Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies
Volume 4, Issue 3, 31-47
e_ISSN: 3025 - 0684
https://ejournal.gomit.id/index.php/ijfis
DOI:10.58723/ijfis.v4i3.886

From al-Bukhari's Usul al-Tashri' to Islamic Daycare Ethics: A Preliminary Living Hadith Assessment Framework

Abbas*
Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, INDONESIA

Muktashim Billah
Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, INDONESIA

Sumantri
Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, INDONESIA

Article Info

Article history:

Received: September 4, 2026
Revised: October 25, 2026
Accepted: November 17, 2026

Keywords:

Child Protection;
Daycare Feasibility;
Hadhanah Mu'assasiyyah;
Hadith Ahkam;
Living Hadith

Abstract

Background: Assessing Islamic daycare quality calls for a transparent link between prophetic ethics, juristic reasoning, and observable childcare safeguards.
Aims: To develop a preliminary Living Hadith-informed Hadhanah Mu'assasiyyah framework and clarify the contribution and limitations of reported field-survey evidence.
Methods: The study combines a reported field questionnaire of 21 items on a four-point Likert scale with contextual analysis of seven prophetic reports, al-Bukhari's bayani, maqasidi, and jam'/tarjih approaches, and ECEC and child-protection literature. The fieldwork account identifies 102 stakeholders in three groups and describes interviews, but original responses, interview records, and integration procedures were unavailable for verification.
Results: Five candidate domains were articulated: rahmah, rifq, amanah, la darar, and fitrah. A source-to-indicator matrix and newly drafted 21-item bank distinguish ethical interpretation from proposed practices. Reported stakeholder-group counts are descriptive; item-level survey percentages, reliability estimates, and interview themes are not claimed as verified findings.
Conclusion: The framework is a field-informed but unvalidated bridge between hadith-based ethical interpretation and daycare-quality assessment. Further work requires primary-data recovery, ethics clarification, expert review, field piloting, and reliability testing.

To cite this article: Abbas., Billah, M., & Sumantri. (2026). Developing a Preliminary Living Hadith Framework for Assessing the Feasibility of Islamic Daycare Institutions. *Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies, 4(3)*, 31-47. https://doi.org/10.58723/ijfis.v4i3.886
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License ©2026 by author/s

INTRODUCTION

The growth of non-parental early childhood care has made the quality of daily caregiving a concern for both families and regulators. Quality includes more than buildings, learning materials, or enrollment administration: responsive interactions, physical and emotional safety, healthy routines, and ongoing family communication are central to young children's well-being (Black et al., 2017; Britto et al., 2017; Richter et al., 2017; von Suchodoletz et al., 2023). For Muslim families, entrusting a young child to a daycare provider may also raise questions about religious identity, caregivers' moral conduct, and the continuity of home-based nurturing. These concerns should not be framed as a conflict between Islamic ethics and developmental science. Both have legitimate contributions, although their sources of authority and methods of assessment differ (Fauziah et al., 2026; Rahiem & Marhamah, 2025).

Contemporary early childhood education and care (ECEC) scholarship commonly distinguishes structural quality (staffing, ratios, facilities, qualifications), process quality (caregiver-child

*** Corresponding author:**
Abbas, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia. ✉ abbas.bacomiro@unismuh.ac.id

interactions), and system quality (regulation, improvement, and oversight). Reviews find that process quality is associated with children's learning and socio-emotional development, while structural conditions influence process quality but do not guarantee positive interactions (Slot, 2018; Ulferts et al., 2019; Eadie et al., 2024; Sluiter et al., 2025). Indonesia already has a national standards structure for PAUD and legal provisions governing service establishment. In particular, Permendikbud No. 84/2014 addresses the establishment, while Permendikdasmen No. 12/2025 explicitly includes religious, moral, and social-emotional development in PAUD content standards (Republic of Indonesia, 2016; Republic of Indonesia, 2025). It is therefore inaccurate to claim that existing regulation covers physical facilities alone; the research problem is how religiously grounded safeguarding commitments could be operationalized and assessed within, rather than in place of, these provisions.

The term 'feasibility' is used here in the modest sense of suitability for safe, ethically responsive operations. It does not mean a new religious permit or a pass/fail accreditation judgment. A faith-sensitive checklist may complement, but must not displace, legally required safeguards, inclusive practices, professional expertise, or families' informed consent (Pilarz et al., 2024; OECD, 2024; Ha et al., 2025).

Three literatures inform this study but answer different questions. Hadith and Islamic family-law scholarship clarifies duties of mercy, care, and the child's best interests; scholarship on Living Hadith examines the reception and social translation of prophetic traditions; and ECEC research evaluates observed caregiving quality and safeguarding systems (Qudsy et al., 2023; Darussamin, 2025; Sari, 2025; Putri et al., 2026; Ha et al., 2025). Islamic early-childhood work further describes parental expectations about moral modeling, habituation, and developmentally suitable religious education (Mumtaz et al., 2024; Fauziah et al., 2026). The specific gap addressed here is not the absence of all daycare standards or the absence of Islamic parenting literature. Rather, it is the lack, within the literature considered, of a transparent crosswalk linking particular hadith texts, their interpretive scope, reported stakeholder concerns, and observable candidate indicators for institutional daycare evaluation. A disciplined reading of al-Bukhari's usul al-tashri' in al-Jami' al-Sahih considers the hierarchy of legal sources and several modes of inference: bayani reasoning through linguistic indications, maqasidi reasoning concerned with legal purposes, and jam'/tarjih when textual evidence appears in tension. The legal significance of al-Bukhari's chapter headings (tarajim al-abwab) likewise requires careful inference rather than automatic identification with the wording of a hadith. These principles provide a methodological lens, not evidence about the operation or quality of daycare institutions.

Hadhanah Mu'assasiyyah is proposed here as a heuristic for the daily care delegated by a family to an organization. It is not a replacement for parental legal custody, and classical *hadhanah* rules concerning post-divorce guardianship cannot be transferred mechanically to a daycare contract (Kadarisman et al., 2025; Harid & Ashufa, 2025; Lubis & Aziz, 2025; Chandra & Alias, 2026). In this model, five levels should remain analytically distinct: (1) the authenticated prophetic report; (2) the ethical or jurisprudential principle inferred from its wording and context; (3) a contemporary institutional risk or caregiving duty; (4) a proposed observable practice; and (5) empirical validation of that practice. Living Hadith is used in the limited sense of reception and translation into organizational routines, not as proof that a newly proposed rule has divine or statutory authority (Qudsy et al., 2023; Riady et al., 2026; Gasmelsid et al., 2026). The originality claimed is the arrangement of this crosswalk for daycare assessment, not the discovery of new hadith norms or the first Islamic discussion of child protection.

