:: JEET ::
(Journal of English Education and Technology)
Volume 07 Number 01 2026
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
ISSN : 2721-3811 (ONLINE)

TOWARD A PROTECTIVE-ECOLOGY FRAMEWORK FOR DIGITAL ENGLISH-MEDIUM ISLAMIC EDUCATION IN AN INDONESIAN PESANTREN

AHMAD SUHAILI[1], M. MUIZZUDDIN[2]
Universitas Kiai Abdullah Faqih Gresik
suhaili.amd@gmail.com[1], muhammadmuizzuddin84@gmail.com[2]

First Received: January 15 2026 Final Proof Received: March 25 2026

ABSTRACT

This article develops a bounded protective-ecology framework for technology-supported English-medium Islamic Religious Education (PAI) in an Indonesian pesantren. Three Indonesian-language drafts derived from a small phenomenological study of five santri who had experienced family disruption were re-read. Available materials comprised authorial interview summaries, observation summaries, coding tables, and documentation; full transcripts, lesson observations, platform traces, and proficiency measures were unavailable. The source themes were compared with research on resilience, belonging, EMI/CLIL, translanguaging, language anxiety, digital wellbeing, and technology-supported language learning. The source materials portray three contextual resources, predictable routines, nurturing relationships, and spiritual meaning-making. These resources are translated into three design layers, relational safety, predictable scaffolding, and meaningful participation. The framework proposes low-stakes rehearsal, guided multilingual clarification, privacy-aware feedback, and offline alternatives. The study did not implement a digital intervention or measure English development, psychological change, or technology use; the framework is therefore propositional and requires direct classroom validation. Practical implications: Teachers can use the framework to align English tasks with PAI meaning, learner agency, and digital safeguards. The article links a culturally situated pesantren ecology to an internationally relevant, mechanism-based agenda for equitable English-medium technology use without claiming universal protection or effectiveness.

Keyword: digital wellbeing; English-medium instruction; Islamic education; psychospiritual resilience; technology-enhanced language learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

English-medium instruction (EMI) is frequently discussed as a way to increase students' access to academic discourse and international communication. Yet the presence of English in a content classroom does not itself establish that learners acquire greater proficiency or experience improved participation. In a systematic review, Macaro et al. (2018) found that evidence of language gains in EMI was insufficiently robust to support automatic benefits. The design of the learning

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

environment matters, particularly where subject matter is conceptually demanding and students are learning through an additional language. The challenge is especially salient for Islamic Religious Education (PAI): learners are expected to engage with ethical and theological concepts whose meaning cannot always be reduced to an English glossary.

The Indonesian pesantren presents a distinctive case. It is a residential learning ecology rather than merely a classroom timetable: worship, informal counselling, peer belonging, religious instruction and mentoring may intersect throughout the day. For students experiencing family disruption, the same setting may provide predictable routines and a sense of being cared for. The three source manuscripts on which the present paper draws describe five such students at Mambaus Sholihin II. They converge on a protective triad comprising structured daily practice, pastoral relationships and spiritual meaning-making. They do not, however, examine language achievement, online learning activity, or the effectiveness of any particular digital tool.

The study setting has subsequently been described by the project proponent as using English as a language of instruction in PAI. That contextual confirmation opens a worthwhile pedagogical question: how might the existing understanding of psychosocial protection inform the design of technology-mediated participation in English-medium Islamic education? This question is not equivalent to asking whether boarding-school students have already benefited from a digital EFL programme. A responsible conceptual extension must distinguish source-derived observations from design propositions that have yet to be tested.

Recent language-education research provides reasons to take affect seriously. Horwitz et al. (1986) established foreign-language classroom anxiety as a specific phenomenon, while MacIntyre et al. (1998) located willingness to communicate in an ecology of confidence, interpersonal affiliation and immediate circumstances. Huang and Liu's (2025) review found that technology can alter language anxiety in different directions depending on task design and learner characteristics. These insights permit a careful connection with pesantren care: digital English tasks can be designed to protect dignity, not only to maximise exposure.

