:: JEET ::
(Journal of English Education and Technology)
Volume 07 Number 02 2026
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

DESIGNING RELATIONALLY PROTECTIVE DIGITAL CLIL FOR ENGLISH-MEDIUM ISLAMIC EDUCATION IN AN INDONESIAN PESANTREN

NUR FADLILAHTUL SAKINAH[1], MOH. FAHMI JAZULI[2]
Universitas Kiai Abdullah Faqih Gresik
kinas3537@gmail.com[1], jsandaljepit993@gmail.com[2]

First Received: April 10 2026 Final Proof Received: June 20 2026

ABSTRACT

This article develops and qualifies a relationally protective digital content and language integrated learning (CLIL) framework for English-medium Islamic Religious Education (PAI) in an Indonesian pesantren. The article addresses a design gap rather than claiming an intervention effect of existing work describes English-medium instruction, CLIL, multilingual mediation and digital wellbeing, but gives less attention to how these elements can be aligned without sacrificing PAI meaning, learner dignity or equitable access. The framework was constructed through a bounded conceptual synthesis informed by three Indonesian-language manuscripts derived from a previous five-participant phenomenological project. The manuscripts were used as contextual material, not as evidence that the participants experienced digital CLIL or achieved English development. A purposive literature synthesis then connected recurring contextual resources with CLIL/EMI theory, translanguaging, language anxiety, relational wellbeing, digital equity and responsible technology use. The resulting design specification contains four analytic domains, content integrity, language-mediated meaning, relational wellbeing and digital participation, and a six-stage cycle of diagnosis, comprehensible input, private rehearsal, collaborative meaning negotiation, dual-channel feedback and reflection with transfer. Each domain is now linked to a proposed mechanism, observable evidence and a safeguarding condition. The article also states four propositions and a staged validation programme involving teacher co-design, classroom observation, learner-accessibility accounts, independent assessment and negative-case analysis. No claim is made that the framework improves English, wellbeing or technology acceptance. Its contribution is a transparent, culturally situated design logic that can be tested and adapted in multilingual faith-based settings.

Keyword: digital CLIL; English-medium instruction; Islamic Religious Education; multilingual pedagogy; relational wellbeing.

I. INTRODUCTION

English-medium Islamic Religious Education (PAI) occupies a consequential but under-theorised space between subject instruction and language education. When English is used to mediate PAI, teachers must preserve conceptual and ethical accuracy while making disciplinary meaning accessible to learners with different

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

English, Arabic and Indonesian repertoires. A fluent response is therefore not sufficient evidence of understanding, and a hesitant response is not sufficient evidence of conceptual weakness. The central design problem is how to coordinate content objectives, language objectives, relational participation and technology access without turning English into a gatekeeper for religious knowledge.

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) offers a principled starting point because it plans subject learning and language learning together rather than treating one as an accidental by-product of the other (Coyle et al., 2010; Anggarini et al., 2022). English-medium instruction (EMI), by contrast, identifies the language of delivery but does not necessarily specify language-development outcomes or integrated assessment (Macaro et al., 2018; Rose et al., 2022; Curle, 2026). Recent work in Islamic and pesantren settings confirms the importance of teacher preparation, content-language alignment and student readiness, but it does not yet provide a sufficiently explicit design account of digitally mediated PAI participation (As Sabiq et al., 2025; Prastyo et al., 2024; Saksono et al., 2025; Sari & Alsulami, 2026). This article therefore treats digital CLIL as a design problem in which technology is selected for a defined pedagogical function, not as an intervention whose novelty guarantees learning.

The contextual material available for this article consists of three Indonesian-language manuscripts based on one earlier phenomenological project involving five santri experiencing family disruption at Mambaus Sholihin II. The manuscripts describe educational routines, moral and spiritual value internalisation and subjective wellbeing, themes consistent with current work on Islamic-education transformation (Fauziyah et al., 2026) and meaning-making under stress (Park, 2010). They contain no digital CLIL intervention, English proficiency measure, platform trace or longitudinal outcome. Their role in the present article is limited to identifying culturally situated resources that may inform design, such as predictable routines, relational support and meaning-making. The manuscripts are not treated as a baseline, a representative sample or evidence of a general pesantren effect.

The article consequently asks two design questions. First, how can contextual resources from a pesantren ecology be translated into observable and non-stigmatising design requirements for English-medium PAI? Second, what evidence would be needed to determine whether a digital CLIL design improves content understanding and English participation without increasing anxiety, surveillance or inequity? These are design and evaluation questions rather than treatment-effect questions. The distinction is essential because a conceptual model can be useful before it is empirically validated, but only if its proposed mechanisms and limits are made explicit.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

The contribution is a design-and-evaluation framework organised around separable outcomes and learner dignity. It adds a traceability layer to CLIL and translanguaging by requiring teachers and learners to show how a PAI source becomes an English-mediated message, what language support was used, and how the message was revised. It also adds a governance layer that treats consent, visibility, deletion, offline access and the optional status of generative AI as part of pedagogy. The framework is not presented as a replacement for CLIL, EMI or culturally responsive teaching. Its added value lies in specifying conditions under which these traditions can be aligned in a multilingual Islamic setting.

