

Pedagogical Authority and Participation in *al-Rasūl al-Mu‘allim: A Focused Reading for Peace Education*

Irza Anwar Syaddad

Universitas Wahid Hasyim, Semarang, Indonesia

syaddad.irza@gmail.com

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Sep 6, 2026	Oct 5, 2026	Oct 16, 2026	Oct 21, 2026

Abstract

This study examines how ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah presents selected Prophetic teaching practices in *al-Rasūl al-Mu‘allim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Ta‘līm*, focusing on the relationship between pedagogical authority and participation and its relevance to peace education. Qualitative document analysis and directed qualitative content analysis were applied to five consecutive sections addressing answering questions, extending answers, redirecting questions, revisiting discussions to clarify explanations, and delegating answers to Companions. The analysis indicates that these practices present teaching as a process of contextual pedagogical judgment involving decisions about relevance, explanatory scope, the appropriateness of responses, and the allocation of opportunities to participate. Delegation particularly illustrates how participants may exercise intellectual judgment while the educator retains authority to evaluate their responses. Participation can therefore coexist with educational asymmetry. These findings offer a conceptual perspective grounded in textual analysis for examining pedagogical relationships in peace education, while providing no basis for assuming that the practices automatically produce peaceful outcomes. The study is limited to Abū Ghuddah’s interpretation of selected hadith and does not assess their effects in contemporary educational settings.

Keywords: Pedagogical Authority; Participation; Prophetic Pedagogy; Abū Ghuddah; Peace Education.

INTRODUCTION

Peace education is commonly approached through the values promoted in educational curricula, the learning objectives established by educational institutions, and the competencies expected of learners (Ferrer Ariza, 2025; Nicoson et al., 2024). In Islamic education, this approach is reflected in studies examining how peace-related values are incorporated into curricular content (Halik et al., 2025). Daud, Ismail, and Zailani (2021), for example, investigated the inclusion of peace-related concepts in Islamic education curricula from the perspectives of 119 teachers in Arab schools in Kuala Lumpur. Their findings indicated that the foundations of peace were insufficiently represented in the curricula examined. Similarly, Al-Quhiaz (2024) conducted a content analysis of Islamic studies textbooks in Saudi Arabia, identifying peace-related values across three dimensions: peace with oneself, peace with others, and environmental peace. These studies demonstrate the importance of examining the content through which peace is taught. Nevertheless, the presence of peace-related values in educational materials does not, by itself, explain how peaceful relationships are enacted through teaching and learning.

The organization of pedagogical interaction therefore deserves closer attention. Harber and Sakade (2009) examined tensions between peace education and conventional schooling practices, reviewing how schools may reproduce or actively perpetuate violence rather than necessarily promote peaceful relationships. Drawing on an educational project in England, they compared peace education approaches with ordinary schooling from the perspectives of project workers, teachers, and pupils. Their analysis raises a critical question: whether the aims of peace education are necessarily reflected in the everyday practices through which educational authority is exercised. A more recent systematic literature review by Arystanbek et al. (2026) further conceptualizes positive peace education through curriculum, pedagogy, relationships, and everyday school practices. The authors identify four generative themes: situated practice, pedagogical balancing, teacher and student agency, and lived peace praxis. Together, these studies provide a basis for examining peace education not only as the transmission of values but also as a concern with the relationships and practices through which education takes place. This perspective does not imply that dialogue or participation automatically produces peace. Rather, it directs attention to how pedagogical practices organize authority, responsiveness, and opportunities for others to participate in educational interactions (Braden et al., 2023).

This concern provides a point of entry for examining *al-Rasūl al-Mu‘allim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Ta‘līm* by ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Abū Ghuddah, 1996). The book presents Prophetic reports within a pedagogical framework, beginning with the Prophet Muhammad’s characteristics and virtues as a teacher before discussing his teaching methods and educational guidance. The present study does not attempt to examine the entire book or produce another comprehensive inventory of Prophetic teaching methods. Instead, it focuses on a connected group of sections near the end of the edition consulted, concerning how the Prophet answers questions, provides more information than requested, redirects questioners toward other matters, seeks clarification, and delegates answers to Companions. This bounded corpus allows the study to examine particular pedagogical decisions and how they are organized and interpreted in Abu Ghuddah’s presentation. By focusing on a limited sequence of sections, the analysis aims to move beyond the identification of teaching techniques toward a more specific examination of the relationship between pedagogical authority and participation.