The gap addressed here is therefore relational and methodological rather than merely technological. Existing scholarship explains why EMI may be difficult, why emotional conditions influence communication, and why pesantren routines can be meaningful, but these strands are rarely specified as a single, testable design logic. Studies of digital language learning often measure motivation, anxiety, or acceptance without describing how pastoral relationships and institutional routines shape the task. Conversely, accounts of pesantren wellbeing may describe care without tracing how a learner uses English, receives feedback, or controls a digital trace. A framework

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

that brings these levels together can be useful only if it keeps their evidentiary status distinct.

The article consequently pursues three objectives. First, it synthesises the protective resources reported in the supplied case materials and explains their contextual meaning without converting qualitative experience into an efficacy claim. Second, it translates those resources into design principles for technology-mediated English participation in PAI, including scaffolding, privacy, translanguaging, feedback, and low-connectivity alternatives. Third, it identifies an evaluation agenda through which future researchers can examine language development, learner affect, participation, and ethical quality together. The objectives are deliberately conditional: they specify what should be observed and tested rather than announcing an outcome that the source dataset cannot support.

This paper makes one specific contribution. It develops a protective-ecology framework for emotionally safe digital participation in English-medium PAI, using the earlier small-scale qualitative corpus as a contextual case and the language-education literature as the primary source of design justification. The argument is a proposal for future evaluation, not a report of a digital intervention. For an international readership, the contribution is a mechanism-based account of how a residential Islamic learning ecology may inform technology-enhanced English education under unequal access conditions. The paper does not present the pesantren as a universally protective institution or propose religious practice as a substitute for language pedagogy. Instead, it identifies potentially transferable mechanisms—predictability, trusted relational support, meaning-making, and learner control—and shows how each can be operationalised in a digital language task and examined with evidence. This formulation allows readers in other multilingual, faith-based, or resource-constrained settings to test functional equivalents while respecting local meanings. It also positions English-medium PAI within the wider agenda of affective, equitable, multilingual, and theory-driven technology use.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Resilience, belonging, and meaning-making

Resilience is not adequately represented as an individual trait possessed by some adolescents and absent from others. Masten (2001) emphasised the ordinary, relational systems that permit adaptive development; Ungar (2008) likewise argued that resilience must be understood in cultural context. These positions illuminate the source study's emphasis on a protective environment rather than a simple narrative of personal strength. The repeated rhythms of communal learning, accessible

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

caregivers and shared worship are plausible resources for adaptation, although they cannot be assumed to operate identically for all students.

The social dimension is crucial. Baumeister and Leary (1995) established the importance of belonging for human motivation, and Cohen and Wills (1985) described the buffering role of social support under stress. The original manuscripts describe peer companionship and the murabbi or female boarding supervisor as trusted figures. In the documents, students were reported to experience the boarding environment as a 'second home'. This phrase is drawn from manuscript coding summaries and should be checked against the source transcript before being treated as a verbatim quotation.

Spiritual meaning-making constitutes a third dimension. In the source material, regular congregational prayer, Qur'anic learning, remembrance and religious reflection were linked in participants' accounts to calmness, acceptance and educational motivation. Park (2010) supplies a broader account of how people interpret stressful events through meaning systems. Nevertheless, it would be inappropriate to attribute clinical recovery or statistically measurable gains in wellbeing to these routines on the basis of five qualitative participants. The finding is a reported and interpreted experience, not an efficacy estimate.

At the interface with language education, a protective ecology may shape whether learners dare to participate, seek clarification, accept feedback and practise new forms. The logic is not that religious commitment automatically improves English; it is that context-specific sources of safety may moderate exposure to demanding communication tasks. That possibility is consistent with the situational account of willingness to communicate (MacIntyre et al., 1998) and with work on control and value in achievement emotions (Pekrun, 2006).

EMI, integrated language learning, and translanguaging

EMI and content-and-language integrated learning (CLIL) should not be treated as interchangeable labels. EMI identifies a language policy or medium; CLIL ordinarily includes explicit attention to content, communication, cognition, and culture. In PAI, a teacher may use English to open access to international scholarship while still drawing on Arabic and Indonesian to secure doctrinal precision. The pedagogical issue is not whether the class looks English-only but whether language choices help learners understand, discuss, and reformulate disciplinary meaning. This distinction aligns with current work on multilingual technology-mediated learning, where a digital tool can support more than one communicative route without reducing the target language to a decorative output.