A distinction from earlier research is important. ECEC reviews already assess the quality of interactions and institutional resources, Islamic pedagogy examines the formation of character, and *hadhanah* studies frequently focus on judicial custody after separation. The proposed contribution lies in connecting these strands at the level of operational indicators while preserving their different evidentiary roles (Putri et al., 2026; Qusyairi et al., 2026; von Suchodoletz et al., 2023).

The gap is methodological and operational rather than an absence of prior standards. ECEC research provides tested structural and process-quality constructs, yet does not normally trace such constructs back to specific prophetic textual warrants. Child-protection studies address identification and reporting of harm but do not determine the interpretive scope of hadith. Living Hadith scholarship examines the reception of traditions in practice, whereas hadhanah scholarship often analyzes parental and judicial custody. This article draws these distinct perspectives together through a transparent sequence: identified text, limited ethical inference, contemporary childcare risk, proposed observable evidence, and future empirical testing. The proposed crosswalk is original as an organizing framework, not as a new legal duty (Slot, 2018; Ayling et al., 2020; Qudsy et al., 2023; Kadarisman et al., 2025). Within this framework, al-Bukhari's modes of legal reasoning serve as an interpretive lens, while the defensibility of contemporary childcare practices is assessed separately against ECEC and child-protection literature. This distinction maintains a clear boundary between historical textual interpretation and contemporary operational design.

This article asks: (1) How can al-Bukhari's bayani, maqasidi, and jam'/tarjih approaches guide a careful reading of hadith relevant to institutionally delegated childcare? (2) Which ethically defensible applications can be translated into observable daycare practices without presenting them as direct prophetic instructions? (3) What can the reported Likert fieldwork substantiate, and what additional records and validation are needed before the proposed practices can function as assessment indicators? The article combines the documented scope of a field survey with a preliminary source-to-indicator framework. Its proposed indicators are intended for formative discussion and further testing, not immediate licensing or proof of effectiveness.

Table 1. Comparison of the Study's Proposed Contribution with Adjacent Research Traditions.

Literature / framework	Established focus	Specific contribution / boundary in this study
ECEC quality and safeguarding	Structural, process, and governance indicators; observed interactions and child outcomes	Adopts established safety and process-quality concepts; does not claim these are absent from current standards (Slot, 2018; Eadie et al., 2024).
Islamic family law/*hadhanah*	Rights, custodial responsibilities, best interests of children in family disputes	Uses custody ethics by analogy for institutionally delegated daily care; does not change family-law custody status (Kadarisman et al., 2025).
Living Hadith studies	Reception and practical enactment of prophetic traditions in social life	Explains an institutional translation pathway, without declaring recommendations directly revealed or legally binding (Qudsy et al., 2023).
This preliminary framework	A named hadith, an interpretive rationale, an earlier unverified stakeholder concern, and an auditable candidate practice for each pillar	Provides a transparent conceptual crosswalk and testable item bank, not a validated score or accreditation outcome.
Al-Bukhari's usul al-tashri'	Primary and derivative legal sources; bayani, maqasidi, and jam'/tarjih reasoning; significance of chapter headings in al-Jami' al-Sahih.	Uses usul al-tashri' as an interpretive framework, not as empirical daycare evidence or a claim of direct prophetic accreditation rules.

METHOD

This study combines an exploratory field-research component, described as a questionnaire survey using a four-point Likert scale, with qualitative interpretation of hadith and published childcare scholarship. The study account also describes semi-structured interviews following the questionnaire. Nevertheless, the original response files, recruitment log, interview guide, transcripts, and an audit trail connecting survey responses to interviewee selection were not supplied for this revision. Accordingly, the paper acknowledges the reported fieldwork but does not claim that a fully documented explanatory sequential mixed-methods procedure or quantitative-qualitative triangulation has been demonstrated (Levitt et al., 2018; Fetters & Tajima, 2022). The interpretive component proceeds through five steps: identifying the seven reports and their transmission qualifications; examining wording, context, and relevant chapter headings (bayani); considering child welfare and prevention of harm without displacing the text (maqasidi); examining competing interpretations and evidence (jam'/tarjih); and comparing each inferred ethical principle with ECEC and child-protection research to propose an observable practice. This approach distinguishes the Qur'an and Sunnah as primary textual foundations from supplementary juristic reasoning, including carefully bounded analogy, customary practice, and welfare considerations. The categories are analytical tools for contemporary interpretation, not a claim that al-Bukhari explicitly formulated daycare rules or that reports in Muslim, al-Tirmidhi, or Ibn Majah were transmitted in al-Jami' al-Sahih.

The fieldwork account reports an overall group of 102 stakeholders: seven daycare managers, 35 parents using daycare, and 60 community members. Recruitment is described in general terms as deliberate selection of persons familiar with daycare, which is consistent with purposive, non-probability sampling. These figures describe the reported cohort and cannot automatically be treated as the number of valid survey responses or the number of interviewees. The study location, collection period, sampling frame, eligibility criteria, response rate, demographic composition, separate survey and interview counts, and overlap between the two activities are not documented in the materials available for verification. The study makes no claim of national representativeness or population prevalence.

The field component is described as administering 21 questions on a four-point Likert scale relating to physical protection, hadhanah-oriented care, and spiritual nurturing. This establishes the reported use of a rating questionnaire, not the content validity or reliability of its measurement. The exact administered wording, response anchors, coding direction, individual answers, and missing-data log were unavailable for examination. Table 2 therefore retains a different, newly drafted 21-item importance-rating bank aligned with the five proposed domains. Its suggested anchors (1 = not important to 4 = essential) are prospective, not verified labels of the original questionnaire. Survey endorsement, actual daycare performance, and the proposed assessment instrument are analytically distinct; institutional performance would require observation, record review, and safeguards for privacy and informed participation (Boateng et al., 2018).

The quantitative strand is appropriately framed as descriptive unless the original questionnaire and item-level dataset allow further analysis. For each administered item, a reproducible report would show the four response frequencies, valid denominator, missing responses, percentage distribution, and any justified descriptive summary, with subgroup breakdowns where sample sizes permit. The previous manuscript mentioned Pearson item correlations, Cronbach's alpha, assumption tests, and multiple regression in SPSS; however, no outputs, variables, codebook, or model specification were supplied. Consequently, no significance, regression effect, reliability coefficient, validated factor structure, or unsupported percentage is presented as a verified finding. The narrative account of interviews is likewise not treated as transcript-based thematic analysis: coding, theme development, negative cases, and authorized anonymous quotations cannot be independently assessed (Braun & Clarke, 2021; Levitt et al., 2018).

