HUMANIZING EDUCATION THROUGH CLASSROOM GUIDANCE SERVICES WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE LOVE-BASED CURRICULUM

Sayyid Muhammad Abdulloh Almustofa
UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, Indonesia
Jl. Jenderal Ahmad Yani No. 40A, Karanganjing, Purwanegara, Kecamatan Purwokerto Utara, Kabupaten Banyumas, Jawa Tengah, 53126

Juttalee Petsong
Walailak University, Thailand
222 Thaiburi, Thasala, District, Nakhon Si Thammarat 80160, Thailand

Email: tofan0747@gmail.com

Abstract: *This article examines the idea of humanizing education through classroom guidance services within the framework of a Love-Based Curriculum. The discussion arises from the long-term national agenda of strengthening Indonesia's human resources toward the vision of Indonesia Emas 2045, which highlights not only academic excellence but also character formation and social maturity. In many schools, learning practices still prioritize cognitive achievement, while students' personal growth, empathy, and relational awareness receive less systematic attention. This study employs a library research approach, drawing on literature related to dialogical pedagogy, humanistic education, and comprehensive school counseling models. The analysis indicates that classroom guidance can serve as a meaningful space for dialogue, reflection, and personal development when it is designed based on students' actual needs and implemented through participatory methods. Within the framework of a Love-Based Curriculum, guidance activities are grounded in values such as respect, compassion, and responsibility. In this way, classroom guidance moves beyond the delivery of developmental content and becomes a space for nurturing self-awareness and social responsibility. Such an approach contributes to character education and supports broader efforts to develop humane and responsible citizens in line with national development goals.*

Keywords: *humanizing education, classroom guidance, Love-Based Curriculum, character education*

INTRODUCTION

The year 2045 is projected to be an important milestone in the journey of the Indonesian nation through the vision of Indonesia Emas (Golden Indonesia). This vision places human resource development as the main axis toward becoming a developed country with a strong economy, equitable prosperity, sustainable social justice, and global competitiveness (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/Bappenas Republik Indonesia, 2026). Within this framework, education is given a strategic mandate as the arena for forming Indonesians who are not only technically competent but also morally, socially, and humanly mature. However, this mandate confronts the reality of formal education, which still shows symptoms of dehumanization in everyday practice.

The dehumanization of education is evident in the tendency to treat students as passive objects of the learning process. Learning activities often proceed as a one-way process in which knowledge is transferred mechanically, without opening space for dialogue and meaningful participation. This situation hinders the development of critical consciousness and diminishes the dignity of students as subjects who have experiences, voices, and social contexts. This condition is not an incidental event but the culmination of an educational structure that is still influenced by the *banking model of education* as criticized by Paulo Freire in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. In that model, education operates as an instrument of control over consciousness rather than as a praxis of liberation (Freire, 2008).

Freire asserts that education that loses its dialogical dimension has the potential to reproduce relations of oppression in subtle and concealed forms. Knowledge is positioned as an indisputable authority, while students are positioned as passive recipients who are expected to comply. In this context, education moves away from the essence of humanization and toward the objectification of human beings. Freire's critique is relevant for reading contemporary educational practices that appear progressive in policy but remain problematic in pedagogical relationships.

A number of studies in Indonesia have raised the idea of humanizing education from various perspectives. Zuchdi (2004) showed that humanistic education contributes significantly to students' character formation and conflict resolution skills. Tilaar (2012) emphasized the importance of transformative pedagogy in responding to complex social change. On the other hand, studies of education based on religious values also position humanization as part of the mission of honoring human dignity. However, most of these studies stop at normative conceptual elaboration and have not specifically examined how

humanization is realized in the structure of educational services in schools, particularly in the domain of Guidance and Counseling.

In response to this crisis, the Love-Based Curriculum was developed as a normative framework that emphasizes the ethical dimension of education. This curriculum places empathy, respect for human dignity, dialogue, social justice, and respect for diversity as the core values of the educational process. This orientation shifts the focus of education from mere academic achievement toward the formation of people who are self-aware, socially sensitive, and responsible toward their surroundings (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2025a).

In the framework of educational development toward Indonesia Emas, the role of Guidance and Counseling holds a position that cannot be sidelined. Education oriented toward human resource development cannot be sustained by subject-matter instruction alone. The personal, social, emotional, and moral dimensions of students require a systematic space for development. Classroom guidance services provide that space through a group approach that enables reflection, dialogue, and the strengthening of self-awareness collectively.