The revised article has four aims. It distinguishes EMI, CLIL and technology-mediated learning; translates bounded pesantren evidence into four design domains with explicit mechanisms and failure conditions; specifies a six-stage instructional cycle and an assessment architecture that separates PAI understanding from English performance, participation and safeguarding; and establishes a staged research programme capable of testing the proposal without requiring sensitive disclosure. The article treats all four aims as provisional design work. The framework is therefore offered for critical adaptation and validation, not as an established model of effectiveness.

EMI and CLIL overlap but are not synonymous. EMI minimally describes the use of English to teach academic content, while CLIL explicitly plans both content and language objectives and makes responsibility for linguistic access visible (Macaro et al., 2018; Rose et al., 2022). Digital CLIL adds a third layer: digital tools are selected to perform a specified function within the content-language design, such as repeated input, private rehearsal, collaborative annotation or revision. A lesson does not become digital CLIL merely because a platform is used. The relevant question is whether the tool changes an identifiable learning process while preserving the subject's conceptual integrity.

Digital affordances are therefore treated as conditional rather than inherently beneficial. Audio may support repeated exposure and private rehearsal, shared annotation may support close reading, asynchronous response may provide preparation time, and recorded feedback may make revision visible. These affordances can also create distraction, public exposure, data risk or disadvantage for learners with unreliable access. Research on technology and language anxiety shows that personalisation and automation can produce both support and pressure (Huang & Liu, 2025; Ding & Xue, 2025). The design must consequently specify the problem a tool solves, the evidence of that function and an equivalent low-tech route.

The pesantren context contributes a fourth dimension. The original manuscripts foreground relational support, stable routines and spiritual meaning, but these resources are not assumed to operate as universal mechanisms. They become

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

pedagogically relevant only when connected to an observable decision, such as asking for clarification, choosing a rehearsal route, requesting accessible materials or revising an explanation. The framework uses this distinction to preserve cultural specificity without converting family disruption, religious commitment or institutional belonging into learner categories or predicted outcomes.

II. Model-Building Method

This is a bounded conceptual synthesis informed by contextual case material. The article does not report a new intervention, re-code original transcripts or estimate an effect. The contextual component is a previously authored five-participant phenomenological corpus represented by three Indonesian-language manuscripts and their coding summaries. The literature component was selected purposively rather than exhaustively. Sources were retained when they clarified at least one of the article's design problems content-language integration, multilingual mediation, learner affect, digital access, ethical governance or evaluation. The synthesis therefore makes an interpretive design argument, not a statistical estimate of the literature.

Model construction followed an explicit audit trail. First, the three manuscripts were compared for recurring descriptions of routines, relationships, value internalisation and wellbeing, while material unrelated to instructional design was excluded. Second, each recurring resource was mapped to CLIL/EMI, translanguaging, language-anxiety, wellbeing and digital-equity concepts. Third, the authors converted the mapped concepts into design specifications and stated the observable learner or teacher action expected from each specification. Fourth, each specification was assigned a possible evidence source and a safeguarding condition. The audit trail separates contextual observations, theoretical interpretations and author-proposed hypotheses. It does not claim formal systematic-review coverage or empirical validation.

Three boundary conditions govern use of the model. Teachers must verify that the lesson actually involves English-mediated PAI, identify the linguistic burden of the source and provide access to qualified PAI and language expertise. Learners must not be recruited into a new intervention merely because they participated in the earlier phenomenological project. Researchers must obtain appropriate institutional approval, age-appropriate consent or assent, data-minimisation procedures and platform permissions before collecting recordings, interaction traces or sensitive wellbeing measures. A design that cannot meet these conditions should use a low-tech, non-recorded alternative or should not be implemented.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

The source corpus was treated as contextual material with a documented provenance boundary. It consisted of three draft manuscripts prepared from one phenomenological project involving five santri at Mambaus Sholihin II. The present article does not claim ownership of a new interview dataset, does not reproduce identifiable quotations and does not use the corpus as baseline evidence for English outcomes. Before publication, the authors should be able to document permission to reuse the manuscripts, the original ethical approval or consent arrangements and the distinct contribution of this framework article in relation to companion manuscripts. This provenance requirement protects both participants and the integrity of the publication record.

Ethical reasoning was built into the method. Family disruption remains a contextual condition because it appears in the source material, but it is not equated with trauma, diagnosis or a stable learner identity. The design consequently uses universal supports predictable instructions, choice, private rehearsal, respectful feedback and accessible alternatives that can benefit any learner. No task requires disclosure of family history, religious commitment or emotional state. Generative AI is optional rather than central, and any use requires disclosure, source checking and data minimisation. These boundaries keep the framework educational rather than clinical and make later validation ethically reviewable.

III. Proposed Digital CLIL Framework

Domain 1—Content integrity is a design principle concerning the accuracy, contextualisation and ethical framing of PAI knowledge. Each module begins with a limited set of concepts and verified sources, such as mutual assistance, ethical communication or stewardship. A qualified PAI teacher checks the conceptual distinctions before the English task is designed. The proposed mechanism is source-guided meaning construction: learners annotate the source, justify an interpretation and explain the ethical rationale rather than merely translate key words. Observable evidence includes an annotated source, a justified explanation and a content rubric. A failure condition is a fluent but decontextualised message; the safeguard is qualified subject review and traceable attribution.