The available numeric information permits the reported cohort composition in Table 3 to be displayed, with percentages calculated only from its three group counts. These are group-composition shares, not Likert response frequencies or valid response rates. If the research archive becomes accessible, the authors should reconcile participant identifiers with separate survey and interview logs, restore the exact questionnaire and response scale, and calculate item-specific distributions before interpreting preferences. Formal mixed-methods integration would additionally require evidence of interview selection following the survey and a joint display connecting quantitative patterns with authenticated qualitative excerpts. The present source-to-indicator display connects reported field concerns, hadith reasoning, and ECEC literature at an interpretive level; it is not evidence of empirical convergence (Creswell & Inoue, 2025).

Research ethics and evidence integration: Because this paper reports a human-participant field component, its ethics and data-protection history must be stated transparently. The materials reviewed do not document an ethics-committee approval number or exemption, the study setting and period, the content of informed consent, permission for recording interviews, de-identification, secure storage, data access, or retention arrangements. The authors should verify and disclose their actual status before submission; approval, exemption, and consent cannot be assumed retrospectively. No identifiable responses, verbatim quotations, or unverified inferential statistics are inserted. Interpretive analysis of hadith is separately grounded in the reports' wording and transmission context, and the suitability of resulting institutional indicators is checked against ECEC and child-protection scholarship. These evidentiary roles remain distinct from the survey record and do not constitute field triangulation simply because they appear in a shared matrix.

Table 2. Newly Drafted Candidate 21-Item Importance-Rating Bank (NOT the Instrument Administered in the Reported Study). Proposed Response Anchors: 1 = Not Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Important, 4 = Essential. Items Require Expert Review and Field Validation

Item	Domain	Candidate item (rate importance)
1	*Rahmah*	Staff respond calmly when a child is visibly distressed.
2	*Rahmah*	Caregivers use age-appropriate comforting and reassurance.
3	*Rahmah*	Caregivers attend fairly to children with different needs.
4	*Rahmah*	Parents receive respectful updates about recurring distress.
5	*Rahmah*	Daily routines allow flexible responses to children’s emotions.
6	*Rifq*	The institution prohibits hitting, pinching, and other physical punishment.
7	*Rifq*	Staff refrain from shaming, threats, or insulting labels.
8	*Rifq*	Caregivers practice calm redirection when children are upset.
9	*Rifq*	The provider records and follows up on safety incidents.
10	*Rifq*	Staff receive refresher training on non-violent guidance.
11	*Amanah*	A designated safeguarding officer has defined responsibility.
12	*Amanah*	Parents receive transparent, privacy-respecting daily updates.
13	*Amanah*	Recruitment includes lawful child-safety background checks.
14	*Amanah*	Staffing and breaks accommodate child and caregiver needs.
15	*Amanah*	Records and monitoring protect the privacy of children.
16	*La darar*	There is a confidential way to submit safeguarding concerns.
17	*La darar*	The complaint pathway explains emergency escalation procedures.

Item	Domain	Candidate item (rate importance)
18	*La darar*	Reported concerns receive documented, non-retaliatory follow-up.
19	*Fitrah*	Caregivers model honesty, fairness, and respectful speech.
20	*Fitrah*	Religious activities are age-appropriate and non-coercive.
21	*Fitrah*	The provider consults families about food and moral routines.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research account describes a field questionnaire and stakeholder engagement, while the independently inspectable output of the current analysis is the preliminary five-domain architecture, a proposed 21-item item bank (Table 2), and a hadith-to-indicator matrix (Table 5). Table 3 transparently presents the reported composition of 102 stakeholders; Tables 4 and 4a record what cannot yet be established from the unavailable item-level dataset and interview transcripts. The five domains are reasoned interpretive categories, not statistically identified survey factors. They arise from examining textual indications and context (bayani), ethical purposes related to child welfare and harm prevention (maqasidi), and apparent tensions between duties (jam'/tarjih), then assessing whether proposed practices are intelligible in ECEC and safeguarding research. Fieldwork is acknowledged as part of the research design, but the available account is not converted into fabricated empirical outcomes.

Table 3. Reported composition of the fieldwork cohort (n = 102); shares describe stakeholder groups, not verified item-response denominators

Stakeholder group	Reported n (% of cohort)	Evidence-Status Qualification
Daycare managers	7 (6.9%)	Survey and interview Ns not identified separately
Parents using daycare	35 (34.3%)	Survey and interview Ns not identified separately
Community members	60 (58.8 %)	Survey and interview Ns not identified separately
Total / interview overlap	102 (100.0%)	Not a verified valid-response denominator for the Likert items

The account identifies seven managers, 35 parents, and 60 community members. The percentages in Table 3 are simple calculations of those reported group totals and are not proportions endorsing any questionnaire statement. Because separate valid survey Ns and interview Ns are unavailable, it cannot be inferred that every one of the 102 participants answered all 21 items or took part in an interview. Recruitment, timing, and ethics records remain necessary for a complete empirical audit. Two earlier numerical statements about prioritizing children's emotional needs and preferring non-punitive guidance were not accompanied by original item wording, response-category counts, valid denominators, or missing-data details. They are therefore not reproduced as verified Likert results. Table 4 sets out the outstanding evidence required to assess those claims and any previously mentioned statistical analyses, while the substantive concerns remain questions that can inform subsequent field verification.

Table 4. Survey claims requiring source verification before numerical reporting; no unaudited endorsement percentages or inferential estimates are presented

Earlier assertion	Minimum Evidence Required	Evidence Availability	Treatment in this Article
Emotional responsiveness endorsement	Exact item; category frequencies; valid N; missing N	Not available	Percentage removed; retained as a candidate ethical concern
Preference for non-punitive guidance	Exact item; category frequencies; valid N; missing N	Not available	Percentage removed; retained as a candidate ethical concern
Correlation, alpha, and regression tests	Dataset; coding; hypotheses; model outputs and diagnostics	Not available	No statistical result or reliability claim reported

The appropriate next step is to recover the administered instrument, response coding, frequency tables, and item-level data, and to report survey Ns separately from interview participation. Counts and percentages must use the valid response denominator for each item; missing responses require explicit reporting. A frequency cannot be inferred from an earlier rounded percentage, nor can reliability or regression estimates be reconstructed from narrative summaries. The study should therefore be read as field-informed framework development with limited auditable empirical reporting, rather than as an already validated institutional assessment.