From the perspective of critical pedagogy, dialogue functions as a medium for forming consciousness and restoring humane relationships in education (Cahyani, Indah Galis; Wibowo, 2025). Classroom guidance services implemented within the framework of the Love-Based Curriculum have the potential to become a concrete praxis of humanization in the school environment. Without a clear ethical orientation, such services risk being reduced to an instrument of behavioral adjustment that actually reinforces the tendency toward dehumanization.

For this reason, realizing the Love-Based Curriculum through classroom guidance services is a strategic necessity in preparing Indonesia's human resources for 2045. This enables education to reach the cognitive, affective, and social dimensions simultaneously, so that the humanization of education does not remain a normative slogan but is present as real practice in everyday educational relationships.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with a literature study method (*library research).* The literature study method in this study is a method that elaborates and analyzes the literature related to the humanization of education through classroom guidance services within the framework of the Love-Based Curriculum. This study relies on major works in the fields of critical pedagogy and humanistic education as primary references, particularly Paulo Freire's thought on dialogue, critical consciousness, and the humanization of education, as well as core

literature on classroom guidance services and humanistic approaches in Guidance and Counseling. In addition, secondary data sources were obtained from reputable national and international scientific journal articles, Guidance and Counseling textbooks, and educational policy documents relevant to strengthening humanitarian values and the ethical orientation of education.

The purpose of this literature review is to explore and analyze the concepts and practices of humanizing education through classroom guidance services, and to reconstruct the conceptual understanding of these services in the context of the Love-Based Curriculum. The method involves an extensive review of the primary literature, complemented by relevant secondary sources. The analysis was carried out by systematically collecting and curating sources through a process of data reduction. The data reduction process includes selecting, organizing, and focusing attention on important components that contribute to a deep understanding of the humanization of education, the dialogical dimension, and the praxis of classroom guidance services.

The final stage of the study was carried out through interpretation, or drawing out findings, by analyzing the curated literature using a conceptual analytical framework and critical pedagogy. In this way, the study produces a theoretical synthesis that explains the position of classroom guidance services as a praxis of humanizing education in the Love-Based Curriculum, while also providing a theoretical basis for developing humanistic education in schools (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Humanizing Education

Regarding the term humanization of education, it is clear that the term was not born from a single figure. Nevertheless, genealogically and conceptually, the term is most strongly rooted in the tradition of critical pedagogy, particularly through the work of Paulo Freire. This is not without reason. In his book titled *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, which has been translated into many languages, including Indonesian under the title *Pendidikan Kaum Tertindas*, the term humanization occupies a central position as both the philosophical foundation and the ethical aim of all his ideas.

Freire asserts that humanization is the ontological vocation of human beings, namely the process of becoming fully human through critical consciousness and reflective action upon their social reality (Freire, 2008). This book was born out of concern about educational practices that perpetuate dehumanization through

oppressive relations between teachers and students. For this reason, humanization is the fundamental reason why the critique of the banking model of education was put forward. Education that positions students as objects receiving knowledge is regarded as a denial of their humanity, because it closes off space for dialogue, participation, and the formation of consciousness. In that framework, the humanization of education is understood as a process of liberation that takes place through dialogue, reflection, and praxis. Human beings are not seen as passive creatures shaped by the system but as historical subjects capable of understanding and transforming the world. Thus, the term humanization in Freire's thought is not merely a moral concept but a political and pedagogical category that asserts that education must side with the restoration of human dignity.

It should be emphasized again that the effort to humanize education formulated and carried out by Paulo Freire is based on the process of dialogue. However, the dialogue Freire has in mind is not merely a method of conversation in the classroom but an ontological, epistemological, and praxis-based foundation of liberation. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire states that dialogue is an encounter among human beings, mediated by the world, to name and critically understand reality (Freire, 2008). This statement shows that dialogue cannot be separated from the dimension of human existence as conscious and reflective beings. Humanization, therefore, cannot be realized without dialogue, because dialogue is the way human beings affirm their humanity.