Domain 2—Language-mediated meaning is a design principle concerning purposeful English use in relation to a content goal. The teacher identifies a realistic communicative objective, such as explaining a cause, comparing examples, asking for clarification or presenting a qualified claim. Arabic or Indonesian clarification is allowed when it improves conceptual accuracy, but the path from source to English message must remain visible. The proposed mechanism is mediated formulation through input, negotiation, feedback and revision. Evidence includes a draft and

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

revised explanation, interactional moves and purposeful vocabulary use. A failure condition is either English fluency without PAI understanding or unrestricted clarification that bypasses English development. The safeguard is separate content and language assessment.

Domain 3—Relational wellbeing is a design principle concerning predictable participation, non-stigmatising support and legitimate help-seeking. The source manuscripts portray peer and supervisor relationships as meaningful resources, but the framework does not infer a psychological effect from their presence. Teachers provide predictable instructions, choice over the first response mode, respectful feedback, private rehearsal and a clear route for requesting support. The proposed mechanism is reduced avoidable participation risk, which may make engagement possible without demanding disclosure. Evidence includes available participation routes, feedback responses and learner accounts of accessibility. A failure condition is public comparison, compulsory disclosure or feedback that equates English performance with religious commitment.

Domain 4—Digital participation and access is a design principle concerning the fit between a tool, a learning function and the learner's right to safe participation. Technology is selected only when it supports input, rehearsal, collaboration or revision more effectively than an available alternative. Downloadable audio, editable bilingual glossaries, private drafting and short collaborative documents are possible examples. The proposed mechanism is expanded opportunity to access, practise and revise meaning. Evidence includes artefacts, use traces where consent exists and equivalent offline work. A failure condition is platform dependence, exposure or unequal access. The safeguard is consent, data minimisation, deletion rules, visibility control and a credible low-tech route.

The four domains are analytic categories and design principles, not a causal sequence. They overlap in practice, but each asks a different accountability question: Is the PAI meaning accurate? Is English used for a defined communicative purpose? Can learners participate without avoidable stigma or exposure? Does technology expand access without creating new risk? The framework predicts possibilities rather than outcomes already found at the site. A future study should therefore test the domains separately and jointly, report negative cases and preserve the option that ordinary scaffolding performs as well as or better than a digital design.

Table 1 operationalises the four domains as design principles. The evidence column lists indicators for future evaluation, not findings already observed at the site; the safeguard column states a minimum ethical or access condition.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

Table 1—Digital CLIL domains, mechanisms, evidence and safeguards.

Domain	Design focus and proposed mechanism	Observable evidence for future testing	Failure condition and safeguard
Content integrity	Verified PAI concepts, source traceability and ethical distinctions; source-guided meaning construction	Annotated source, attributed explanation, justification and independent content rubric	Fluent but decontextualised message; qualified subject review and no unsupported quotation
Language-mediated meaning	Purposeful English form linked to a content objective, with structured Arabic or Indonesian clarification	Draft and revised explanation, interactional moves, terminology choices and transfer task	English fluency without understanding or clarification that bypasses English; separate content and language scoring
Relational wellbeing	Predictable routines, legitimate choice, respectful feedback and non-stigmatising help-seeking	Available participation routes, feedback response, revision decisions and accessibility accounts	Disclosure, public comparison or moralised fluency; universal support and privacy protection
Digital participation and access	Tool selected for a defined function in input, rehearsal, collaboration or revision	Artefacts, consented traces, offline-equivalent work and access feedback	Platform dependence, exposure or unequal access; consent, deletion, visibility control and low-tech alternatives

A Six-Stage Instructional Cycle

Stage 1—Diagnose without labelling. Teachers check prior knowledge of the PAI concept and the language demands of the task through low-stakes prompts, short annotations or optional oral responses. The diagnostic is used to plan support, not to identify family histories, rank emotional resilience or exclude hesitant learners. In large classes, a short common task and rotating teacher or peer support may be more feasible than individual screening. Evidence consists of a baseline concept response and a language sample, while the safeguard is minimal data collection and non-stigmatising interpretation.

Stage 2—Provide comprehensible multimodal input. A short English explanation is paired with a clear visual, checked bilingual terminology and teacher modelling. Students may pause, replay or download the input where access permits, while a printed or teacher-led equivalent remains available. The teacher checks that Arabic and Indonesian glosses preserve the PAI concept rather than simply reducing linguistic difficulty. Evidence includes annotations, questions and a vocabulary record. The design is successful only when the input supports both conceptual access and a specified English objective.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

Stage 3—Rehearse privately. Students create a low-stakes written, audio or visual draft and compare it with success criteria before public interaction. Private rehearsal is an instructional scaffold, not a therapeutic intervention. Learners may revise, delete or replace a recording, and the platform should not display early errors to peers. If recording is inappropriate or unavailable, a paper draft, whisper rehearsal or teacher conference can serve the same function. Evidence consists of a draft history or rehearsal reflection, not a platform score.

Stage 4—Negotiate meaning collaboratively. Pairs or small groups discuss an ethically bounded PAI case and co-construct a concise English response. Roles should rotate so that writing, source checking, technology control and oral explanation do not become fixed status positions. Arabic or Indonesian may be used to test a difficult interpretation, but the group records how the final English message was formulated. The task should not require disclosure of family experience. Evidence includes interactional moves and a group artefact, with individual explanation used to make learning visible.

