

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

Manuscript ID : 50847

Title : Reconfiguring Religious Authority in Islamic Education: Toward a Pedagogical Model of Critical Religious Literacy

REVISION CHECKLISTS

Follow the revision guidelines below and mark with a check (✓) if you have completed each procedure.

GUIDELINES		CHECKLIST
1. Confirm receipt: Reply to this email to confirm that you have received the review forms and reviewed manuscripts.		✓
2. Highlight revisions: Highlight the revised parts in your manuscript and fill out the response form based on the reviewers' comments and suggestions.		✓
3. Include author details: Include author name(s), institution(s), address, and one correspondence email on a detachable page in the manuscript.		✓
4. APA 7th edition formatting: Adjust the in-text citations, reference list, tables, and figures to comply with APA 7th edition style.		✓

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

REVISION REPORT

No	Page	Comments and suggestions	Excerpt of Revision
1.	1	Title. The title is engaging but overly broad and does not adequately reflect the article's principal contribution; since the manuscript proposes a conceptual model reconceptualizing religious authority as a pedagogical formation with four dimensions, the title should indicate this theoretical contribution and improve its international visibility.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The title has been revised to foreground the article's theoretical contribution, adopting the reviewer's suggested wording in full (see Comment 2). It now signals a pedagogical model of critical religious literacy rather than a broad topic. Location of revision: <i>Title, p. 1.</i> Revised excerpt: <i>"Reconfiguring Religious Authority in Islamic Education: Toward a Pedagogical Model of Critical Religious Literacy"</i>
2.	1	Title. Please replace with the suggested title: "Reconfiguring Religious Authority in Islamic Education: Toward a Pedagogical Model of Critical Religious Literacy."	Thank you for this constructive suggestion. The suggested title has been incorporated verbatim as the title of the revised manuscript. Location of revision: <i>Title, p. 1.</i> Revised excerpt: <i>"Reconfiguring Religious Authority in Islamic Education: Toward a Pedagogical Model of Critical Religious Literacy"</i>
3.	3	Introduction (literature review). The literature review is comprehensive but predominantly descriptive. Provide greater analytical synthesis by explicitly comparing classical, modern, and digital forms of religious authority and explaining how they collectively support the proposed framework.	Thank you for this valuable comment. A new synthetic paragraph now compares the classical, modern, and digital literatures along a single axis—how legitimacy is recognized—showing continuity and displacement across the three registers and mapping them onto the four proposed dimensions, so the review integrates rather than merely lists the scholarship. Location of revision: <i>Introduction, p. 3, paragraph beginning "Read together rather than sequentially..."</i>

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

			Revised excerpt: <i>“Read together rather than sequentially, these three bodies of scholarship describe not three unrelated topics but three successive answers to a single question...”</i>
4.	3	Introduction (research gap). The research gap could be articulated more critically; clarify which specific limitations in previous studies justify the proposed framework, rather than only stating that educational implications remain underexplored.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The gap has been re-articulated critically: a revised paragraph now identifies two specific limitations of the existing scholarship—that it is diagnostic rather than evaluative, and that it treats Islamic education as a context rather than as the site where criteria of authority are formed and taught. Location of revision: <i>Introduction, p. 3, paragraph beginning “These studies have substantially advanced...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“Their limitation for the present purpose is not one of quality but of orientation... Two specific limitations follow.”</i>
5.	4, 17	Introduction (‘pedagogical configuration’). The concept of “pedagogical configuration,” as the central theoretical contribution, requires stronger conceptual grounding by linking it to established educational theories or scholarship on pedagogy, educational authority, or knowledge formation.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The concept is now anchored in established educational scholarship—Bourdieu and Passeron’s pedagogic authority and Bernstein’s pedagogic discourse—in addition to being defined as authority constituted through educational relations. Corresponding entries were added to the reference list. Location of revision: <i>Introduction, p. 4, paragraph beginning “This article addresses that gap...”</i>; <i>References, p. 17 (Bernstein, 2000; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977).</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“In grounding the term this way, the analysis draws on established educational scholarship... Bourdieu and Passeron’s account of pedagogic authority... and Bernstein’s analysis of pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 2000; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977).”</i>