Ontologically, Freire proceeds from the assumption that human beings are creatures with historical consciousness and reflective capacity. Human beings do not merely live in the world; moreover, they are able to take distance from the world in order to understand it. This is what distinguishes human beings from objects or things. In the context of education, this assumption means that students must not be treated as empty vessels to be filled with information. When education ignores this reflective capacity and replaces it with a pattern of one-way transmission, what occurs is dehumanization. Banking education, as criticized by Freire, makes knowledge the possession of the teacher and students a place of storage. Such a relationship negates the human nature of being a conscious subject (Freire, 2008).

Dialogue emerges as a radical correction to this model. In dialogical education, teachers and students both stand as subjects who jointly investigate reality. Freire calls this relationship a co-intentional relationship, that is, a situation in which teachers and students direct their consciousness together toward the object of knowledge (Freire, 2008). This means that no party monopolizes the truth. Knowledge is born from the reflective interaction between students' lived experience and the conceptual framework brought by the educator. Thus, the

humanization of education occurs when the pedagogical relationship changes from hierarchical to dialogical and participatory.

Epistemologically, dialogue is a way of acquiring knowledge that rests on the problematization of reality. Freire developed the concept of *problem-posing education*, an educational approach that starts from the concrete problems students face in their daily lives. The world is not presented as a finished fact but as a reality that must be read, interpreted, and critiqued. In this process, students develop *conscientização* or critical consciousness, namely the ability to understand the relationship between personal experience and broader social structures (Freire, 2008). This critical consciousness is the core of humanization, because human beings become able to see themselves not as passive victims of the system but as agents with the possibility of transformation.

Moreover, dialogue in the humanization of education does not stop at the intellectual level. Freire emphasizes that dialogue has a deep ethical dimension. Dialogue requires love for people and the world, humility to acknowledge one's own limitations, trust in the capacity of others, and a commitment to truth and justice (Freire, 2008). Without love and trust, dialogue turns into manipulation. Without humility, dialogue turns into a disguised monologue. For this reason, the humanization of education demands a transformation in the educator's attitude, not merely a change in teaching technique. Teachers are required to relinquish a dominating position and enter the educational space as partners in reflection.

The praxis dimension is another important aspect. For Freire, reflection without action falls into verbalism, while action without reflection becomes shallow activism. The humanization of education demands the integration of reflection and action in a unity called praxis (Freire, 2008). In the context of education, praxis means that the critical consciousness that grows through dialogue must be translated into concrete action, whether in the form of changes in attitude, the courage to voice opinions, or involvement in social transformation. Education must not stop at the formation of knowledge but must lead to the formation of subjects who are responsible for their reality.

When formulated comprehensively, dialogue as the basis of the humanization of education has four main dimensions. First, the ontological dimension, which recognizes human beings as conscious and dignified creatures. Second, the epistemological dimension, which positions knowledge as the result of dialogical interaction rather than one-sided transmission. Third, the ethical dimension, which requires that educational relationships be grounded in love, trust, and respect for freedom. Fourth, the praxis dimension, which demands the unity of reflection and transformative action. These four dimensions form an inseparable

whole in the effort to humanize education. Thus, when Freire asserts that humanization is the ontological vocation of human beings, he also shows that dialogical education is the path to realizing that vocation. Humanization is not merely an effort to soften pedagogical relationships but a thorough reconstruction of the power structures in education. Dialogical education restores human beings as subjects of history who are able to read the world, critique it, and change it. Here the humanization of education finds its deepest meaning, namely as a process of restoring human dignity through pedagogical relationships that are reflective, critical, and transformative.

Classroom Guidance Services

Within the framework of Guidance and Counseling, BK (guidance and counseling) services generally comprise several main forms, namely: (1) orientation services, (2) information services, (3) placement and distribution services, (4) content mastery services, (5) individual counseling services, (6) group guidance services, (7) group counseling services, (8) consultation services, and (9) mediation services (Sasmita, E.; Rahmadini, M.; Razi, F.; Syam, 2025). Technically, classroom guidance falls under the category of large-scale group guidance, in which the counselor provides services to all members of a class or group at once. Canida (2023) explains that classroom guidance is a form of guidance service delivered to a group of students simultaneously in a single learning session. This service is designed for large groups, generally 30 to 40 students per class, enabling counselors to provide direction and coaching collectively.

When examined more deeply, classroom guidance cannot be understood merely as a technical strategy for reaching large numbers of students. This service holds a strategic position in the comprehensive Guidance and Counseling framework because it functions as a developmental instrument that is preventive and systematic. In the developmental BK approach, classroom services are positioned as a universal intervention given to all students in a class unit in order to facilitate their achievement of developmental tasks (Gysbers & Henderson, 2021). Thus, its orientation is not merely curative but earlier and anticipatory.