Stage 5—Offer dual-channel formative feedback. Teachers comment separately on PAI accuracy and English communication. A content comment may address an unsupported interpretation, while a language comment may address clarity, organisation or an appropriate form. Automated translation, speech recognition or generative suggestions may be used only as optional prompts, with disclosure and human checking. Learners decide which suggestions to accept, reject or revise and explain the reason. Evidence consists of feedback response and a revised product; the safeguard is that no automated output determines religious accuracy or personal worth.

Stage 6—Reflect and review. Students identify a substantive PAI insight, a useful English expression, the support they used and a manageable next target. A short transfer task with a new PAI passage or communicative problem tests whether the learner can use the strategy with reduced scaffolding. Optional anonymous feedback asks whether instructions, access and participation expectations were fair, not whether a learner has disclosed distress. The teacher revises the unit from observed patterns and negative cases rather than presumed wellbeing effects.

Responsibility should be shared but not blurred. Teachers remain responsible for source selection, task boundaries, language support, feedback quality, accessibility and safeguarding. Learners remain responsible for making meaning, asking for clarification, attempting the target language and deciding how to revise. Institutions remain responsible for platform contracts, data retention, staff preparation and offline provision. This allocation prevents a learner's willingness to speak or disclose

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

from becoming a moral indicator. It also acknowledges that a six-stage cycle requires time, collaboration and professional judgement rather than a single application.

Table 2—Six-stage instructional cycle and evidence for review

Stage	Teacher action	Learner action	Evidence for review
1 Diagnose	Check PAI prior knowledge and language demands through low-stakes, non-stigmatising prompts	Identify what is understood and choose where clarification is needed	Baseline concept response, language sample and access needs
2 Input	Provide short English input, checked visuals, bilingual terminology, modelling and an offline equivalent	Listen, read, annotate, question and compare source meaning	Annotations, questions, terminology record and comprehension check
3 Rehearse	Offer private drafting or recording with success criteria, deletion choice and low-tech alternative	Practise, compare, revise and decide what to share	Draft history, revision reason or rehearsal reflection
4 Negotiate	Structure an ethically bounded pair or group problem with rotating roles	Explain, clarify, listen and co-construct a traceable answer	Interactional moves, individual explanation and group artefact
5 Feedback	Comment separately on PAI accuracy, English communication, access and source use	Interpret feedback, accept or reject suggestions and revise	Feedback response, revision log and revised product
6 Reflect and transfer	Invite substantive and linguistic reflection, a new-task transfer and unit redesign	State a PAI insight, English gain, language choice and next goal	Reflection, transfer task, access feedback and negative case

Assessment and Research Design

A principal safeguard is to separate outcomes. PAI understanding can be judged through conceptual accuracy, source attribution, justification and ethical reasoning. English development can be judged through comprehensibility, relevant vocabulary, interactional clarity and discourse organisation. Participation can be documented through voluntary turns, completion of supported tasks and help-seeking routes, but it is not equivalent to proficiency. Safeguarding evidence concerns consent, access, visibility, deletion and learner experience of the task. Sample descriptors and anchor performances should be developed before implementation, and content and language raters should be calibrated separately.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

An initial feasibility study should collect at least four kinds of evidence: co-designed lesson plans, classroom interaction or digital artefacts, independent ratings of PAI and English performance, and learner accounts of access and safety. The study should report class size, proficiency, teacher preparation, device access, missing data and the extent of actual revision. A mixed-methods design can connect product outcomes with participation and usability, while negative-case analysis can identify situations in which recording, bilingual support or group work increases anxiety or obscures PAI meaning. No psychological measure should be collected without specialist oversight and appropriate consent.

The earlier corpus is useful for identifying design priorities, but it must not be merged into a later intervention as though it were baseline evidence for English outcomes. Research involving the same original participants requires explicit disclosure of the shared source, a distinct research question and renewed consent where new data are collected. The present article should be evaluated as a conceptual contribution independent of the earlier phenomenological findings. This separation is necessary for methodological validity and for a transparent publication record.

A useful assessment architecture therefore has three layers. Product evidence records the accuracy of a PAI explanation, the intelligibility of English and the appropriateness of interaction. Process evidence records annotation, rehearsal attempts, feedback interpretation, language choices and revision reasons. Transfer evidence asks learners to respond to a new PAI passage or communicative problem with reduced scaffolding. These layers should not be collapsed into a single impressionistic grade. Future studies should use independent raters, anchor examples, accessibility checks and inter-rater reliability estimates, while treating view counts and visual polish as supplementary rather than substantive outcomes

DISCUSSION

Conceptual Contribution, Relational Agency, and Ethical Digital CLIL

The principal contribution is the distinction between cultural resources and learning mechanisms. Pesantren routines, peer support, and spiritual meaning become educational mechanisms only when they are connected to observable decisions, such as requesting clarification, selecting a rehearsal mode, revising an explanation, or choosing whether to share a response. This conditional relationship is consistent with self-determination theory, which views meaningful choice as central to learner agency (Deci & Ryan, 2000), and with resilience research that conceptualises protection as ordinary, context-dependent support rather than as a fixed learner trait (Masten, 2001). Within the proposed model, CLIL coordinates content and language, translanguaging mediates meaning across linguistic

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

resources, and digital pedagogy provides selected affordances. The additional contribution is a layer of traceability and accountability that connects cultural meaning to observable learning choices.