The fieldwork narrative refers to children's distress and separation, caregivers' capacity and fatigue, access to complaints, and continuity between home and daycare. These accounts help explain why the five ethical domains may matter to stakeholders. However, the original interview transcripts, interviewee-selection rationale, coding decisions, participant identifiers, and records of discrepant views were not available. The topic-and-subtopic outline in Table 5 is therefore a transparent provisional analytical guide, not a confirmed set of themes or attributed participant quotations. Future qualitative reporting should document theme development, contradictory experiences, and the consent basis for any anonymized extracts (Braun & Clarke, 2021)

Table 5. Provisional interview topic-and-subtopic guide based on reported narrative concerns; not themes verified against transcripts

Topic	Provisional subtopics / questions for checking against transcripts	Current documentation status
Responsive care	Distress, separation, comforting, parent updates	Reported narrative topic only; transcript coding unavailable
Non-violent guidance	Harsh speech, physical punishment, redirection	Reported narrative topic only; transcript coding unavailable
Accountable care	Staff workload, supervision, privacy, communication	Reported narrative topic only; transcript coding unavailable
Protected reporting	Complaint access, escalation, retaliation safeguards	Reported narrative topic only; transcript coding unavailable
Moral nurturing	Family preferences, daily modeling, non-coercion	Reported narrative topic only; transcript coding unavailable

Table 6 makes the distinction between evidence types explicit. Prophetic reports provide normative textual sources; bayani and maqasidi reasoning, with jam'/tarjih where needed, supports bounded author interpretations; the fieldwork narrative suggests stakeholder concerns but does not supply

independently verified individual quotations or statistical patterns; and ECEC and child-protection studies support the selection of observable candidate practices (Slot, 2018; Eadie et al., 2024; Ayling et al., 2020). The table is therefore an interpretive source-to-indicator crosswalk rather than a verified triangulation of survey and interview findings. The same method prevents confusion between the legal standing of a maxim and the grading of one particular transmission, especially for la darar.

The quantitative questionnaire, reported interviews, and textual-juristic interpretation have different evidentiary functions. Their juxtaposition is useful for developing testable hypotheses, but it does not demonstrate statistical association, agreement among interviewees, or empirical confirmation of five dimensions. Such claims would require the original data, a transparent coding and integration trail, and independent field testing (Creswell & Inoue, 2025; Levitt et al., 2018).

The distinction also constrains the interpretation of stakeholder preferences. A hypothetical preference for CCTV is not evidence that continuous parent video access is safe, lawful, or superior to written reporting. Similarly, a proposal for caregiver psychological screening does not establish that a particular clinical test predicts maltreatment. Consent, data minimization, proportional oversight, staff dignity, and child privacy must be considered before any intervention is prescribed (Meishar-Tal et al., 2022; Matthiesen et al., 2023).

Potentially divergent perspectives requiring verification include calls for broader video surveillance versus concerns about child and staff privacy, stricter staffing rules versus affordability, and explicit religious identity versus families' informed preferences. These are interpretive contrasts from the childcare literature and the reported concerns, not documented negative cases from unavailable interview transcripts.

Existing professional literature supplies an essential counterbalance to oversimplified policy conclusions. Training, work conditions, workforce well-being, and child-staff ratios can influence process quality, but evidence does not warrant a universal ratio, a single compulsory psychometric test, or automatic permanent license revocation after unverified allegations (Egert et al., 2020; Dalgaard et al., 2022; Hanno et al., 2022; Hausladen et al., 2026). Safeguarding policies should favor prompt protective action, appropriate investigation, transparent review, and proportionate legal responses consistent with applicable law.

In summary, the proposed architecture connects ethical justification, anticipated stakeholder concerns, and feasible verification methods without treating them as equivalent. The comparison with ECEC quality frameworks shows complementarity: *rahmah* and *rifq* refine process-quality expectations; *amanah* and *la darar* add transparent responsibility and reporting pathways; *fitrah* adds a religiously contextualized dimension of moral nurturing, constrained by developmental suitability and informed parental choice (Eadie et al., 2024; Fauziah et al., 2026). The reported questionnaire motivates further inquiry into stakeholder priorities, but item-specific endorsement and construct validity cannot be claimed without its primary records. The framework remains preliminary and requires expert review, documented field piloting, and reliability assessment.

Indicator selection follows a common rule: the ethical interpretation must be stated separately from the hadith wording; the proposed practice must correspond to an established childcare-quality or safeguarding construct; and its occurrence should be inspectable without measuring a child's religiosity or violating privacy. Suggested evidence includes repeated observation of responses to distress (rahmah), policies and incident records on non-violence (rifq), named safeguarding roles and communication records (amanah), confidential complaint and referral logs (la darar), and age-appropriate activity observation plus family preferences (fitrah). These are possible assessment methods, not findings from completed observations (Slot, 2018; Ayling et al., 2020; Eadie et al., 2024). Accordingly, the matrix applies bayani analysis to the report's explicit subject, maqasidi reasoning to a proportionate child-welfare objective, and jam'/tarjih scrutiny to conflicts such as disclosure

versus privacy or religious formation versus non-coercion. Every step is documented as author interpretation, distinct from the hadith itself and from any empirical test.

Table 6. Interpretive source-to-indicator matrix: normative hadith sources, author-derived ethical principles, unverified earlier concerns, and proposed observable evidence are distinct (not empirical triangulation).

Normative hadith source	**Ethical principle (author interpretation)**	**Earlier narrative (unverified)**	**Proposed indicator / evidence to inspect**
Rahmah; Muslim 2319a; Bukhari 5997	Compassion and care for the vulnerable | Interpretive path: bayani mercy narrative; maqasidi emotional safety; privacy/boundary checks.	Earlier text mentions parental concern about distress; not transcript-verified	Observation of calm responses, child-sensitive comfort; parent feedback log
Rifq; Muslim 2593; Tirmidhi 1977	Gentleness; prohibition of abusive speech | Interpretive path: bayani language of gentleness; maqasidi non-violence; proportionality review.	Earlier text mentions harshness; not transcript-verified	Non-violence policy; training records; observed redirection; incident log
Amanah; Bukhari 893	Entrusted leadership carries accountability | Interpretive path: bayani delegated responsibility; maqasidi accountability; reconcile transparency with privacy.	Earlier text mentions trust and staffing; not transcript-verified	Safeguarding lead; lawful vetting; staffing review; protected parent updates
La darar; Ibn Majah 2341 (qualified chain)	Preventing injury and retaliatory harm | Interpretive path: multiple-route source criticism; maqasidi harm prevention; proportional reporting.	Earlier text mentions complaint access; not transcript-verified	Confidential reporting channel, escalation register, non-retaliation policy
Fitrah; Bukhari 1385	Formative moral and religious socialization | Interpretive path: bayani parental context; maqasidi child development; guard against coercive analogy.	Earlier text mentions home-service continuity; not transcript-verified	Age-appropriate moral activities; caregiver conduct review; family preferences

Pillar 1: *Rahmah* (Compassion) and Responsive Care

مَنْ لَا يَرْحَمِ النَّاسَ لَا يَرْحَمْهُ اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

Translation: "Whoever does not show mercy to people, Allah Almighty does not show mercy to him." The report is narrated from Jarir ibn Abdullah.