Structurally, classroom guidance is a service carried out inside the classroom in a large-group format. Nevertheless, its essence is not identical to a one-way lecture. Prior studies show that the effectiveness of this service increases significantly when a participatory and student-centered approach is used (Wulandari & Hidayat, 2021). This means that the success of the service is determined not only by the completeness of the material but also by the quality of the interaction built between the counselor and the students.

In terms of objectives, classroom guidance is directed toward personal, social, academic, and career competencies. Service materials may include the development of study skills, emotion regulation, character formation, digital literacy, and future planning (Rahman & Sari, 2023). The universal character of this service enables all students to receive the same basic reinforcement, so that gaps in developmental readiness among them can be minimized. In other words, classroom services function as a foundation that supports further interventions, whether in the form of individual or group counseling.

From a methodological standpoint, implementing classroom guidance requires planning based on students' real needs. Needs analysis is a crucial first step so that services are not merely generic and normative. The next stages include preparing the Service Implementation Plan (Rencana Pelaksanaan Layanan, RPL), carrying out interactive activities, and conducting evaluation as a form of reflection on the achievements of the service (Prasetyo & Lestari, 2022). This evaluation is important to ensure that the service truly has an impact on improving students' understanding, attitudes, and skills.

When linked to the paradigm of humanizing education, classroom guidance has great potential as a dialogical pedagogical space. When counselors develop methods such as discussions, case studies, simulations, or joint reflection, the relationship that is built is no longer hierarchical but collaborative. Students are given space to voice their experiences and perspectives. Recent research confirms that a student-centered approach in classroom BK services contributes to improving students' self-awareness and social responsibility (Sari & Fitri, 2024). In this context, classroom guidance is not only a medium for delivering information but also a means of forming reflective and responsible subjects.

Thus, classroom guidance can be positioned as a strategic service in the school BK system. This is because it is universal, preventive, and developmental; carried out in a structured manner; and employs an interactive approach so as to align with the principles of education that humanizes. When designed and implemented reflectively, this service not only strengthens students' competencies but also affirms their dignity as individuals who are growing and have the capacity to direct their own development consciously.

Love-Based Curriculum

If the humanization of education speaks of restoring human dignity through dialogical relationships and liberating praxis, then the Love-Based Curriculum goes further by placing love as the normative foundation that animates the entire edifice of education. Here the curriculum is understood as an expression of values that

determines the direction of human formation (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2025). In other words, the fundamental question posed is no longer "what must students master?" but "what kind of human beings do we wish to bring forth through education?".

The Love-Based Curriculum was born from the awareness that modern education is often trapped in the logic of performativity: numbers, standards, targets, and quantitative achievements become the center of attention. In such a situation, educational relationships risk being reduced to functional relationships that position students as objects for producing achievement (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2025). The concept of love emerges as a critique of this tendency. Love here is understood as an ethical orientation that demands respect for students' dignity, recognition of their uniqueness, and a commitment to nurturing their potential fully.

Philosophically, the Love-Based Curriculum rests on the view that human beings have intrinsic value that must not be determined merely by academic achievement. Education, therefore, must be designed to develop the intellectual dimension together with the affective and moral dimensions. Love functions as an integrative principle that unites these three dimensions. Without love, the curriculum tends to become an instrument of standardization that ignores the diversity of students' backgrounds, needs, and psychological dynamics. To translate this orientation operationally, the Ministry of Religious Affairs formulated the Panca Cinta (Five Loves) framework, namely: love for God, love for fellow human beings, love for oneself, love for the environment, and love for the nation. These five dimensions are value directions that structure the goals, content, and learning experiences.

Love for God directs education toward strengthening a spirituality that is reflective and not dogmatic; love for fellow human beings affirms the importance of empathy, solidarity, and respect for differences; love for oneself encourages students to develop self-esteem, personal responsibility, and awareness of their potential; love for the environment fosters ecological concern; and love for the nation strengthens an inclusive commitment to nationhood. These five dimensions form the spectrum of character that education seeks to bring about. Thus, love functions as an integrative principle that unites the spiritual, social, personal, ecological, and national dimensions in one complete framework.