The model is most plausible when teachers possess PAI expertise, language-pedagogical knowledge, and basic digital-safeguarding competence. It also requires English to serve a substantive communicative purpose and learners to have legitimate choices concerning rehearsal, language support, and feedback. The model becomes less plausible when English is used symbolically, vocabulary is imposed without explanation, platforms record participation without consent, or technology becomes an assessor of personal worth. Relationally protective pedagogy therefore means reducing avoidable barriers and preserving learner dignity. It does not mean diagnosing trauma, guaranteeing wellbeing, or treating religious commitment as a measurable learning outcome.

The framework extends rather than replaces the formative tradition of pesantren education. Routines, modelling, mutual assistance, and care may shape digital pedagogy, but culturally responsive education must also permit questioning and critique. Meaning-making may support adjustment without prescribing a single spiritual interpretation (Park, 2010), and religion can function as a developmental resource only when participation remains voluntary and non-coercive (King & Furrow, 2004). The mechanism proposed here is narrower and more accountable. It concerns predictable instructions, legitimate choice, respectful feedback, private rehearsal, and accessible alternatives that may reduce avoidable participation risk. These proposed benefits remain hypotheses requiring empirical examination.

Agency becomes observable when learners can explain why they accepted, rejected, or adapted a suggestion. For example, a learner may retain an Arabic technical term, provide an Indonesian gloss, and formulate an English explanation for a broader audience. This should not automatically be interpreted as deficient English if the learner can demonstrate how each language contributes to meaning and can revise the resulting message. Such activity is compatible with an autonomy-oriented account of learning (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Evidence from Arabic–English translanguaging provides a relevant point of comparison (Aziz & Siddik, 2026; Lubaba & Aziz, 2026), but it does not validate this unimplemented framework. The relevant outcomes are purposeful language choice, source awareness, feedback interpretation, and independent revision.

Translanguaging is therefore treated as a planned resource for accessing disciplinary concepts, testing interpretations, and designing audience-appropriate explanations. Arabic may preserve a technical term, Indonesian may support precise ethical discussion, and English may enable wider academic communication. Structured technology use outside class can also support self-regulation (Lai & Gu,

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

2011), but learners should document significant language choices and the movement from source to final message. Teachers must state explicit English outcomes so that multilingual support does not eliminate the target-language purpose.

A short inquiry project could require learners to locate a source, compare an Arabic expression with an Indonesian explanation, prepare an English summary, and respond to questions. Haq et al. (2025) report benefits for Arabic speaking and confidence, but those findings cannot automatically be transferred to English-mediated PAI. The present framework identifies planning, rehearsal, feedback, and revision as possible mechanisms while recognising potential workload, unequal group participation, and superficial source engagement.

Technology remains infrastructure rather than authority. Digital editions, annotation tools, audio recorders, learning-management systems, and generative applications may extend access and revision, but none can determine theological responsibility or learner safety. Pronunciation scores may misrecognise Arabic-influenced English, machine translation may flatten pragmatic distinctions, and generative text may be fluent but inaccurate. Research on AI-supported L2 learning suggests that self-efficacy, anxiety, and attitudes shape technology uptake (Chen et al., 2024), while emotionally designed materials may humanise learning rather than automate pedagogy (Diao & Yu, 2026). Teachers should therefore model verification and ask whether a particular affordance solves a defined pedagogical problem under equitable conditions.

Ethical governance requires informed consent, restricted access, retention limits, and deletion procedures for recordings. Shared documents require visibility controls and offline equivalents. Generative AI requires disclosure, source comparison, and data minimisation. Emotion-recognition systems should not be used to infer vulnerability, effort, or religious commitment. Institutions must provide platform guidance, staff training, and clear escalation procedures when digital tools create risks.

The international relevance of the framework lies in its design logic rather than in any claim that one Indonesian pesantren represents all multilingual faith-based institutions. Potentially transferable elements include separate content and language objectives, source traceability, private rehearsal, dual-channel feedback, learner choice, and low-tech alternatives. Context-dependent elements include pesantren routines, Arabic–Indonesian terminology, and local authority structures. Resilience research cautions that protective resources are culturally and institutionally situated (Ungar, 2008). Comparative studies should therefore test revision, help-seeking, feedback interpretation, source accuracy, and transfer through contextual co-design rather than simple replication.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

A defensible digital CLIL unit should state objectives before selecting applications. In a unit entitled "Ethical Communication and Mutual Respect," PAI objectives might include identifying an ethical problem, explaining a principle, distinguishing a justified claim, and attributing the source. English objectives might include summarising a viewpoint, asking a clarification question, using two target expressions, and revising a short explanation. Learners should be able to choose a private or collaborative participation route without disclosing personal experiences. Each digital tool should serve a documented function rather than become an unquestioned requirement.

Preparation could involve a two-minute teacher-recorded English explanation with captions and a bilingual concept map. The teacher would check terminology, captions, language level, and data settings. Downloadable audio, a printed transcript, and teacher-led explanation would provide equivalent access. Learners would annotate the source and identify one term that cannot be transferred without qualification.

The main task could involve a structured pair dialogue in which each learner summarises a viewpoint, asks a clarification question, and produces a short English response. Learners could rehearse privately, use Arabic or Indonesian to test an interpretation, and record the English decision in a revision log. Roles would rotate across source checking, drafting, technology control, and presentation. No personal disclosure would be required.