Previous studies have examined Abu Ghuddah’s book from several educational perspectives. Mannan and Salabi (2024) identified fourteen learning principles in *al-Rasūl al-Mu‘allim*, grouping them into cognitive, affective, social, and methodological strategies. Ihsan and Fitriani (2022), meanwhile, examined selected hadiths discussed in the book through the framework of behaviorist learning theory, particularly the relationship between environmental conditions, reinforcement, and behavioral responses. These studies establish the relevance of Abu Ghuddah’s work to contemporary educational discussions, but they also indicate that another general classification of teaching principles or comparison with an established learning theory would offer limited differentiation. The present study therefore shifts its analytical focus from identifying methods as discrete techniques to examining how Abu Ghuddah’s selection, organization, and explanation of particular teaching interactions frame the exercise of pedagogical authority and the participation of others.

Related questions have also been explored in Arabic-language scholarship on dialogue and expression in the Prophetic Sunnah. Al-Yazidi (2022) examines dialogue in the Prophetic Sunnah and its implications for individuals and society, drawing on examples of interaction between the Prophet and different groups of people. Al-Hamad (2015) investigates forms of self-expression and the expression of opinions in the light of the Sunnah, including oral, written, bodily, silent, and practical forms of expression, together

with the ethical constraints governing their exercise. These studies provide relevant context for understanding dialogue, expression, and participation within Prophetic pedagogy. However, studying dialogue or the right to express an opinion is not identical to examining how pedagogical authority is organized within a particular text (Majid Muhammad Abdoh & Abdulrahman Hussein Obeid, 2022). The present study addresses this more specific issue by focusing on the way Abu Ghuddah frames selected interactions between the Prophet, questioners, and Companions.

The relationship between these pedagogical practices and peace education requires a similarly careful distinction (Mousa et al., 2024; Mubashir & Pc, 2026). Existing research on Islamic education has examined peace through curriculum content, textbook analysis, and the identification of peace-related values (Batula et al., 2025). The present study approaches the question from a different direction: rather than determining which values are present in a pedagogical text, it examines how teaching interactions are represented and what they may reveal about the relationship between authority and participation. Its provisional research gap lies in this analytical shift, not in a claim that dialogue, questioning, or participation have never been studied in Islamic education. Establishing the precise extent of this gap requires comparison with the full texts of the closest previous studies.

Accordingly, this study addresses two research questions: (1) How does Abu Ghuddah frame answering, elaborating, redirecting, clarifying, and delegating responses as pedagogical practices in *al-Rasūl al-Mu'allim*? and (2) How can these practices be interpreted in terms of pedagogical authority and participation, and what implications, within the limits of textual analysis, may they offer for peace education? The study aims to analyze Abu Ghuddah's pedagogical framing of the selected reports and to develop a textually grounded interpretation of the relationship between authority, participation, and peaceful educational relationships. Peace education is employed as a contemporary interpretive framework, not as a theory explicitly formulated by Abu Ghuddah. Accordingly, the study distinguishes its textual findings from the contemporary educational implications drawn from them, without assuming that any particular Prophetic teaching practice automatically produces peaceful outcomes in modern educational settings.

METHODS

This study employs qualitative document analysis and directed qualitative content analysis to examine how ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah presents pedagogical authority and participation in *al-Rasūl al-Mu‘allim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Ta‘līm*. Document analysis provides a systematic means of examining and interpreting written sources within their textual context (Bowen, 2009), while directed qualitative content analysis uses existing concepts to guide the initial analysis without excluding patterns that emerge from the data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Accordingly, the concepts of pedagogical authority and participation serve as analytical guides rather than predetermined conclusions. The study does not seek to reconstruct the complete historical circumstances of every Prophetic report, formulate a comprehensive theory of Islamic education, or evaluate the empirical effectiveness of particular teaching practices. Its principal concern is how Abū Ghuddah selects, organizes, and interprets reports concerning pedagogical interaction.