In the realm of praxis, the principle of love changes how the curriculum is implemented. Learning planning is oriented not only toward completing the material but also toward creating a safe and supportive learning atmosphere (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2025). Teachers are viewed as figures

who not only transmit knowledge but also embody exemplary conduct, empathy, and authentic attention. Such pedagogical relationships build students' confidence to think, ask questions, and reflect without fear. Another implication appears in the formulation of educational goals. The Love-Based Curriculum targets the formation of empathetic and responsible character. The ideal graduate profile is not only an academically competent individual but a person with social concern and the ability to build healthy relationships. Thus, educational evaluation does not merely assess cognitive aspects but also the development of attitudes and values.

At the institutional level, love is translated into a school culture that respects every individual. Disciplinary policies, assessment mechanisms, and even patterns of communication must reflect respect for students' dignity (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2025). Discipline is carried out through the cultivation of awareness. Evaluation is conducted not to punish but to improve and develop. It can also be understood here that love becomes an operational principle that ensures the structure of education does not lose its human dimension.

When synthesized, the Love-Based Curriculum has three interwoven layers. First, the value layer, namely love as a moral principle that animates the direction of education. Second, the pedagogical layer, namely love as a pattern of relationships that is dialogical and empathetic. Third, the praxis layer, namely love as concrete action in policy, evaluation, and school culture. These three layers form a systemic unity: values give direction, pedagogy gives form, and praxis gives proof.

Ultimately, the Love-Based Curriculum is an educational orientation that places values at the heart of the entire learning process. Every goal, method, and evaluation always carries an attitude toward students: whether they are treated merely as numbers or as dignified human beings. By making love its foundation, the curriculum is directed to maintain a balance between firmness and empathy, between academic standards and character growth, and between achievement and care. Within this framework, education does not merely produce competent graduates but shapes persons who are aware, possess integrity, and are able to bring humanity into their social lives.

Integrating the Humanization of Education into the Implementation of Classroom Guidance Based on the Love-Based Curriculum

If, in the previous sections, the humanization of education was placed as the philosophical foundation, and classroom guidance services were understood as a universal and preventive medium of development, then integrating the two within the framework of the Love-Based Curriculum becomes an unavoidable conceptual

step. Humanization provides the normative direction, classroom services provide the space for praxis, and the Love-Based Curriculum ensures that these values do not remain individual idealism but are institutionalized within the education system.

Humanization, as formulated by Freire (2008), demands education that is dialogical and reflective. This principle directly intersects with the character of classroom guidance services, which are carried out in a large-group setting. Although conducted in a single class with a relatively large number of students, classroom services still have the opportunity to build two-way interaction when designed with a participatory approach. Wulandari and Hidayat (2021) showed that the effectiveness of classroom services increases when counselors use discussion strategies and active student involvement compared with the conventional lecture model. This finding reinforces the argument that dialogue in the context of humanization is not merely a philosophical concept but can be operationalized in BK practice.

Furthermore, in the developmental BK approach, classroom services are positioned as a basic intervention given to all students to support their developmental tasks (Gysbers & Henderson, 2021). In this framework, integrating the value of humanization means ensuring that every service targets not only skill mastery but also the formation of self-awareness and social responsibility. For example, emotion regulation material is directed not only at behavior control but also at the ability to understand the feelings of others. Career planning material does not merely discuss career choices but also the social responsibility attached to those choices. It is at this point that the Love-Based Curriculum plays a structural role. The Love-Based Curriculum, as formulated in the policy of the Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia (2025), places compassion, respect for dignity, and empathy as the orientation of education. When these values are integrated into classroom services, counselors no longer merely deliver self-development material but create learning experiences that foster mutual respect and care. Thus, the value of love does not stop as a curricular slogan but is translated into the dynamics of classroom interaction.

More concretely, this integration appears in service planning. Preparing the Service Implementation Plan (Rencana Pelaksanaan Layanan, RPL) needs to begin with an analysis of students' real needs, not normative assumptions. The implementation stage must include activities that provide space for reflection, such as social case studies, role-play simulations, or discussions based on personal experience. Rahman and Sari (2023) showed that classroom services that include reflective activities can significantly improve students' empathy and social skills.

This means that a dialogical and value-based approach has a measurable impact, not merely idealism.