Assessment should separate content, English, participation, and safeguarding. Content would address the ethical issue, relevant principles, source attribution, and justification. English would address comprehensibility, vocabulary, interactional clarity, and organisation. Participation would record available routes, help-seeking, and revision decisions rather than personality or religious commitment. Safeguarding would record consent, visibility, deletion, and access. Raters should use anchor examples and discuss disagreements before scoring.

The module should provide an accessible alternative at every digital point. A streamed explanation could be replaced by downloadable audio, a printed transcript, or teacher-led input. A learner unable to record could submit a written rehearsal or participate in a live conference. A platform that exposes personal data could be replaced by an approved local system. Equivalence means preserving the content and language outcome rather than requiring a single device, platform, or medium.

Implementation, Empirical Validation, and Boundary Conditions

Implementation requires professional learning beyond a single lesson plan. Teachers must identify the conceptual load of a PAI source, specify an English

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

objective, design multilingual clarification, select an appropriate tool, and distinguish content feedback from language feedback. Co-planning between PAI and English specialists is preferable. Training should also address privacy, copyright, data minimisation, accessibility, and the limitations of automated feedback.

Implementation fidelity can be examined through a non-punitive checklist. The relevant questions are whether the teacher stated separate objectives, checked the source, provided terminology support, offered rehearsal and offline access, allowed participation without disclosure, separated content and language feedback, and explained visibility, retention, and deletion. Fidelity should be used to interpret variation rather than rank teachers or claim effectiveness.

Digital safeguarding must form part of teacher preparation. Students may be minors or may have disclosed sensitive experiences in other settings. Institutions should define recording access, retention periods, deletion requests, platform changes, and escalation routes. Where these arrangements are unavailable, the design should use non-recorded and low-technology tasks. Safeguarding is therefore a condition of participation rather than an additional administrative requirement.

Flexible language use must be planned rather than improvised. Tai and Choi (2026) examine digital gamified translanguaging, while Aziz and Siddik (2026) show how Arabic–English repertoires can support comprehension. The present design adds a traceable source-to-message pathway and explicit English outcomes. More language alternation is not automatically better. The central question is whether it improves accuracy, participation, or revision without removing the target-language purpose.

Professional learning should include rehearsal of the framework itself. Teacher teams could analyse a PAI passage, identify its conceptual and language demands, design a low-technology alternative, and practise separate content and language feedback. They could then review a learner artefact for source accuracy, accessibility, and data exposure. Such collaborative rehearsal positions the framework as a professional resource rather than a compliance checklist.

A first research phase should establish feasibility and contextual validity. Teachers, students, and qualified PAI readers could review a sample module for language level, religious accuracy, acceptability, accessibility, and data safety. Researchers would document revisions and report usability, source accuracy, objective clarity, access, and safeguard acceptability. No improvement in English proficiency or wellbeing should be claimed at this stage.

A second phase could undertake a small design-based study across several lessons. The research team would retain material versions, consented non-sensitive

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

artefacts, revision logs, teacher reflections, and learner accounts of accessibility. Independent raters would assess PAI and English separately. Analysis would combine product, process, and transfer evidence with negative cases in which a scaffold increased anxiety or produced unequal participation.

A third phase could compare scaffolding arrangements across classes or institutions. A controlled design might compare private audio rehearsal with written or teacher-led rehearsal while holding objectives constant. Reports should include class size, proficiency, teacher preparation, device access, attrition, missing data, and implementation fidelity. Quantitative comparisons should be interpreted alongside classroom interaction and learner accounts.

The research programme must remain open to disconfirmation. Recording may increase anxiety, bilingual glossaries may simplify concepts inaccurately, group work may conceal unequal participation, and ordinary scaffolding may outperform a digital option. A null or negative result would require revision of the proposed mechanism or its boundary conditions. Such openness is necessary for a credible conceptual contribution.

Four provisional propositions follow. P1 predicts that separate content and language objectives improve assessment interpretability, although they may not necessarily increase language scores. P2 predicts that private rehearsal and meaningful choice support participation when public performance creates a barrier, subject to access and teacher support. P3 predicts that structured translanguaging supports accuracy when the source-to-English pathway remains traceable. P4 predicts digital benefit only when a technological affordance solves a defined problem without increasing surveillance or inequality. Each proposition remains open to empirical rejection.

The design builds on prior research without merely repeating it. EMI cannot be treated as evidence of language development simply because English is present (Rose et al., 2022; Curle, 2026). CLIL contributes explicit content-language planning (Coyle et al., 2010), while Islamic-education studies indicate that teacher preparation, motivation, and disciplinary context shape implementation (Prastyo et al., 2024; Salsabila et al., 2025; Sari & Alsulami, 2026; Zaikalina & Amin, 2026). The present contribution connects these insights to a traceability and governance logic visible in learner artefacts, feedback records, and revision decisions.

Research in Islamic settings confirms disciplinary specificity but does not validate this framework. CLIL-like practice in pesantren and Islamic schools establishes the relevance of content-language integration (Fauziyah et al., 2026; Zaikalina & Amin, 2026), while Arabic speaking and translanguaging studies illustrate possible benefits of structured multilingual mediation (Iqbal et al., 2025; Haq et al., 2025; Aziz & Siddik, 2026; Lubaba & Aziz, 2026). The model must therefore distinguish

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

between conditions that may be shared across settings and those requiring local co-design.