Source and grading: *Sahih Muslim* 2319a, authentic; https://sunnah.com/muslim:2319a (compare the different chains reported under this number).

مَنْ لَا يَرْحَمُ لَا يُرْحَمُ

Translation: "Whoever does not show mercy will not be shown mercy." This statement follows the account of the Prophet kissing al-Hasan in the presence of al-Aqra ibn Habis.

Source and grading: *Sahih al-Bukhari* 5997; also *Sahih Muslim* 2318, authentic; https://sunnah.com/bukhari:5997.

The hadith of Jarir emphasizes mercy toward people, and the report concerning the Prophet's affectionate treatment of al-Hasan gives a concrete example of tenderness toward a child. Neither narration prescribes a fixed number of hugs, a prescribed time to soothe crying, or a compulsory physical-contact procedure. Their ethically defensible application is responsive, non-humiliating care calibrated to each child's comfort, abilities, family preferences, and safeguarding boundaries. In an institutional assessment, raters could observe whether staff notice distress, respond calmly, use age-appropriate comforting strategies, and record unresolved concerns. These behaviors connect religious exhortation to ECEC process quality without claiming that an observational rubric is part of the original hadith (Britto et al., 2017; Partee et al., 2022; Sluiter et al., 2025). On a bayani reading, al-Bukhari's report about al-Hasan evidences compassionate conduct rather than a direct legal prescription for an institutional response time. A maqasidi extension supports reducing foreseeable distress; evidence from child development, not the chapter heading alone, would justify how responsiveness is actually rated.

For evaluation purposes, a rater could note whether a caregiver first checks the child's immediate safety, acknowledges the child's feelings, avoids public shaming, and communicates with parents when distress recurs. Observation should occur across ordinary routines, because isolated inspections may privilege performed friendliness rather than sustained caregiving. Institutional responsibility includes adequate staffing and rest periods, as educator exhaustion can undermine sustained responsiveness (Hanno et al., 2021; Hanno et al., 2022; Kwon et al., 2021).

Pillar 2: *Rifq* (Gentleness) and Non-Violent Practice

يَا عَائِشَةُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ رَفِيقٌ يُحِبُّ الرِّفْقَ وَيُعْطِي عَلَى الرِّفْقِ مَا لَا يُعْطِي عَلَى الْعُنْفِ

Translation (relevant clause): "O Aishah, Allah is gentle and loves gentleness, and grants through gentleness what He does not grant through harshness."

Source and grading: *Sahih Muslim* 2593, authentic; https://sunnah.com/muslim:2593. The passage above reproduces the relevant *matn* rather than an unverified full *isnad*.

لَيْسَ الْمُؤْمِنُ بِالطَّعَّانِ وَلَا اللَّعَّانِ وَلَا الْفَاحِشِ وَلَا الْبَذِيءِ

Translation: "A believer is neither given to insulting others nor to cursing, indecency, or offensive speech."

Source and grading: *Jami at-Tirmidhi* 1977; al-Tirmidhi describes the report as *hasan gharib* (a later catalogue grades it *hasan*); https://sunnah.com/tirmidhi:1977.

The prophetic praise of gentleness, combined with the warning against insulting and abusive speech, supplies a moral rationale for prohibiting physical punishment, humiliation, threatening language, and coercive discipline. The hadith text does not itself create a modern licensing penalty or a clinically validated test of caregiver patience. Recommended indicators are a written non-violence policy; documented induction and refresher training; observed de-escalation and redirection practices;

confidential recording and escalation of incidents; and proportionate, reviewable responses to substantiated breaches. Staff mental health support and manageable workloads are supportive measures, not substitutes for child protection. The evidence favors professional development and attentive supervision rather than unvalidated high-pressure recruitment simulations (Ayling et al., 2020; Egert et al., 2020; Cumming et al., 2021). The bayani step identifies the speech and conduct actually prohibited or commended; the maqasidi step considers protection from humiliation and violence. Because the principal gentleness and speech reports here are transmitted outside al-Bukhari, his reconstructed juristic method is used comparatively rather than as a false attribution of those reports to al-Jami' al-Sahih.

The distinction between a moral duty and an enforceable rule also applies to penalties. An institution should act promptly to secure the child's safety and report suspected abuse through applicable safeguarding channels, but disciplinary and licensing sanctions require investigation, appropriate jurisdiction, and due process. A zero-tolerance conduct standard is compatible with proportionate decision-making; it is not a justification for permanent closure merely because a complaint was filed (Ayling et al., 2020).

Pillar 3: *Amanah* (Responsibility) and Accountable Governance

كُلُّكُمْ رَاعٍ وَكُلُّكُمْ مَسْئُولٌ عَنْ رَعِيَّتِهِ

Translation: "Each of you is a guardian, and each of you is accountable for those under your care." The broader report assigns responsibility across different social roles.

Source and grading: *Sahih al-Bukhari* 893 and *Sahih Muslim* 1829, authentic; https://sunnah.com/bukhari:893.

In the hadith of shared guardianship and responsibility, institutional leaders are accountable for those under their care. For daycare organizations, *amanah* supports clear allocation of safeguarding responsibility, incident documentation, recruitment checks relevant to child protection, transparent communication, and supervision arrangements. It does not require unrestricted live CCTV feeds; constant remote access may create risks to child privacy, educator trust, and secure handling of images. A proportionate model combines secure incident records, parent updates, privacy-controlled monitoring where lawful, emergency access protocols, and independent safeguarding review. Staffing plans also need to consider age, developmental needs, support requirements, and applicable national regulations rather than assume a single revealed numerical ratio (Meishar-Tal et al., 2022; Matthiesen et al., 2023; Dalgaard et al., 2022). Read through a bayani lens, the al-Bukhari guardianship report grounds responsibility for an entrusted role; moving from that general duty to documented daycare oversight is a contemporary maqasidi application. Where confidentiality and parental transparency compete, the reconciliation step requires compatible safeguards, not automatic priority for surveillance.