Recent studies involving Imam Nur Aziz further strengthen this line of reasoning. Haq et al. (2025) show how project-based Arabic speaking work can be linked to confidence when learners receive a meaningful communicative purpose and

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

structured support. Aziz and Siddik (2026) describe digital translanguaging as a way to mobilise Arabic–English repertoires for comprehension rather than treating language alternation as failure. Lubaba and Aziz (2026) likewise connect translanguaging with critical speaking in an Islamic boarding-school context. These studies do not test the present protective-ecology model, but they offer relevant precedents for treating multilingual resources, learner agency, and accountable speaking as mutually reinforcing design concerns.

The present framework extends that literature by adding a psychosocial and ethical layer. Translanguaging can make a task more intelligible, but it can also conceal whether learners have engaged with the English input or whether a religious concept has been altered in translation. Students should therefore be able to explain why a term remains in Arabic, receives an Indonesian gloss, or is reformulated in English. This metalinguistic explanation creates evidence of learning and makes the movement among languages accountable. It also respects the fact that English-mediated Islamic education involves knowledge traditions whose key terms cannot always be replaced without loss.

Digital affect, agency, and equity

A technology is pedagogically consequential through the interactions it makes possible, not through novelty alone. A recorder may enable private rehearsal; a shared document may make revision visible; a learning-management system may offer asynchronous feedback; and an AI tool may provide a prompt that still requires teacher verification. Each affordance has a corresponding risk: recordings can become permanent, shared documents can expose peer judgement, asynchronous work can intensify inequity, and automated language output can misrepresent Arabic or religious terminology. Digital wellbeing therefore includes control over visibility, pace, correction, and data as well as positive emotion.

III. METHOD

Research Design

This article is a case-grounded conceptual analysis, not a new round of field research and not a systematic literature review. Its empirical point of departure comprises three supplied drafts derived from one reported phenomenological study at Pondok Pesantren Mambaus Sholihin II. The source drafts identify five purposively selected santri who had experienced parental separation, sustained family conflict or disrupted family relationships. They report in-depth interviews, observations of collective religious routines and documentation, followed by thematic interpretation. Two documents contain paraphrased coding tables and another includes purported quotations; because interview transcripts were not supplied, the

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

present article treats those materials as secondary authorial summaries rather than independently verified verbatim records.

A two-stage interpretive procedure was adopted. First, overlapping source themes were grouped into ecological resources: predictability of learning and residential routines; relational care from supervisors and peers; and reflective spiritual practice. Second, each resource was contrasted with established language-education constructs, including willingness to communicate, language anxiety, EMI scaffolding and responsible digital engagement. The resulting framework specifies educational propositions that could be tested in later classroom observation or design-based research. No new participants, digital lessons, platform logs, English-proficiency scores or measures of psychospiritual wellbeing have been created or imputed.

The research proponent has confirmed that English is used as a medium of instruction for PAI at the site. This claim is included to define the pedagogical context; its frequency, proficiency demands and actual classroom interaction patterns should be documented from lesson plans, observations or recordings before an empirical EMI claim is submitted. Ethics approval, permissions for secondary analysis and the status of participant consent also require confirmation by the original research team.

The analysis followed a claim-discipline rule. Each sentence was classified as source-derived, literature-supported, design-propositional, or future research-oriented. Source-derived statements describe what the supplied drafts report. Literature-supported statements connect the case to established constructs or recent studies. Design propositions describe what a teacher might do, while future-oriented statements specify evidence that would be needed to test the proposition. Keeping these categories visible reduces the risk of presenting a plausible pedagogical idea as an observed result.