However, this integration does not happen automatically. Structural challenges such as limited time, administrative burdens, and large numbers of students often push classroom services back toward one-way patterns. Therefore, consistency between the values of humanization and service practice becomes a key factor. The Love-Based Curriculum must provide room for pedagogical flexibility, while counselors need to maintain their ethical orientation so that services do not get trapped in formality.

Thus, the integration of the humanization of education into the implementation of classroom guidance based on the Love-Based Curriculum can be understood as an alignment of values, methods, and systems. Humanization provides the moral direction, classroom services provide the space for real interaction, and the Love-Based Curriculum guarantees the sustainability of those values in school policy. When all three work together, classroom services not only strengthen personal and social competencies but also form students as subjects who are aware, reflective, and responsible in their social lives.

CONCLUSION

This study affirms that the humanization of education is not merely a normative discourse but a fundamental need in facing the challenges of human development toward Indonesia Emas 2045. Paulo Freire's critique of banking education shows that pedagogical relationships that position students as passive objects have the potential to perpetuate dehumanization in subtle ways. Therefore, education needs to be reconstructed through a dialogical approach that recognizes students as conscious, reflective subjects with the capacity for transformation.

This certainly gives classroom guidance services a significant position. As a service that is universal and developmental, classroom guidance can become a concrete space for the praxis of dialogue, reflection, and the strengthening of self-awareness. When implemented with a participatory approach and based on students' real needs, this service not only supports the achievement of developmental tasks but also strengthens the dimensions of empathy, social responsibility, and personal maturity. The Love-Based Curriculum then provides the ethical and structural foundation for this process. Through its value orientation and the Panca Cinta framework, this curriculum directs education toward the formation of whole human beings, spiritually, socially, personally, ecologically, and nationally. The integration of humanization, classroom guidance services, and the Love-Based

Curriculum shows that education that humanizes cannot stop at philosophical ideas but must be realized in service design, interaction methods, and school culture.

Ultimately, realizing the Love-Based Curriculum through classroom guidance services is a strategic step toward delivering education that not only produces academic achievement but also shapes persons who are self-aware, empathetic, and responsible. Here the humanization of education finds its praxis form, namely in everyday relationships that respect the dignity of students as human beings who are growing.

REFERENCES

Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2026). *Rencana pembangunan jangka panjang nasional 2025–2045: Indonesia emas 2045*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Bappenas RI.

Cahyani, I. G., & Wibowo, A. (2025). Dialog pedagogis dalam perspektif pedagogi kritis dan implikasinya terhadap pendidikan humanistik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kritis, 12*(1), 45–58.

Canida, R. (2023). Implementasi layanan bimbingan klasikal dalam pengembangan karakter peserta didik. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling Indonesia, 8*(2), 112–123.

Freire, P. (2008). *Pendidikan kaum tertindas* (Trans.). Jakarta, Indonesia: LP3ES. (Original work published 1970)

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2021). *Developing and managing your school guidance and counseling program* (6th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2025). *Kurikulum berbasis cinta: Kerangka konseptual dan implementasi*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kementerian Agama RI.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Prasetyo, D., & Lestari, S. (2022). Perencanaan dan evaluasi layanan bimbingan klasikal berbasis kebutuhan peserta didik. *Jurnal Konseling Pendidikan, 10*(1), 78–90.

Rahman, F., & Sari, N. (2023). Pengaruh layanan bimbingan klasikal berbasis reflektif terhadap empati dan keterampilan sosial siswa. *Jurnal Psikopedagogia, 12*(2), 134–146.

Sari, M., & Fitri, A. (2024). Student-centered approach dalam layanan BK klasikal dan dampaknya terhadap kesadaran diri siswa. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling Terapan, 9*(1), 25–37.

Sasmita, E., Rahmadini, M., Razi, F., & Syam, R. (2025). Model layanan bimbingan dan konseling komprehensif di sekolah menengah. *Jurnal Ilmiah Konseling, 14*(1), 1–15.

Tilaar, H. A. R. (2012). *Perubahan sosial dan pendidikan: Pengantar pedagogi transformatif*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rineka Cipta.

Wulandari, D., & Hidayat, T. (2021). Efektivitas layanan bimbingan klasikal berbasis partisipatif di sekolah menengah. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling Indonesia, 6*(2), 89–101.

Zuchdi, D. (2004). Pendidikan humanistik dan pembentukan karakter siswa. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan, 23*(2), 163–175.