Implementation could be evaluated by checking the existence of a named safeguarding officer, written handover and incident protocols, parent communication logs, periodic supervisory review, a lawful and limited video-access policy, and a staffing-contingency plan. The degree of parental access should be negotiated within the bounds of privacy law and the rights of all children and staff, rather than presented as an unqualified expression of trust (Matthiesen et al., 2023; Meishar-Tal et al., 2022).

Pillar 4: *La Darar* (Prevention of Harm) and Protected Reporting

لَا ضَرَرَ وَلَا ضِرَارَ

Translation: "There should be neither harm nor reciprocating harm." The phrase is treated as a legal maxim, with more than one transmitted route.

Transmission note: *Sunan Ibn Majah* 2341 transmits the *matn* via Ibn Abbas and is graded *daif* in the Darussalam edition; https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:2341. Al-Nawawi (Hadith 32) also

discusses an Abu Sa'id route and Malik's mursal transmission; this must not be conflated with the specific Ibn ‘Abbas route in Ibn Majah 2341 (al-Nawawi, n.d.; Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali, 1997).

The maxim 'no harm and no reciprocating harm' offers a widely used jurisprudential rationale for preventing foreseeable injury and providing channels for remedy. Its transmission history needs qualification: the route presented as Ibn Majah 2341 is through Ibn ‘Abbas in that numbering and is graded weak in one contemporary classification, while the no-harm maxim is supported and discussed through multiple routes in legal scholarship. It should not be labeled unconditionally *sahih* on the basis of the single isnad cited in the manuscript. The institutional implication is a clear, accessible, confidential complaint pathway, a record of follow-up, referral to competent authorities when needed, and protection against retaliation. Community participation means reporting credible concerns through lawful mechanisms, not an unrestricted right to enter or publicize allegations (Ayling et al., 2020; Riady et al., 2026).

Transmission criticism and juristic authority are different questions. In Hadith 32 of al-Arba‘in, al-Nawawi discusses the supporting routes of the no-harm report; Ibn Rajab's commentary examines the various chains and the rule's legal implications, without requiring every isolated route to be sound. The Ottoman Majalla separately articulates the prohibition of reciprocal harm (Article 19) and the removal of harm (Article 20), illustrating the maxim's standing within juristic reasoning. None of this converts Ibn Majah 2341's particular chain into an unqualified sahih report, and none imposes a ready-made daycare audit checklist. This example underscores the methodological distinction between the probative status of a text, the interpretive route to a legal principle, and the selection of a practical response. A juristically accepted maxim may inform safeguarding design without treating one weak isnad as authentic or deriving an accreditation sanction directly from it.

A reporting protocol should describe how concerns are received, who can access sensitive information, what triggers urgent child protection referral, how families are informed within legal limits, and how follow-up is recorded. Neighbors and community leaders can raise concerns, but cannot independently determine whether a child was abused. This qualification prevents a preventive principle from becoming a pretext for vigilante intervention or public disclosure (Ayling et al., 2020).

Pillar 5: *Fitrah* (Moral and Spiritual Nurturing)

كُلُّ مَوْلُودٍ يُولَدُ عَلَى الْفِطْرَةِ فَأَبَوَاهُ يُهَوِّدَانِهِ أَوْ يُنَصِّرَانِهِ أَوْ يُمَجِّسَانِهِ

Translation: “Every child is born upon the fitrah; then his parents make him a Jew, a Christian, or a Magian.” This is the relevant clause of a longer report.

Source and grading: *Sahih al-Bukhari* 1385 and *Sahih Muslim* 2658, authentic; https://sunnah.com/bukhari:1385.

The *fitrah* narration recognizes the importance of the formative environment and the strong influence of parents on children's religious socialization. Its immediate wording concerns parents; describing daycares as 'parents' by legal equivalence is an interpretation rather than a direct quotation. In a Muslim-oriented daycare, observable practices could reasonably include respectful daily routines, appropriate prayer and religious storytelling, nutritious food consistent with agreed family requirements, modeling fairness and honesty, and age-sensitive guidance. A proposed indicator must protect children's dignity, avoid coercive religious assessment, and respect differences among families. Evidence about religious upbringing supports careful, developmentally appropriate habituation rather than claims that screen bans or specified media rules are mandated word-for-word by this hadith (Hafid, 2023; Anikoh & Muarif, 2024; Mumtaz et al., 2024; Zaida, 2024; Rahiem & Marhamah, 2025; Al Faqh & Sirait, 2026; Fauziah et al., 2026; Muthohar et al., 2026). The bayani limit is especially important here: the al-Bukhari report names parents, not institutional childcare staff. Any proposal concerning caregiver modeling or age-appropriate activities is a reasoned and revisable extension motivated by child welfare (maqasidi), not an express rule extracted from the report's immediate wording.

The proposed *fitrah* criterion is therefore an audit of the learning environment and caregiver conduct, not an attempt to measure a child's faith or to presume that a daily religious routine proves spiritual safety. Developmental literature indicates that responsive care, play, and emotionally secure relationships remain essential, even in settings with explicit religious programming (Black et al., 2017; Fauziah et al., 2026; Robingatin & Anwar, 2026).

Taken together, the five pillars form a preliminary ethical-operational matrix, not a validated accreditation scale. For pilot use, each indicator should specify its unit of observation (written policy, employee practice, training record, safeguarding log, parent communication, or child-safe learning activity), the assessor, evidence threshold, and remedial pathway. A practical cycle would be voluntary self-review, independent content review by hadith and ECEC specialists, non-punitive pilot observation, feedback from families and staff, revision of items, and formal reliability and validity assessment. Only after that process could policymakers examine whether particular criteria merit inclusion in official standards, subject to legal authority, costs, privacy, and the risk of excluding low-resource providers (Boateng et al., 2018; Slot, 2018; OECD, 2024; Fauziah et al., 2026). Before piloting, reviewers should examine both the usul-based interpretive justification (textual scope, legal objective, reconciliation with other evidence) and the secular assessment specification (measurable behavior, safe observation protocol, rater training, reliability). This distinguishes rigorous hadith-based reasoning from the empirical obligations of developing and testing a new assessment instrument.

The interpretive progression remains the same for every pillar: hadith text and context, ethical inference, present-day childcare application, and proposed verification method. Thus, mercy is related to observed responsiveness, gentleness to non-violent guidance, entrusted responsibility to governance records, the no-harm principle to protected reporting, and fitrah to developmentally appropriate moral routines. Each association is a contemporary author proposal rather than a direct numerical, administrative, or licensing instruction in the narrated text. A field pilot should state assessor training, sampling of routines, observation windows, documentary thresholds, safeguarding escalation rules, and inter-rater agreement before any score or institutional judgment is used.