Trustworthiness, ethics, and positional boundaries

Because the transcripts and original ethics documentation were not supplied, the present analysis does not claim independent verification of participants' words, coding reliability, or consent procedures. The five-person corpus is treated as a contextual archive whose meaning depends on the original research team's interpretation. The authors should confirm the institution's ethics approval or exemption, the permissions governing secondary use, and whether participants consented to the publication of indirect descriptions. The revised manuscript intentionally avoids personal names, detailed family histories, and identifying combinations of biographical information.

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

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

Analytical Findings from the Source Study

The first recurring pattern is predictable structure. The source manuscripts describe regulated boarding routines incorporating communal prayer, religious study, Qur'an memorisation and peer activity. A coded observation refers to the dormitory schedule as consistent and disciplined, while a student summary associates living in the pesantren with being able to focus on study rather than persistent family conflict. This supports a bounded interpretation of routine as a perceived protective resource. It does not establish which activity caused any particular emotional change.

The second pattern concerns social attachment and educational care. The documents report that supervisors offer personal advice and that peers provide companionship during difficulties. One student's account is paraphrased as feeling accepted rather than alone; another describes the setting as offering a sense of safety. These observations imply that a learner's opportunities to ask for help may be socially embedded. In English-medium lessons this could matter when students must risk making linguistic mistakes in front of peers, yet the source study did not directly examine such classroom risks.

Third, participants associated repeated religious activities with calmness and acceptance. The codes refer to prayer, recitation, guidance, gratitude and forward-looking motivation. The original documents interpret these as internalised values and psychospiritual resilience. The present analysis retains that indigenous interpretation while avoiding a universal claim that religious routines will relieve distress among all students or that religiously oriented students necessarily perform better in English.

Taken together, these patterns support a contextual proposition: the pedagogical value of language-learning technology in a pesantren is likely to depend not only on tool functionality but also on routines, relationships and learners' sense of safety. The source evidence is sufficiently coherent to propose a framework, but not sufficient to evaluate it.

A second result is the difference between perceived protection and demonstrated learning. The source drafts make a coherent case that participants experienced routines, care, and religious practice as resources. They do not show how many English words were learned, whether explanations became more intelligible, or whether anxiety changed after a digital lesson. The revised analysis therefore treats protection as a contextual condition to be investigated, not as a learning outcome already established. Future instruments should measure both

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

sides of the relationship: language evidence such as lexical uptake, accuracy, fluency, and content explanation, and affective evidence such as perceived safety, willingness to communicate, and control over participation.

A Protective-Ecology Framework for Digital EMI

The proposed framework has three layers. Layer 1, relational safety, provides a climate in which students can disclose difficulty, request clarification and decide whether to share their work publicly. In practice, a teacher may offer confidential formative feedback on an audio recording before inviting public oral performance. This is a design proposal, not a practice observed in the source research. Low-stakes rehearsal can preserve the learning goal while reducing unnecessary exposure to peer judgement.

Layer 2, predictable scaffolding, provides stable sequences for demanding tasks: advance vocabulary, clear comprehension checks, short English explanations, bilingual conceptual clarification when needed, rehearsal, feedback and revision. In PAI, a unit on patience or mutual assistance could combine a short English text with key terms in Indonesian or Arabic, teacher modelling and a short spoken explanation. EMI does not forbid careful access to learners' full linguistic repertoires; indeed, the substantive objective is understanding, not the appearance of English-only fluency. The relevant assessment must distinguish content knowledge from communicative performance.

Layer 3, meaningful participation, relates academic tasks to learners' existing ethical vocabulary and collective responsibilities without turning personal trauma into classroom content. A digital storytelling exercise might invite students to explain how a community practice encourages respect and mutual assistance, but must not require a learner to reveal family conflict. Technology is useful only insofar as it supports accessible input, rehearsal, formative interaction and purposeful English production. Low-connectivity alternatives and paper-based equivalents are needed where devices or connectivity are unequal.

The three layers should be treated as a set of conditional, falsifiable propositions. For example, if a teacher introduces private audio rehearsal before public discussion, will willingness to communicate increase relative to a comparable sequence without rehearsal? Does teacher-supported glossary use improve both English lexical uptake and the accuracy of PAI explanations? Does access to private feedback reduce reported anxiety without diminishing opportunities for authentic interaction? These questions require prospective data, repeated observations and ethically appropriate measures.