The primary source is Abū Ghuddah’s *al-Rasūl al-Mu‘allim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Ta‘līm*, using the edition represented by the scan supplied for this study. The principal corpus comprises five consecutive sections within the printed pages 135–150. An earlier discussion of the Prophet’s character and conduct as a teacher, particularly printed pages 64–67, will serve as contextual material for understanding the selected sections within Abū Ghuddah’s broader presentation. Secondary sources include Arabic-language studies of dialogue and the expression of opinion in the Prophetic Sunnah, such as al-Yazidi (2022) and al-Hamad (2015), as well as research on learning principles in Abū Ghuddah’s book by Mannan and Salabi (2024). Selected international scholarship on peace education, particularly Harber and Sakade (2009) and Daud, Ismail, and Zailani (2021), will inform the contemporary interpretive framework. These studies provide conceptual context and points of comparison rather than substitutes for direct engagement with the primary text. The hadith references cited by Abū Ghuddah will also be checked against the relevant collections, where identifiable, to verify attribution and wording. This procedure is a supporting verification step, not a comprehensive hadith-authentication study.

The analysis will proceed through a comparative reading of the five sections. First, each section will be examined in terms of its heading, position within the book, selected reports, and explanatory comments to establish how Abū Ghuddah frames the pedagogical interaction. Second, each report will be analyzed according to who initiates the exchange,

what is asked, how the response is formulated, whether it extends beyond the original question, whether the question is clarified or redirected, and whether another person is invited or authorized to answer. Third, the sections will be compared to identify recurring patterns, differences, and possible counter-examples in the exercise of pedagogical authority and the forms of participation represented in the text. An analytical table may be used during this process to organize the evidence and facilitate comparison.

Finally, the identified patterns will be interpreted through the concepts of pedagogical authority and participation before their possible relevance to peace education is considered. Throughout this process, the analysis will distinguish meanings explicitly supported by Abū Ghuddah's text from contemporary interpretations advanced by the present study. Dialogue or the delegation of an answer will not automatically be treated as evidence of democratic or egalitarian pedagogy. The findings will instead be developed into a connected argument about the relationship between pedagogical authority, participation, and the possibilities these interactions may offer for interpreting peace-oriented educational practice.

RESULTS

The textual analysis reveals that the selected sections of *al-Rasūl al-Mu'allim wa Asalibuhu fī al-Ta'lim* represent pedagogical response as a differentiated practice rather than a uniform act of transmitting information. Abū Ghuddah's account distinguishes between answering the question as formulated, extending the answer to address a related need, redirecting the questioner toward a more consequential issue, revisiting a question to complete an explanation, and entrusting another person with the task of answering. These practices suggest that pedagogical authority operates not only through the possession of knowledge but also through judgments about relevance, timing, explanatory adequacy, and the questioner's circumstances (Abū Ghuddah, 1996, pp. 135–150). The following analysis examines the first two dimensions of this pattern: the grounds for extending an answer and the pedagogical judgment involved in redirecting or revisiting a question.

Responsive and Expanded Answers: The Scope of Pedagogical Response

Abū Ghuddah distinguishes between answering a question directly and providing additional information relevant to the questioner's circumstances. He presents expanded answering as a form of pedagogical care, justified by the learner's need rather than by the length of the explanation.

One example concerns a man who asks whether seawater can be used for ablution because fresh water is limited during sea travel. The Prophet confirms that seawater is purifying and adds that its dead creatures are lawful to eat. As Abū Ghuddah explains, this additional information addresses a related practical concern that the original question does not explicitly raise. The response thus extends beyond the immediate inquiry while remaining relevant to the questioner's circumstances. Abū Ghuddah cites the report from Mālik's *al-Muwattaʿ* and Abū Dāwūd's *Sunan* (Abū Dāwūd, 1972; Abū Ghuddah, 1996; Mālik ibn Anas, 1985).

A second example involves a woman who asks whether her young child will receive the merit of pilgrimage. The Prophet affirms the child's pilgrimage and adds that the woman herself will be rewarded. The answer therefore acknowledges not only the child's religious act but also the caregiver's role in facilitating it. Abū Ghuddah presents this addition as educationally significant because it recognizes the woman's contribution and encourages such care.