A wellbeing-sensitive model must also confront contradictory effects. Foreign-language anxiety and willingness to communicate are shaped by confidence, perceived value, and affiliation (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Pekrun, 2006). Recent studies show that enjoyment, anxiety, and technology use may coexist (Sun & Yang, 2025; Huang & Liu, 2025; Ding & Xue, 2025), while anxious learners may nevertheless experience flow during supported speaking tasks (Almukhaild & King, 2024). Wellbeing pedagogy and emotional design likewise require attention to learner experience rather than a promise of comfort (Ma'rufa et al., 2026; Diao & Yu, 2026). Safety is therefore an enabling condition to examine, not an outcome to presume. Evidence should include learners who reject a tool or prefer a low-technology route.

Belonging may support participation, but it can also become coercive when conformity is equated with wellbeing or religious commitment (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Brunzell et al., 2016; King & Furrow, 2004). Universal Design for Learning requires multiple means of access, expression, and engagement rather than one ideal participation route (CAST, 2024). Cross-cultural resilience research similarly warns against treating one community's protective resource as universal (Ungar, 2008). The framework applies these principles by protecting source integrity, language choice, privacy, and access simultaneously. Success should be judged through learning evidence and learner rights.

Methods must match the claims. Braun and Clarke (2006) support analytic transparency, but the source manuscripts do not provide a new interview dataset for this article. The model is consequently a design hypothesis grounded in bounded contextual material and existing scholarship. Future reports must state whether data are original, reused, or newly collected, how permissions were obtained, and which outcomes were measured. This methodological discipline prevents a situated design from overstating its evidential basis.

Several limitations constrain the contribution. The article is a conceptual design study rather than an intervention, and the framework has not been tested for effects on English, PAI understanding, wellbeing, or technology use. The corpus is small and purposive, represented by three manuscripts rather than full transcripts, lesson observations, platform traces, or proficiency measures. The literature synthesis is purposive rather than systematic and may omit relevant studies. Institutional proximity may also create confirmation bias. These limitations restrict the conclusions to a testable design proposal.

The constructs require further operational refinement. Relational wellbeing, agency, and safe participation cannot be inferred from attendance, view counts, or

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

polished products. They require clearly defined indicators, learner-accessibility accounts, process evidence, independent assessment, and ethical oversight. The propositions are not established findings, and transfer cannot be assumed from one Indonesian pesantren. Future studies should examine different class sizes, language profiles, technologies, and institutional arrangements, including cases in which ordinary scaffolding proves more equitable than a digital alternative.

IV. CONCLUSION

This article proposes a six-stage, four-domain framework for digital content and language integrated learning in English-mediated Islamic Religious Education. The framework distinguishes PAI understanding, English development, learner participation, and digital safeguarding while connecting pesantren resources to observable learning decisions such as clarification, rehearsal, feedback interpretation, and revision. Digital technology is positioned as instructional infrastructure rather than an authority capable of determining theological accuracy, learner wellbeing, or educational success. Its use therefore requires teacher mediation, source verification, informed consent, data minimisation, privacy protection, and accessible low-technology alternatives. The framework also treats translanguaging as a purposeful resource through which Arabic, Indonesian, and English support disciplinary understanding and audience-oriented communication without eliminating explicit English objectives. However, the proposed model remains conceptual and has not yet been implemented, experimentally tested, or psychometrically validated. Its propositions concerning learner agency, participation, translanguaging, and digital access should therefore be treated as researchable hypotheses rather than established effects. Future studies should examine the framework through design-based, mixed-methods, longitudinal, and comparative research involving measures of PAI accuracy, English development, revision quality, participation, accessibility, and learner rights. The framework's value will ultimately depend on empirical evidence showing whether it can support accurate learning, meaningful English use, equitable participation, and responsible technology integration across diverse Islamic educational contexts.

Use of generative AI

Generative AI assistance was used during language revision and document formatting of this revised manuscript. It was not used to create participant data, fabricate findings, or replace author verification of claims and references. The authors remain responsible for the accuracy, originality, ethical compliance, and final wording of the submission.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

REFERENCES

Almukhaild, H., & King, J. (2024). Scaling the apex of engagement: Anxious language learners' positive flow experiences during speaking tasks. System, Article 103373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103373

Anggarini, I. F., Azzahwa, A. C. A., Setyawan, C. A., A'la, M. T. R., Maghfiroh, A. L., & Putri, R. H. E. (2022). Integrative learning in Islamic Indonesian EFL classroom: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues, 5(2), 147. https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v5i2.17091

As Sabiq, A. H., Ma'rufah, D. W., & Monteza, A. M. M. (2025). English as a medium of instruction for Islamic higher education: Classroom pedagogy, students' motivation, and challenges. Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research. https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v6i1.2043

Aziz, I. N., & Siddik, N. A. W. A. (2026). Digital translanguaging and santri cognition: Enhancing English comprehension through Arabic-English repertoires. EDUKASIA Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 7(1), 247–258. https://doi.org/10.62775/edukasia.v7i1.1918

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 117(3), 497–529. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brunzell, T., Stokes, H., & Waters, L. (2016). Trauma-informed positive education: Using positive psychology to strengthen vulnerable students. Contemporary School Psychology, 20, 63–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-015-0070-x

CAST. (2024). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0. https://udlguidelines.cast.org/

Chen, D., Liu, W., & Liu, X. (2024). What drives college students to use AI for L2 learning? Modeling the roles of self-efficacy, anxiety, and attitude based on an extended technology acceptance model. Acta Psychologica, 249, Article 104442. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104442

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and language integrated learning. Cambridge University Press.