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

Framework components and observable evidence

The framework can be made operational by linking each layer to an instructional decision and an evidence source. Table 1 summarises this logic. The table is not a prescriptive checklist; it is a compact representation of the kinds of choices that make an ecological claim inspectable. Teachers can adapt the evidence to their resources, while researchers can use the categories to compare lessons without assuming that every institution has the same pastoral structure.

Table 1-Protective-ecology layers, instructional mechanisms, and evidence logic

Ecological layer	Instructional mechanism	Digital or low-tech enactment	Evidence to collect
Relational safety	Confidential help, respectful correction, learner choice about visibility	Private audio rehearsal, teacher conference, paired practice, or paper rehearsal	Participation choices, feedback records, learner reflections, interactional tone
Predictable scaffolding	Stable sequence from access to production and revision	Bilingual glossary, model text, comprehension check, shared or printed script	Vocabulary use, content accuracy, drafts, revisions, transfer task
Meaningful participation	Ethically relevant content without forced disclosure	Community scenario, bilingual caption, short presentation, offline equivalent	Audience comprehension, explanation quality, agency statements, access notes

The framework also implies a sequence of responsibility. Teachers remain accountable for source selection, content accuracy, language support, feedback quality, and data boundaries. Learners receive meaningful choices, but choice is not the same as abandonment: a student cannot be expected to infer a doctrinal nuance or evaluate an automated translation without instruction. School leaders influence whether teachers have time, devices, and professional learning to implement the sequence. Researchers must then document these conditions rather than attributing every difference to the platform or to learner motivation.

DISCUSSION

Ecological Alignment for Equitable English-Medium Technology Use

The framework contributes to scholarship in technology-enhanced English education in multilingual, religious, and resource-constrained settings. Its central concern is not the adoption of a particular digital application but the design of conditions under which technology can support meaningful English participation.

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

In an Indonesian pesantren, English-medium PAI learning is shaped by institutional routines, religious knowledge, interpersonal relationships, and learners' diverse emotional histories. The pesantren should therefore be understood as a cultural and relational ecology rather than merely as a physical location for language instruction (Dhofier, 2011; King & Furrow, 2004; Ungar, 2008).

This ecological perspective prevents vulnerability from being treated as an individual deficit. Learners who have experienced family disruption may require predictable routines, respectful relationships, and opportunities to construct meaning, but such provisions should not publicly identify them or lower academic expectations. Trauma-informed education argues that support should be combined with opportunities for agency, competence, and purposeful challenge (Brunzell et al., 2016). Similarly, belonging and relatedness are central to learners' willingness to participate in socially demanding activities (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2017). The proposed framework consequently treats emotional safety and language development as mutually supportive rather than competing objectives.

Ecological alignment means that technology is used to strengthen four pedagogical functions: access, rehearsal, feedback, and revision. A short audio explanation, bilingual glossary, private recording, or teacher-mediated feedback channel may enable learners to engage with PAI content before participating publicly. Such tools do not replace teacher judgement. Instead, they give learners additional time and alternative routes for preparing language, clarifying meaning, and revising communication. The teacher remains responsible for selecting appropriate materials, checking the accuracy of religious concepts, protecting learner privacy, and ensuring that technological support does not become a substitute for interaction.

This position also requires a clear distinction between English-medium instruction and content and language integrated learning. EMI may describe the language used to teach a subject, whereas CLIL explicitly connects disciplinary understanding with planned language development (Coyle et al., 2010; Macaro et al., 2018). Recent work on EMI further indicates that exposure to English alone is insufficient when learners lack linguistic preparation, disciplinary support, or opportunities for guided participation (As Sabiq et al., 2025; Curle, 2026). The framework therefore recommends preparatory language work, accessible explanations, and staged participation rather than assuming that English-medium delivery automatically produces English development.