These examples suggest that expanded answering involves more than supplying extra information. Its pedagogical value lies in addressing a related need, anticipating a practical concern, or recognizing a dimension of the situation left implicit in the original question. Abū Ghuddah's account does not imply unrestricted elaboration; rather, it presents expansion as a judgment about what information is relevant and useful in a particular context. Unlike a general classification of Prophetic teaching methods (Mannan & Salabi, 2024), this reading highlights the relationship between the scope of an answer and the questioner's circumstances. It also raises a question of pedagogical responsibility: the educator determines what additional knowledge to provide, but the justification for doing so rests on its relevance to the learner's needs.

Redirection and Reprise: Reframing Questions and Completing the Answer

Abū Ghuddah identifies two related but distinct pedagogical practices: redirecting a questioner toward a more relevant issue and revisiting a question to complete or qualify an answer. Under *laft al-sā'il ilā ghayr mā sa'ala 'anhu*, redirection does not simply mean refusing a question or changing the subject. Rather, it directs the exchange toward knowledge considered more pertinent or consequential for the questioner (Abū Ghuddah, 1996, p. 145).

One example concerns a man who asks when the Last Hour will occur. The Prophet instead asks what the man has prepared for it. When the man explains that he has little to offer in prayer, fasting, or charity but loves God and His Messenger, the Prophet responds that he will be with those whom he loves. Abū Ghuddah interprets this exchange as shifting attention from the timing of an event beyond the questioner's control to his own moral and religious commitments. The question is not dismissed but redirected toward a matter of personal responsibility (Abū Ghuddah, 1996, p. 145; Al-Bukhārī, 2001; al-Qusyairī an-Naisābūrī, 1955).

Other examples illustrate how reformulating an answer can make it more precise. Asked about clothing prohibited during *iḥrām*, the Prophet identifies what must not be worn rather than listing every permissible garment. Similarly, when asked who fights in the cause of God, he identifies the person whose purpose is to uphold God's word, establishing intention as the criterion rather than merely classifying outward actions. These responses do not redirect the question toward an unrelated subject; they reorganize the answer to communicate the relevant ruling or principle more clearly.

Abū Ghuddah's discussion of *isti'ādat al-su'āl min al-sā'il li-ṭfā' bayān al-ḥukm* presents another practice: returning to a question to supplement or qualify an earlier answer. In the report concerning Abū Qatādah, a question about whether being killed in the path of God expiates one's sins receives a qualification concerning debt and obligations owed to others. The additional explanation prevents the initial answer from being understood as unrestricted (Abū Ghuddah, 1996, p. 149). Unlike redirection, which changes the focus or framing of an inquiry, this practice completes the explanation itself.

Taken together, these examples reveal distinct forms of pedagogical judgment. Redirection shifts attention toward a more consequential concern, reformulation makes an answer more manageable or conceptually precise, and reprise completes or qualifies an

explanation. None necessarily indicates arbitrary control over the exchange; their significance depends on how the intervention contributes to understanding.

These findings should not, however, be taken as evidence of democratic or egalitarian pedagogy. Research on dialogic education highlights the tension between educators' authority to guide learning and learners' opportunities to participate meaningfully (Kullenberg & Marjanovic-Shane, 2023; Skidmore, 2000). Peace education likewise requires attention to the relationships and institutional practices through which authority, voice, and engagement are organized, rather than conversation alone (Harber & Sakade, 2009; Millican et al., 2021). Abū Ghuddah's account therefore provides material for examining whether pedagogical interventions address relevant needs and support understanding, but it does not establish that redirection or correction is inherently peaceful or emancipatory.

Delegating an Answer: Authority and the Participation of Others

Abū Ghuddah's discussion of delegating answers highlights the relationship between pedagogical authority and opportunities to exercise knowledge. The chapter heading, *tafarrūduhu ṣallā Allāhu 'alayhi wa-sallam al-ṣaḥābī bi-al-jawāb 'ammā su'ila 'anhu li-yudarribahu*, describes entrusting a Companion with answering a question as a means of training him. Delegation is therefore presented not merely as transferring a task but as developing the Companion's capacity to respond to questions (Abū Ghuddah, 1996, p. 150).