CONCLUSION

This article combines a reported exploratory field survey employing a four-point Likert questionnaire with a carefully delimited analysis of hadith-based childcare ethics. Its main contribution is a preliminary Hadhanah Mu'assasiyyah framework linking prophetic sources and reasoned interpretation to five possible domains of institutional practice: rahmah (responsive compassion), rifq (non-violent care), amanah (accountable governance), la darar (harm prevention and protected reporting), and fitrah (age-appropriate moral and religious nurturing). The source-to-indicator matrix and a newly proposed 21-item bank offer candidates for observation and future testing, not validated factors, a reliable scale, or accreditation requirements. The fieldwork account identifies 102 stakeholders in three groups, but item-level Likert responses, original anchors and questions, separate survey and interview denominators, interview transcripts, recruitment details, and ethics records were not available for verification. Accordingly, unsupported numerical endorsements, regression findings, and claims of instrument validity are not repeated. Further work must recover the primary study archive, confirm ethics and consent procedures, report complete descriptive distributions, evaluate expert content judgments, pilot the indicators in actual childcare settings, and assess inter-rater agreement and psychometric reliability. These stages are necessary before claiming generalizability or regulatory readiness. The methodological contribution lies in applying bayani analysis to the wording and context of hadith, maqasidi analysis to child welfare and protection, and jam'/tarjih to competing interpretive considerations. This careful bridge between legal-ethical reasoning and measurable childcare practice remains an author-developed contemporary proposal; it does not imply that al-Bukhari prescribed daycare rules or that the proposed indicators have already demonstrated effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia, for institutional support.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

A contributed to the conceptualization of the study, development of the research framework, methodology, formal analysis, and preparation of the original manuscript. MB contributed to the methodology, data collection, data analysis, validation, and critical review of the manuscript. S contributed to data collection, interpretation of the findings, validation, and manuscript editing. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

AI DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Gemini and Grammarly were used for language editing and readability. ChatGPT was also used to assist with editorial restructuring and literature organization during revision. The authors must verify all citations, hadith texts, factual claims, and analyses before publication and retain full responsibility for the article.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

Al Faqh, M. A., & Sirait, S. (2026). Religious Behavior in Early Childhood: Internalization of Values and Habituation in the School Environment. *Al-Athfaal*. https://doi.org/10.24042/al-athfaal.v91.31012

Anikoh, I., & Muarif, A. S. (2024). Parental Guidance in Instilling Religious Values Early Childhood in Karangdoro Village. *At-Taujih*, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.30739/jbkid.v4i1.3433

Ayling, N. J., Walsh, K., & Williams, K. E. (2020). Factors Influencing Early Childhood Education and Care Educators' Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 45(1), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939119885307

Black, M. M., Walker, S. P., Fernald, L. C. H., et al. (2017). Early Childhood Development Coming of Age: Science Through the Life Course. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 77–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7

Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A primer. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 6, 149. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One Size Fits All? What Counts As Quality Practice In (Reflexive) Thematic Analysis?. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Britto, P. R., Lye, S. J., Proulx, K., et al. (2017). Nurturing Care: Promoting Early Childhood Development. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 91–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31390-3

Chandra, A. S. D., & Alias, M. A. A. (2026). Reformulating Child Custody Determination in Indonesian Islamic Family Law: Realizing the Best Interests of the Child Principle. *SMART: Journal of Sharia, Tradition, and Modernity.* https://doi.org/10.24042/kf1xc354

Creswell, J. W., & Inoue, M. (2025). A Process for Conducting Mixed Methods Data Analysis. *Journal of General and Family Medicine*, 26(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgf2.736

Cumming, T., Wong, S., & Logan, H. (2021). Early Childhood Educators' Well-Being, Work Environments And "Quality": Possibilities for Changing Policy and Practice. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 46(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939120979064

Dalgaard, N. T., Bondebjerg, A., Klokker, R., Viinholt, B. C. A., & Dietrichson, J. (2022). Adult/Child Ratio and Group Size in Early Childhood Education or Care to Promote the Development of Children Aged 0–5 Years: A Systematic Review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 18(2), e1239. https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1239

Darussamin, Z. (2025). The Relevance of Textual and Living Hadith Studies in Indonesia: Methodologies and Their Contributions to the Comprehension of Hadith. *Al-Bukhari*, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.32505/al-bukhari.v8i1.9125

Eadie, P., Page, J., Levickis, P., Elek, C., Murray, L., Wang, L., & Lloyd-Johnsen, C. (2024). Domains of Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: A Scoping Review of the Extent and Consistency of the Literature. *Educational Review*, 76(4), 1057–1086. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2022.2077704

Egert, F., Dederer, V., & Fukkink, R. G. (2020). The Impact of in-Service Professional Development on The Quality of Teacher–Child Interactions in Early Education and Care: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 29, 100309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100309

Fauziah, Y. R., Murfi, A., Syafii, A., & Prasetyo, G. (2026). Lived Faith and Moral-Spiritual Development in Muslim Early Childhood: A PRISMA-Based Systematic Review and A Proposed Multi-Level Assessment Framework. *Al-Athfal: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak*, 12(1), 175–196. https://doi.org/10.14421/al-athfal.2026.121-12

Fetters, M. D., & Tajima, C. (2022). Joint Displays of Integrated Data Collection in Mixed Methods Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221104564

Gasmelsid, S. M., Bin Jamil, K. H., & Nasution, A. (2026). On Living Hadîts: A New Trend of Hermeneutics Approach to Study Hadîts in Indonesia. *MIQOT*, 50(1). https://doi.org/10.30821/miqot.v50i1.1587

Ha, N. T. N., Tham, M., & Hurley, P. (2025). Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care in Australia: A Systematic Literature Review. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 53, 2193–2206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-024-01735-4

Hafid, A. (2023). Pendidikan Islam pada Anak Usia Dini: Peran Orang Tua dalam Membentuk Identitas Keagamaan dalam Rumah Tangga. *Mitra Ash-Shibyan*, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.46963/mash.v6i02.877

Hanno, E. C., Gardner, M., Jones, S. M., & Lesaux, N. K. (2022). An Ecological Perspective on Early Educator Well-Being at the Start of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 60, 214–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2022.02.002

Hanno, E. C., McCoy, D. C., Sabol, T. J., & Gonzalez, K. E. (2021). Early Educators' Collective Workplace Stress as A Predictor of Professional Development's Impacts on Children's Development. *Child Development*, 92(3), 833–843. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13566