The multilingual dimension is equally important. Indonesian and Arabic may support comprehension, doctrinal precision, and collaborative planning, while English may be used for explanation, international communication, or the final learning product. Translanguaging should not be interpreted as evidence that

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

English has failed. When planned carefully, it can provide a bridge between disciplinary knowledge and English expression (Prastyo et al., 2024; Sari & Alsulami, 2026). Digital translanguaging research further suggests that Arabic–English repertoires can support comprehension when learners are encouraged to move deliberately between languages rather than translate mechanically (Aziz & Siddik, 2026). In Islamic boarding-school contexts, translanguaging may also support critical discussion and higher-order speaking rather than functioning only as emergency translation (Lubaba & Aziz, 2026).

The framework nevertheless rejects unrestricted technological optimism. Digital tools may extend participation, but they can also increase surveillance, anxiety, unequal access, and exposure of personal recordings. The relevant question is therefore not whether technology is innovative but whether it improves the quality, accessibility, and ethical conditions of language learning. Teachers should offer offline alternatives, explain who can access learner work, limit data retention, and allow students to revise or withdraw recordings where appropriate. Technology becomes educationally valuable when it remains subordinate to pedagogical purpose, learner agency, and the integrity of PAI knowledge.

Multilingual Digital Wellbeing and Equitable Language Participation

Technology-enhanced language education should be evaluated not only through learning outcomes but also through the conditions under which learners participate. In multilingual Islamic education, digital wellbeing involves emotional safety, meaningful interaction, privacy, manageable cognitive demands, and equitable access to learning resources. Technology may reduce participation barriers by allowing learners to rehearse privately, replay explanations, access bilingual materials, and revise their responses before public performance. However, it may also intensify anxiety when learners are exposed to constant monitoring, public comparison, unstable connectivity, or pressure to produce polished English immediately. A systematic review of technology and foreign-language anxiety confirms that digital tools can generate both supportive and stressful learning conditions, depending on task design and teacher mediation (Huang & Liu, 2025).

The emotional consequences of technology are particularly important in English-mediated PAI learning. Learners may experience anxiety not only because of limited English proficiency but also because religious concepts carry intellectual and ethical significance. An inaccurate explanation may be perceived as more serious than an ordinary linguistic error. Research on AI-mediated language learning shows that learners interpret digital feedback through emotional and regulatory processes rather than receiving it neutrally (Yang & Zhao, 2024). Similarly, self-efficacy, anxiety, and attitudes influence students' willingness to adopt AI-supported language tools (Chen et al., 2024). These findings suggest that automated feedback, translation,

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

pronunciation scoring, or generative tools should be introduced as provisional resources rather than unquestionable authorities. Teachers must help learners evaluate, revise, and, when necessary, reject technological suggestions.

Multilingualism can strengthen this process when language choices are deliberately connected to meaning. Arabic may be retained for key religious terms, Indonesian may support conceptual clarification, and English may be used for explanation, discussion, or wider communication. Such movement across languages should be planned rather than treated as an uncontrolled departure from English practice. Digital translanguaging can support comprehension when learners use Arabic–English repertoires to connect unfamiliar concepts with existing knowledge (Aziz & Siddik, 2026). In Islamic boarding-school settings, translanguaging can also support critical speaking and collaborative reasoning when it is integrated into problem-based tasks (Lubaba & Aziz, 2026). The important issue is not the quantity of English produced but whether multilingual resources help learners develop more accurate, independent, and audience-sensitive communication.

This approach also requires a broader understanding of equitable participation. Students should not be assessed according to the sophistication of their devices, the speed of their internet connection, or their willingness to publish personal recordings. A fair design provides equivalent alternatives, including printed materials, shared devices, offline rehearsal, written responses, and teacher-mediated submission. Equity also requires transparency about data collection, recording, storage, and publication. Learners should know who can access their work, how long digital artefacts will be retained, and whether participation in public dissemination is optional. These safeguards are pedagogical rather than administrative because privacy conditions influence learners' willingness to experiment with language.