Curle, S. (2026). Preparing students for success in English medium instruction: What works, what doesn't, and why it matters. Language Teaching. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-teaching/article/preparing-students-for-success-in-english-medium-instruction-what-works-what-doesnt-and-why-it-matters/FA814D7DE379DE35C59FB11F86BC936B

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Diao, J., & Yu, S. (2026). Humanizing English language teaching (ELT) materials: An emotional design framework. Language Teaching Research. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688261430560

Ding, Z., & Xue, W. (2025). Navigating anxiety in digital learning: How AI-driven personalisation and emotion recognition shape EFL students' engagement. Acta Psychologica, 260, 105466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105466

Fauziyah, A., Fatmawati, I., Andriani, N., Hoiri, & Maftuh. (2026). Contemporary learning models and instructional strategies in the transformation of Islamic Religious Education. JEET: Journal of English Education and Technology, 7(1), 20–41. https://doi.org/10.59689/jeet.v7i01.214

Haq, M. A., Amrulloh, F. S., & Aziz, I. N. (2025). The PjBL for Arabic speaking skills and student confidence: A quasi-experimental study at the University of Kiai Abdullah Faqih Gresik. Al-Himam: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Pendidikan & Bahasa Arab, 5(1), 32–46. https://doi.org/10.51590/alhimam.v5i1.1135

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal, 70(2), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Huang, L., & Liu, M. (2025). The impact of technology on foreign language anxiety: A systematic review of empirical studies from 2004 to 2024. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12, Article 1665. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05921-6

Iqbal, M., Ahsanuddin, M., & Alfan, M. (2025). Enhancing Arabic proficiency through content and language integrated learning: Implementation and challenges in pesantren. International Journal of Arabic Language Teaching, 7(2), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.32332/ijalt.v7i02.10769

King, P. E., & Furrow, J. L. (2004). Religion as a resource for positive youth development: Religion, social capital, and moral outcomes. Developmental Psychology, 40(5), 703–713. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.40.5.703

Lai, C., & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 24(4), 317–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.568417

Lubaba, A., & Aziz, I. N. (2026). Translanguaging in problem-based learning: Fostering critical speaking skills in an Islamic boarding school. Journal on English as a Foreign Language, 16(1), 272–298. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v16i1.10464

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. Language Teaching, 51(1), 36–76. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualising willingness

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. The Modern Language Journal, 82(4), 545–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. American Psychologist, 56(3), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227

Ma'rufa, I. M. U., Widodo, J., Zuriah, N., & Setiyawan, A. (2026). Well-being pedagogy in English language teaching: A systematic literature review. Journal on English as a Foreign Language, 16(1). https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v16i1.10015

Park, C. L. (2010). Making sense of the meaning literature: An integrative review of meaning making and its effects on adjustment to stressful life events. Psychological Bulletin, 136(2), 257–301. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018301

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. Educational Psychology Review, 18, 315–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9

Prastyo, H., Jabu, B., & Baa, S. (2024). Teachers' perceptions of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in an Islamic educational context: A qualitative case study in East Java, Indonesia. ELT Worldwide, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v11i2.66992

Rose, H., Macaro, E., Sahan, K., Aizawa, I., Zhou, S., & Wei, M. (2022). Defining English medium instruction: Striving for comparative equivalence. Language Teaching. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-teaching/article/abs/defining-english-medium-instruction-striving-for-comparative-equivalence/4B3433DFCB62C7216C5CDB5861DAEFA4

Saksono, L., Dari, R. W., Kartika, A. D., & Ilhamuddin, M. F. (2025). The implementation of context and language integrated learning approach in the learning process at SMP Progressive Bumi Shalawat Sidoarjo. Abisatya. https://doi.org/10.26740/abisatya.v2i2.38251

Salsabila, S., Abdurahman, M., Khalid, S. M., & Al Bani, M. (2025). Content and language integrated learning approach in qawāʿid learning through yellow books in Islamic boarding schools. International Journal of Arabic Language Teaching, 7(1), 193–206. https://doi.org/10.32332/ijalt.v7i01.10991

Sari, D. M., & Alsulami, N. D. (2026). Integrating faith with global competence in pesantren English education: Challenges and strategies. Edukasi Islami. https://doi.org/10.30868/ei.v15i01.9514

Sun, Y., & Yang, Q. (2025). English-medium instruction learners' enjoyment and anxiety: A quasi-experimental research. Cogent Education, 12(1), Article 2477351. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2477351

Tai, K. W. H., & Choi, K. C. K. (2026). Conceptualising multilingual classrooms as a digital gamified translanguaging space: Fostering language learning motivation and reducing foreign language anxiety in content and language learning. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 47(8), 5036–5071. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2025.2580563

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

Ungar, M. (2008). Resilience across cultures. The British Journal of Social Work, 38(2), 218–235. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcl343

Yang, L., & Zhao, S. (2024). AI-induced emotions in L2 education: Exploring EFL students' perceived emotions and regulation strategies. Computers in Human Behavior, Article 108337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108337

Zaikalina, R., & Amin, M. (2026). CLIL and its potential application in primary English classes in an Islamic school. EduLite, 11(2), 523–540. https://doi.org/10.30659/e.11.2.523-540

© 2018 by the journal. Submitted for possible open access publication under the
terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY SA) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).