Harid, M. A., & Ashufa, A. H. (2025). Child Custody and the Principle of Best Interests in Divorce Decisions at the Makassar Religious Court: An analysis of Maqashid al Syariah. *Shautuna.* https://doi.org/10.24252/shautuna.v6i3.58337

Hausladen, K., Wolf, K., Burghardt, L., & Anders, Y. (2026). The Relationship Between the Child–Staff Ratio and Process Quality in Early Childhood Education Institutions: A Meta-Analysis. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 76, 556–567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2026.05.002

Kadarisman, A., Fedro, A., & Arifin, Z. (2025). Best Interest of the Child in Islamic Family Law: Integrating Maqasid Al-Shariah and Double Movement Theory in Hadanah Cases. *Jurnal Al-Dustur*, 8(2), 155–174. https://doi.org/10.30863/aldustur.v8i2.10459

Kwon, K. A., Ford, T. G., Jeon, L., Malek-Lasater, A., Ellis, N., Randall, K., Kile, M., & Salvatore, A. L. (2021). Testing a Holistic Conceptual Framework for Early Childhood Teacher Well-Being. Journal of School Psychology, 86, 178–197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2021.03.006

Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal Article Reporting Standards for Qualitative Primary, Qualitative Meta-Analytic, and Mixed Methods Research in Psychology. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 26–46. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151

Lubis, I., & Aziz, A. (2025). The Comparative Analysis of the Legal Implications of Hadhanah In Islamic Family Law. *Inklusif*, 10(2). https://doi.org/10.24235/inklusif.v10i2.22335

Matthiesen, N., Cavada-Hrepich, P., & Tanggaard, L. (2023). The Trust Imperative: Conceptualizing the Dynamics of Trust and Distrust in Parent–Professional Collaboration. *Educational Theory*, 72(5), 663–683. https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12549

Meishar-Tal, H., Forkosh-Baruch, A., Levy, L., et al. (2022). Implications of CCTV Cameras on Child-Care Centres' Routines, Peer Relationships, and Parent–Teacher Relationships: Child Care Educators' Opinions. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 16, 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40723-022-00102-3

Mumtaz, B., Darmu'in, D., & Sutiyono, A. (2024). How Authoritative Parenting Shapes Religious Values in Early Childhood: Insights from PAUD Citra Harapan. *Jurnal Obsesi*, 8(5), 915–925. https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v8i5.6103

Muthohar, S., Filasofa, L. M. K., Fatmawati, N. M., & Hayati, M. (2026). Guided Digital Mediation in Early Childhood Islamic Education: Multisensory Approaches to Religious Identity Formation. *Qualitative Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-12-2025-0456

OECD. (2024). Engaging Parents and Guardians in Early Childhood Education and Care Centres. *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, 110. https://doi.org/10.1787/d05dd1cf-en

Partee, A. M., Alamos, P., Williford, A. P., & Downer, J. T. (2022). Preschool Children's Observed Interactions with Teachers: Implications for Understanding Teacher–Child Relationships. *School Mental Health*, 14(4), 967–983. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-022-09517-2

Pilarz, A. R., Lin, Y.-C., & Premo, E. M. (2024). Family Engagement Practices and Children's Attendance and Early Learning Skills in A Public Pre-Kindergarten Program. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 163, 107794. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2024.107794

Putri, V. S., Judiasih, S. D., & Kusmayanti, H. (2026). The Best Interest of the Child in Islamic Family Law: Declarative and Enforceable Custody Protection in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Nusantara Islam*, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.15575/ijni.v14i1.54393

Qudsy, S. Z., Abdullah, I., Jubba, H., Prasojo, Z. H., & Taufik, E. T. (2023). The Making of Living Hadith: A New Direction of Hadith Studies in Indonesia. *Culture and Religion*, 23(4), 353–372. https://doi.org/10.1080/14755610.2024.2336461

Qusyairi, A. I., Aisah, S., & Halid, A. (2026). Lived Religion as A Pedagogical Ecology for Early Childhood Character Formation in Muslim Families. *Al-Athfal: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak*, 12(1), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.14421/al-athfal.2026.121-09

Rahiem, M. D. H., & Marhamah, L. (2025). Parents' Conceptions of Islamic Religious Education for Indonesian Early Childhood. *TARBIYA: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 12(2). https://doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v12i2.51595

Republic of Indonesia. (2016). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 84 Tahun 2014 tentang Pendirian Satuan Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini. https://oss.go.id/id/regulasi/9919641c-84cb-4f24-a398-7323d46d6947

Republic of Indonesia. (2025). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Nomor 12 Tahun 2025 tentang Standar Isi pada PAUD, Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar, dan Jenjang Pendidikan Menengah. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/322494/permendikdasmen-no-12-tahun-2025

Riady, F., Hudaya, H., & Karim, A. (2026). Suspending Hasty Legitimation: Affirming the Substance of Living Hadith As A Study of Reception of Text and Practice. *Jurnal Living Hadis*, 11(1), 48–74. https://doi.org/10.14421/livinghadis.2016.7710

Richter, L. M., Daelmans, B., Lombardi, J., et al. (2017). Investing in the Foundation of Sustainable Development: Pathways to Scale Up for Early Childhood Development. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31698-1

Robingatin, R., & Anwar, S. (2026). Development of an Islamic Values-Based Early Childhood Education Curriculum to Foster Children's Religious Character. *Al-Athfaal*. https://doi.org/10.24042/al-athfaal.v91.31787

Sari, R. (2025). Analysis of the Development of Hadith Trends in Indonesia. *Al-Munir*, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.24239/al-munir.v7i01.2086

Slot, P. (2018). Structural Characteristics and Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: A Literature Review. *OECD Education Working Papers*, 176. https://doi.org/10.1787/edaf3793-en

Sluiter, R. M. V., Fukkink, R. G., & Fekkes, M. (2025). The Impact of Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care on Socio-Emotional Development: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(5), 775. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22050775

Ulferts, H., Wolf, K. M., & Anders, Y. (2019). Impact of Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care on Academic Outcomes: Longitudinal meta-analysis. Child Development, 90(5), 1474–1489. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13296

von Suchodoletz, A., Lee, D. S., Henry, J., Tamang, S., Premachandra, B., & Yoshikawa, H. (2023). Early Childhood Education and Care Quality and Associations with Child Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 18(5), e0285985. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0285985

Zaida, N. A. (2024). The Role of Parents in Forming the Islamic Identity of Early Children in the Digital Era. *Darul Ilmi*, 12(2). https://doi.org/10.24952/di.v12i2.13836