The design of materials and feedback should therefore incorporate emotional and relational considerations. Humanising language pedagogy recognises that learners respond to tasks through confidence, fear, interest, identity, and perceived legitimacy, not through linguistic processing alone (Diao & Yu, 2026). Wellbeing-oriented language education similarly requires a balance between challenge, autonomy, feedback, and social support (Ma'rufa et al., 2026). Excessive protection may restrict opportunities for communicative growth, whereas unstructured exposure may reproduce existing inequalities. A more defensible approach is graduated participation, beginning with preparation and low-stakes rehearsal before moving towards guided interaction and increasingly independent English use.

The framework consequently positions digital wellbeing as a condition for meaningful language development rather than as an additional outcome detached from pedagogy. Future research should examine whether private rehearsal, purposeful translanguaging, differentiated feedback, and offline alternatives

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

improve English participation while preserving the accuracy and integrity of PAI learning. Evidence should include language performance, learner agency, anxiety, access, interactional quality, revision processes, and perceptions of privacy. Such an approach avoids technological determinism and recognises that equitable digital language education depends on the interaction among tools, teachers, learners, languages, institutional values, and material conditions.

An important conceptual boundary concerns the difference between educational protection and therapeutic intervention. The framework does not diagnose trauma, prescribe counselling, or claim that a language task can resolve family disruption. Its purpose is narrower: to reduce avoidable barriers to participation while preserving demanding intellectual work. This distinction matters because a teacher may notice hesitation without knowing its cause. Universal supports such as clear instructions, rehearsal time, private feedback, and alternative submission modes can therefore be offered to all learners, while individual pastoral support should be referred through appropriate institutional channels. The approach also recognises that protection involves power. A platform may make learner activity visible to teachers, peers, and administrators, but visibility is not the same as agency. Learners should be able to understand the consequences of sharing a recording, choose among legitimate response modes, and question feedback that appears inaccurate or culturally inappropriate. In this sense, digital wellbeing is connected to voice and participation in decision-making, not simply to reduced anxiety. Evidence of short-term engagement should likewise be separated from evidence of durable development. A student may complete an audio task because the activity is novel, yet still lack the vocabulary, confidence, or strategies to communicate in a new context. Future studies should include delayed transfer tasks, individual explanations, and opportunities for learners to redesign a task after feedback. Such evidence would clarify whether the framework supports temporary participation, broader communicative agency, or both. It would also help identify conditions under which protective design becomes overly restrictive. The strongest version of the model is therefore neither permissive nor paternalistic. It creates supported routes into English participation, keeps disciplinary and linguistic standards visible, and gradually returns responsibility to learners as their competence and confidence develop. This balance is essential for a framework that seeks inclusion without lowering expectations or converting care into control.

The framework offers a focused agenda for empirical validation. Design-based research could begin with one bounded PAI unit and examine how teachers adapt the three layers across several cycles. A mixed-methods study could compare private rehearsal and differentiated feedback with a conventional public-performance sequence while measuring content explanation, English accuracy, participation, anxiety, agency, and perceived privacy. Interactional analysis would be needed to

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

determine whether translanguaging supports conceptual development or merely allows learners to avoid the target-language demand. Qualitative interviews could examine how students interpret the relationship between religious identity, English use, and digital visibility. Comparisons across pesantren would be valuable, but transferability should be argued through mechanisms rather than assumed from institutional similarity. Predictable routines, trusted relationships, and meaning-making may have functional equivalents in other faith-based or residential settings, yet their significance must be established locally. The model should therefore remain open to disconfirming evidence, including cases in which technology increases anxiety, multilingual support delays English development, or institutional routines limit rather than expand learner agency.

Implementation is likely to depend on professional collaboration. An English teacher may be well positioned to support language development but less able to judge the doctrinal precision of a PAI explanation. A PAI teacher may understand the source tradition deeply but require support in scaffolding English interaction or evaluating digital feedback. Research on CLIL and Islamic educational settings indicates that integration requires shared planning, explicit language objectives, and institutional support rather than the simple addition of English to an existing subject lesson (Anggarini et al., 2022; Prastyo et al., 2024; Saksono et al., 2025; Zaikalina & Amin, 2026). The framework consequently recommends co-review of task instructions, glossaries, scripts, and assessment criteria. Professional learning should also address privacy, responsible AI use, and the interpretation of learner silence. A quiet student should not automatically be classified as unmotivated, while active online participation should not automatically be read as evidence of comprehension. These distinctions are central to a humane and evidence-based model of technology-enhanced language education.