The principal example concerns Abū Bakr's interpretation of a dream narrated to the Prophet. After requesting permission to interpret it, Abū Bakr receives the instruction *i'birhā* ("Interpret it"). He then interprets the dream's imagery, including a cloud, honey, clarified butter, and a rope extending from heaven to earth. When Abū Bakr asks whether his interpretation is correct, the Prophet explains that some parts are correct and others mistaken. The report appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and is discussed by Abū Ghuddah alongside parallel narrations in other hadith collections.

This exchange combines authorization, intellectual practice, and evaluation. Abū Bakr is permitted to interpret rather than simply receive an answer, but his interpretation remains subject to the Prophet's assessment. Delegation thus creates space for intellectual participation without removing the authority responsible for evaluating the result.

Participation here involves more than the opportunity to speak: it entails undertaking a meaningful task while remaining open to correction.

Abū Ghuddah also cites reports in which the Prophet entrusts Companions, including ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and ‘Uqbah ibn ‘Āmir, with adjudicating disputes. These accounts extend the discussion from verbal interpretation to the exercise of practical judgment. However, Abū Ghuddah notes weaknesses in the transmission of some adjudication reports. They should therefore not be treated as evidentially equivalent to Abū Bakr’s dream interpretation, which is recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Abū Ghuddah, 1996, p. 150).

The central implication is not that Prophetic pedagogy abolishes hierarchy, but that authority can create opportunities for others to exercise judgment while retaining responsibility for evaluating their contributions. This reading resonates with research on pedagogical authority and participation. Harjunen (2011) examines how teachers’ authority is negotiated within educational relationships, while Matusov et al. (2016) emphasize agency in dialogic education. These concepts serve as contemporary analytical perspectives, not labels attributable to Abū Ghuddah or the Prophetic reports themselves. The selected account does not establish a theory of democratic education; rather, it illustrates how authority may enable meaningful participation without eliminating differences in responsibility. For peace education, this offers a limited conceptual point of departure: attention should be paid to how educational authority distributes opportunities to contribute and exercise judgment, rather than assuming that peaceful pedagogy requires authority to disappear.

A Comparative Synthesis of Pedagogical Practices

The selected sections of *al-Rasūl al-Mu‘allim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Ta‘līm* present five distinct forms of pedagogical response: direct answering, expanded answering, redirection, revisiting a question, and delegation. Each involves a different pedagogical judgment. Direct answering addresses the question as posed, while expansion provides additional information relevant to the questioner’s circumstances. Redirection reframes the inquiry toward a more consequential concern, whereas revisiting a question supplements or qualifies an earlier explanation. Delegation differs from these practices because it transfers the immediate task of answering to another participant. These categories are analytical distinctions derived from the selected sections, not a taxonomy explicitly formulated by Abū Ghuddah.

Taken together, the practices suggest that pedagogical authority operates through decisions about the relevance and scope of information, the framing of questions, the completeness of explanations, and the allocation of responsibility for answering. Authority is therefore expressed not only through the provision of knowledge but also through the organization of educational interaction. Nevertheless, participation does not necessarily entail an equal distribution of authority. In the delegation episode, for example, Abū Bakr is authorized to interpret a dream, while the Prophet retains the authority to evaluate his interpretation. The findings thus indicate that pedagogical direction and participation can coexist without eliminating the asymmetry between educator and participant.

This interpretation resonates with contemporary research examining the relationship between teacher authority and learner participation. Munir (2025) explores how teacher authority structures participation in classroom interaction, while Sarid (2014) argues that authority and dialogical education should not be treated as inherently incompatible. These studies provide comparative perspectives rather than evidence about the historical meaning of the Prophetic reports. Similarly, Harber and Sakade (2009) emphasize the importance of examining educational practices and institutional relationships, rather than curricular content alone, when considering peace education. From this perspective, Abū Ghuddah's account offers a basis for asking how authority responds to questions, justifies interventions, and creates opportunities for others to contribute. It does not, however, establish that these practices are inherently democratic, egalitarian, or peaceful. Their relevance to peace education lies in the questions they raise about how authority is exercised and participation is organized within educational relationships.

DISCUSSION

Pedagogical Authority as a Relational Practice

The findings invite a reconsideration of pedagogical authority beyond the conventional opposition between authoritative instruction and learner participation. In educational relationships, authority is not exhausted by the teacher's institutional position or possession of knowledge. It also becomes consequential through the decisions by which knowledge is made accessible, questions are interpreted, explanations are qualified, and responsibility for intellectual work is allocated. The significance of Abū Ghuddah's account, therefore, lies not simply in its presentation of Prophetic teaching practices, but in the

possibility of examining authority as a relational practice through which educational interaction is organized.

