate action rather than through generic claims of balance (Ramadani & Sofa, 2025).

Combining written analysis and oral deliberation

A written response provides a stable record of the initial argument, while oral deliberation allows probing of assumptions and adaptability. Lecturers may ask what evidence would change the recommendation, how the response protects a minority student, or how the plan could be implemented without escalating conflict.

The oral component should use standardized prompt categories and brief scoring notes. A reflective addendum after the discussion documents learning and revision. This combination reduces overreliance on writing fluency and provides richer evidence of personal understanding and communication competence.

Controlling bias and harmful simplification

Poorly designed scenarios can reproduce stereotypes by repeatedly presenting particular groups as problems. They may also create false equivalence between harmful conduct and legitimate difference. Bias threatens both validity and the educational climate.

Scenario development should therefore include sensitivity review, varied social positions, neutral language, and evidence that avoids stigmatizing identities. Students must be assessed on the quality of reasoning, not conformity to political labels. Lecturers also need facilitation protocols for disagreement and debriefing after emotionally demanding cases.

Synthesis of discussion

The framework combines realistic scenarios, structured written analysis, oral deliberation, analytic scoring, and reflective revision. Religious moderation becomes assessable through stakeholder-sensitive and evidence-based judgment. Multiple defensible answers are possible, but every answer must demonstrate conceptual accuracy, ethical proportionality, and respect for human dignity.

Table 1. Scenario-based ethical reasoning framework

Assessment Focus	Scenario Practice	Evidence of Learning
Problem recognition	Identify value tension	Accurate ethical diagnosis
Stakeholder analysis	Map rights and consequences	Inclusive perspective
Decision justification	Compare alternatives	Proportionate reasoning
Reflective revision	Respond to oral challenge	Intellectual flexibility

The novelty of this article lies in operationalizing religious moderation as a structure of professional reasoning rather than a self-reported attitude. The model links Islamic sources, stakeholder analysis, consequence evaluation, oral challenge, and reflective revision. It also explicitly requires bias review so that assessment itself does not undermine the inclusive values it intends to measure.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that scenario-based assessment can provide meaningful evidence of religious moderation and ethical reasoning in S2 PAI UNZAH. It enables students to demonstrate how they interpret Islamic principles, educational evidence, stakeholder needs, and possible consequences when facing complex problems. Written analysis and oral deliberation should be assessed with transparent analytic criteria.

Scenario validity depends on authenticity, ethical complexity, cultural sensitivity, and freedom from stereotyping. The conceptual limitation of this study requires future research using expert validation, cognitive interviews, pilot testing, inter-rater reliability analysis, and comparison of student reasoning across different scenario types and courses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brookfield, S. D., & Preskill, S. (2016). *The discussion book: 50 great ways to get people talking*. Jossey-Bass.
- Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52(3), 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504676>
- Husnia, S., & Sofa, A. R. (2026). Religious moderation in the Ahlussunnah wal Jamaah perspective: Relevance for S1 PIAUD and S2 Islamic Education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Global and Multidisciplinary*, 2(2), 434-445.
- Jones, T. M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(2), 366-395. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1991.4278958>

- Joughin, G. (1998). Dimensions of oral assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23(4), 367-378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293980230404>
- Parawansah, S. H., & Sofa, A. R. (2024). Pendekatan komprehensif berbasis Al-Qur'an dan Hadits dalam pengembangan pendidikan Islam: Integrasi nilai, metode, evaluasi, sosio-kultural, dan kompetensi pendidik. *Karakter: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Pendidikan Islam*, 2(1), 187-205.
- Ramadani, S., & Sofa, A. R. (2025). Kejujuran dalam perspektif pendidikan Islam: Nilai fundamental, strategi implementasi, dan dampaknya terhadap pembentukan karakter santri di pesantren. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 3(1), 193-210.
- Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory*. Praeger.
- UNESCO. (2017). *Preventing violent extremism through education: A guide for policy-makers*. UNESCO.
- Villarroel, V., Bloxham, S., Bruna, D., Bruna, C., & Herrera-Seda, C. (2018). Authentic assessment: Creating a blueprint for course design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(5), 840-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1412396>
- Wiggins, G. (1990). The case for authentic assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 2, Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.7275/ffb1-mm19>
- Wulandari, R. H., Sofa, A. R., Aziz, A., Islam, M. H., & Bukhori, I. (2026). Urgensi desain pembelajaran PAI berbasis Kitab Ad-Diyanah dalam meningkatkan mutu pendidikan Islam di kelas II dan III SD Cahaya Cendekia Glagah Pakuniran. *Al-Madrasah: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*, 10(2), 932-943.
- Zhan, Y., Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2025). Designing for authentic assessment: A scoping review. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-025-01588-9>