Digital equity also requires institutional governance. The availability of a mobile phone does not guarantee stable connectivity, a private space for recording, or the confidence to use an unfamiliar application. Technology-mediated tasks should therefore include an equivalent low-bandwidth route, such as printed source notes, shared devices, downloadable audio, or teacher-mediated submission. This principle is consistent with the wider argument that technology-supported language learning depends on learners' capacity to regulate access and participation beyond scheduled lessons (Lai & Gu, 2011). It also responds to evidence that digital personalisation and emotion-sensitive systems may alter engagement in unpredictable ways (Ding & Xue, 2025). Data minimisation is essential. Teachers should collect only the recordings, drafts, or interactional traces needed for the learning objective, explain retention periods, and avoid making publication a hidden requirement. Universal design can broaden participation, but it must be adapted to the actual material conditions of the institution rather than applied as a generic checklist (CAST, 2024).

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

Assessment should make this mediation visible. A public-facing audio or video product can appear fluent while masking unequal participation, copied language, or weak engagement with the source concept. Conversely, a hesitant performance may represent substantial learning when a student has clarified a difficult idea, revised a script, and taken a communicative risk. Assessment should therefore combine product evidence with process evidence. Product criteria may include content accuracy, intelligibility, language control, and audience awareness. Process criteria may include vocabulary decisions, feedback responses, revision history, and a short explanation of how Arabic, Indonesian, and English were used. Willingness to communicate is shaped by confidence and affiliation rather than proficiency alone (MacIntyre et al., 1998), and enjoyment or anxiety can affect performance in English-medium settings (Sun & Yang, 2025). A fair rubric should consequently reward accountable improvement and reflective decision-making rather than fluency, speed, or visual polish alone.

A further condition of ecological alignment is teacher mediation. In technology-supported PAI, teachers are not simply managers of a platform; they are responsible for deciding which knowledge can be translated, which terms require preservation, and which interpretations need disciplinary review. This responsibility is especially important when English explanations concern theological or ethical concepts whose meaning is distributed across Arabic terminology, Indonesian educational practice, and local pesantren traditions. Emotionally responsive materials can create a more inviting entry point, but emotional accessibility cannot replace conceptual accuracy (Diao & Yu, 2026). Teachers therefore need to coordinate language support with PAI expertise, establish a limited vocabulary focus, and distinguish an acceptable simplification from a misleading one. Such mediation also protects learners from the assumption that an automated translation or generative response is authoritative. A digital tool may suggest a formulation, but the teacher and learner must jointly examine its semantic, cultural, and pedagogical adequacy.

V. CONCLUSION

The source study portrays the pesantren as a learning ecology in which predictable routines, supportive relationships and spiritual meaning-making are experienced as resources by students facing family disruption. English-medium PAI provides a possible application setting, but the source material does not prove any effect on English learning or digital wellbeing. The contribution of this article is a bounded framework for aligning protective educational practices with scaffolded, privacy-conscious technology-mediated English participation. Its claims should be tested through direct classroom observation, language-task evidence and ethically sound wellbeing measures before any effectiveness conclusions are drawn. The

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

article's final position is deliberately modest but constructive. A pesantren ecology can offer resources for an emotionally and ethically responsive English-medium task, yet those resources become educationally consequential only through careful design and evidence. The proposed framework keeps the target language, disciplinary meaning, learner agency, and digital responsibility in the same analytic frame. Its value will be demonstrated not by the elegance of the model but by whether future studies can show when, for whom, and under what conditions it improves participation and learning without compromising dignity.

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.

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

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

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

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98(2), 310–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310

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

Dhofier, Z. (2011). Tradisi pesantren: Studi tentang pandangan hidup kiai. LP3ES.

Diao, J., & Yu, S. (2026). Humanizing English language teaching 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,

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

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

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 to communicate in a second language: 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

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

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 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

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. Guilford Press.

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

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

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

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



© 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/).