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

6.	4, 6	Introduction (derivation of dimensions). Clarify how the four dimensions were derived—synthesized from the literature, developed conceptually, or adapted from an existing framework—to strengthen conceptual rigor.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The manuscript now states explicitly that the four dimensions were neither adopted from a pre-existing model nor postulated in advance, but consolidated from the grounds of authority surfaced by the historical-conceptual analysis; this is asserted in the Introduction and detailed in the Method. Location of revision: <i>Introduction, p. 4, paragraph beginning “This configuration is formed through four interrelated dimensions...”</i>; <i>Method, p. 6.</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“These dimensions were not adopted from a pre-existing model, nor postulated in advance; as detailed in the Method, they were consolidated from the grounds of authority that the historical-conceptual analysis surfaced.”</i>
7.	5	Introduction (novelty statement). Make the novelty statement more explicit by specifying the precise theoretical contribution—whether the study proposes a new conceptual model, pedagogical theory, or analytical framework—rather than only describing a shift in perspective.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The novelty statement now names the contribution precisely as an analytical framework—a four-dimensional pedagogical model for evaluating how religious authority is constituted and recognized—rather than a general shift in perspective. Location of revision: <i>Introduction, p. 5, paragraph beginning “The novelty of this article lies not only in relocating...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“The article’s principal contribution is an analytical framework, a four-dimensional pedagogical model comprising epistemic depth, ethical formation, institutional credibility, and digital literacy...”</i>
8.	5	Method (justification). The methodological justification is rather general; explain why a historical-conceptual approach is particularly suitable for developing the proposed framework, rather than	Thank you for this valuable comment. The Method now explains that the framework rests on a diachronic claim—that the criteria of authority have been successively reconfigured—and that reconstructing this layered formation requires a historical-

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

		merely stating that the study reports no empirical findings.	conceptual approach, a task a single-site empirical study is not designed to perform. Location of revision: <i>Method, p. 5, opening paragraph beginning “This study employs library research...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“This approach is particularly suited to the article’s aim because the framework it develops rests on a diachronic claim...”</i>
9.	5	Method (source selection). Provide a more transparent explanation of the source-selection strategy (systematic search, purposive sampling, citation tracking, or expert judgment) and clarify the inclusion criteria to improve transparency and reproducibility.	Thank you for this valuable comment. A dedicated paragraph now specifies purposive selection, describes the combination of foundational-text selection and citation tracking used to identify works, and lists three explicit inclusion criteria. Location of revision: <i>Method, p. 5, paragraph beginning “The corpus was constructed through purposive selection...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“The corpus was constructed through purposive selection rather than exhaustive or systematic search... admitted according to three inclusion criteria...”</i>
10.	6	Method (analytical procedure). Elaborate how the content analysis was conducted (e.g., coding process, thematic categorization, concept mapping, or analytical synthesis) to enhance methodological rigor.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The Method now describes a thematic-conceptual analysis combined with historical interpretation, detailing close reading, emergent (non-pre-fixed) conceptual coding, the grouping of recurring categories into higher-order clusters, and their diachronic ordering. Location of revision: <i>Method, p. 6, paragraph beginning “The literature was analyzed through thematic-conceptual analysis...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“These accounts were then coded conceptually, not through a pre-fixed coding scheme, but by identifying recurring categories as they emerged...”</i>

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

11.	6	Method (stages to dimensions). It remains unclear how the analytical stages resulted in the four dimensions; make the connection between the analytical process and the development of the framework more explicit.	Thank you for this valuable comment. A new paragraph makes the stage-to-dimension relationship explicit, showing how the first stage yielded two dimensions, how the second and third were consolidated into institutional credibility, and how the fourth yielded digital literacy—presenting the dimensions as products of the analysis rather than its premise. Location of revision: <i>Method, p. 6, paragraph beginning “These stages were diagnostic before they were constructive...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“...the four dimensions of the framework were then consolidated from the criteria that recurred across the stages.”</i>
12.	7, 15–16	Method (limitations). Acknowledge the methodological limitations of a library-based conceptual study, particularly the absence of empirical validation, and briefly state how future studies could test the framework.	Thank you for this valuable comment. A limitation statement has been added to the Method noting that the framework is analytically warranted but not yet empirically validated, and forward-referencing the Conclusion, where the means of empirical testing are specified. Location of revision: <i>Method, p. 7, paragraph beginning “This design also carries a methodological limitation...” (see also Conclusion, pp. 15–16).</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“...it is analytically warranted but not yet empirically validated... The concluding section returns to this point and specifies how such validation might be pursued.”</i>
13.	7	Results and Discussion (first finding). The section is presented as a “finding” yet largely summarizes existing scholarship; make the analytical contribution explicit by distinguishing the author’s interpretation from previous studies.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The opening of the section has been rewritten to state that the finding is analytical rather than expository, and that the integration of knowledge, adab, and transmission into a single epistemic-ethical structure is the author’s inference from placing the sources in relation.

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

			Connective sentences after the Rosenthal, Al-Attas, and Arjmand discussions mark each source's role within that argument. Location of revision: <i>Results and Discussion, "Epistemic-Ethical Foundations of Religious Authority," p. 7.</i> Revised excerpt: <i>"This is not a claim that any of the cited authors makes individually; it is the inference that follows from placing their accounts in relation."</i>
14.	10	Results and Discussion (Modern Credentials and Digital Visibility). The section is predominantly descriptive; provide greater analytical synthesis explaining how the reviewed studies collectively support the proposed model rather than being presented sequentially.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The subsection has been reworked so that the Indonesian digital-Islam studies are synthesized around a single convergent finding—that recognition is increasingly conferred by visibility and circulation and competes with, rather than supplements, classical and institutional grounds—rather than presented case by case. Location of revision: <i>Results and Discussion, "Modern Credentials and Digital Visibility," p. 10, paragraph beginning "Algorithmic visibility should therefore be understood..."</i> Revised excerpt: <i>"...a distinction that constitutes the analytical core of this subsection... converge on a single finding: recognition is increasingly conferred by visibility and circulation..."</i>
15.	11	Results and Discussion (sufficiency of the four dimensions). Explain more explicitly why the four dimensions are conceptually sufficient and how they were derived from the preceding analysis, to strengthen the framework's theoretical validity.	Thank you for this valuable comment. Two new paragraphs address distinctness and sufficiency: the first explains why each dimension names a ground of legitimacy the others cannot supply; the second advances a bounded sufficiency claim, acknowledging that charismatic, political, and economic bases lie outside the model while showing the four dimensions to be non-redundant and jointly adequate to the pedagogical task.

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

			Location of revision: <i>Results and Discussion, “A Pedagogical Framework for Authority Reconfiguration,” p. 11, paragraphs beginning “Two questions bear on the adequacy...” and “The claim to sufficiency is bounded...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“The claim to sufficiency is bounded rather than absolute... The framework does not claim to exhaust every conceivable basis of authority...”</i>
16.	14	Discussion (transferability). Discuss how the framework extends beyond the Indonesian context and informs broader international debates; clarifying transferability would increase the manuscript’s significance for a global readership.	Thank you for this valuable comment. A new paragraph distinguishes the four dimensions as portable analytical categories from the context-specific institutional forms through which they are realized, illustrating transferability with reference to South Asian madrasa systems, Arab scholarly institutions, and diaspora educational settings, and framing the framework as a portable pedagogical vocabulary for international debates. Location of revision: <i>Results and Discussion, p. 14, paragraph beginning “Although the framework is developed largely through Indonesian material...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“The four dimensions function as analytical categories that are not specific to any single national context... What is context-specific is the institutional form through which each dimension is realized.”</i>
17.	15	Conclusion (restatement). The paragraph largely reiterates findings from the Results and Discussion; emphasize the broader implications and theoretical significance rather than restating them in detail.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The relevant conclusion paragraph has been rewritten to move from cataloguing the mechanisms of authority to their implication—that because legitimacy is now conferred through several partly independent channels, the burden of evaluation shifts to the learner and to the settings that form the learner’s judgment—emphasizing significance rather than restating findings.

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

			Location of revision: <i>Conclusion, p. 15, paragraph beginning “The study answers its research objective...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“The significance of this result lies less in cataloguing these mechanisms than in what their coexistence implies for Islamic education.”</i>
18.	15	Conclusion (theoretical advance). Clarify how the proposed framework advances existing theories of religious authority or Islamic education beyond the current body of literature.	Thank you for this valuable comment. The contribution is now located explicitly against the existing literature: whereas that scholarship is diagnostic, the framework converts its descriptive findings into evaluative and pedagogical criteria. The advance is stated as a move from an account of how authority is contested in society to a framework for how it can be evaluated in the classroom. Location of revision: <i>Conclusion, p. 15, paragraph beginning “The main conceptual contribution of this article...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“The advance, in other words, is from an account of how authority is contested in society to a framework for how authority can be evaluated in the classroom.”</i>
19.	14–15	Conclusion (applicability beyond Indonesia). Discuss how the framework may apply beyond the Indonesian context; highlighting relevance to broader Islamic educational settings would enhance international significance.	Thank you for this valuable comment. This point is addressed in the Discussion paragraph on transferability (Comment 16) and reinforced in the Conclusion’s limitations passage, which notes that the framework’s transferability beyond the Indonesian material, argued at the level of analytical categories, awaits empirical demonstration in other institutional settings. Location of revision: <i>Results and Discussion, p. 14; Conclusion, p. 15, paragraph beginning “The principal limitation of this study...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“...the framework’s transferability beyond the Indonesian material... likewise awaits empirical demonstration in</i>

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

			<i>the different institutional settings of other Muslim educational contexts.”</i>
20.	15	Conclusion (limitations). Expand the limitations by acknowledging that the framework has not yet been empirically validated, for a more balanced conclusion and greater methodological transparency.	Thank you for this valuable comment. A dedicated limitations paragraph now states that the framework is analytically warranted but not empirically validated, specifies the two consequences that follow, and clarifies that this defines the contribution as a warranted analytical proposal open to empirical testing. Location of revision: <i>Conclusion, p. 15, paragraph beginning “The principal limitation of this study follows from its design...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“The principal limitation of this study follows from its design: the framework is analytically warranted but not empirically validated...”</i>
21.	16	Conclusion (future research). Make the directions for future research more specific by suggesting potential research designs (case studies, comparative studies, curriculum evaluation, or empirical validation).	Thank you for this valuable comment. A new paragraph proposes four specific research designs—a curriculum-evaluation study, a comparative case study of contrasting institutional types, a multi-context comparative design beyond Indonesia, and a student-cohort validation study—each tied to a particular claim the framework makes. Location of revision: <i>Conclusion, p. 16, paragraph beginning “Several research designs would allow the framework to be tested...”</i> Revised excerpt: <i>“Several research designs would allow the framework to be tested, each addressing a specific claim it makes...”</i>
22.	16	Conclusion (concluding sentence). The concluding sentence would be more impactful if it explicitly highlighted the broader scholarly significance of the	Thank you for this valuable comment. The concluding sentence has been recast to foreground the framework’s significance, stating that the article’s contribution is to reframe religious authority as a set of teachable and evaluable criteria, offering

REVISION FORM FOR REVIEWER 1 & 2

		framework for future research and practice, rather than only restating the main argument.	Islamic education a portable pedagogical basis for curriculum design and a foundation for future empirical research. Location of revision: <i>Conclusion, p. 16, final sentence beginning “Even with this limitation, the article makes a clear contribution...”</i> Revised excerpt: “...by reframing religious authority as a set of teachable and evaluable criteria rather than an inherited possession, it offers Islamic education a portable pedagogical basis for curriculum design and a foundation for the empirical research needed to refine it...”
--	--	---	--

*Please add the space if you need more