This interpretation is consistent with scholarship that treats pedagogical authority as a problem of educational relationships rather than a matter of formal status alone. Harjunen (2011), for example, examines students' consent to teachers' pedagogical authority, drawing attention to the relational conditions under which authority is exercised and recognized. Sarid (2014) similarly interrogates the relationship between authority and dialogical education, challenging the assumption that dialogue necessarily requires the disappearance of authority. These perspectives help clarify the conceptual issue raised by the present study: authority and participation need not be mutually exclusive, but their relationship depends on how educational responsibilities and opportunities are structured.

Abū Ghuddah's presentation can be interpreted within this framework without attributing contemporary theories of pedagogy to either Abū Ghuddah or the Prophetic reports themselves. The textual evidence suggests that pedagogical authority may involve more than determining the content of an answer. It also concerns the judgment to extend or qualify an explanation, the decision to redirect an inquiry, and the authorization of another person to undertake an intellectual task. Such practices indicate that the exercise of authority includes decisions about the conditions under which knowledge is communicated and who may participate in its articulation. Authority is consequently understood not merely as the power to provide the correct answer, but also as the responsibility to organize the process through which an answer is sought, communicated, and evaluated.

This distinction is especially important in relation to delegation. If authority were understood exclusively as the prerogative to speak and decide, entrusting another person with an answer might appear to diminish the authority of the principal teacher. The selected material suggests a different possibility: authority can create an opportunity for another person to exercise judgment while retaining responsibility for evaluating the outcome. This arrangement does not establish equality between teacher and learner, nor does it eliminate the asymmetry of their respective roles. Rather, it indicates that the distribution of intellectual responsibility can occur within an authoritative relationship. The educational question is therefore not simply whether authority is present, but how it is exercised and what forms of participation it enables.

This reading also resonates with Matusov et al.'s (2016) discussion of dialogic education and authorial agency. Their approach emphasizes the importance of learners becoming agents in the production of meaning rather than merely recipients of predetermined knowledge. The connection is analytical rather than historical: Abū Ghuddah does not employ the contemporary vocabulary of authorial agency, and the selected reports should not be presented as an anticipation of a modern pedagogical theory. Nevertheless, the comparison makes it possible to ask whether an educational relationship gives participants meaningful opportunities to interpret, respond, and assume responsibility, or confines them to the reproduction of answers supplied by an authority.

The conceptual contribution of this study is thus deliberately limited. It does not propose a comprehensive theory of Islamic pedagogical authority. Instead, it identifies a way of reading Abū Ghuddah's account in which authority is examined through its relational operation. This approach shifts the analytical emphasis from the enumeration of exemplary teaching methods to the conditions under which pedagogical authority directs, supports, evaluates, and redistributes intellectual work. Such a shift provides a more precise basis for discussing the possible relevance of the text to contemporary educational concerns.

From Pedagogical Interaction to Peace Education

The implications for peace education emerge when pedagogical authority is considered in relation to the organization of educational relationships. Peace education is often associated with curriculum content concerning conflict, nonviolence, tolerance, or reconciliation. However, the presence of such content does not by itself establish that the relationships through which education occurs are consistent with the principles being taught. Harber and Sakade (2009) demonstrate this tension by examining the differences between peace education practices and the structures of ordinary schooling. Their analysis raises a fundamental question: can educational institutions promote peaceful values while maintaining interactional patterns that restrict participation, reproduce unequal power relations, or discourage critical engagement?

A more recent systematic literature review by Arystanbek et al. (2026) develops a complementary perspective through its examination of positive peace education in schools. The authors identify four themes in the international literature: situated practice, pedagogical balancing, teacher and student agency, and lived peace praxis. Their synthesis places

relationships, pedagogical decisions, and everyday educational practices alongside curriculum as relevant dimensions of peace education. It also draws attention to the ethical and contextual conditions under which peaceful educational practice becomes possible. These findings support the relevance of examining pedagogical interaction, although they do not establish that any particular practice in Abū Ghuddah's text necessarily constitutes peace education.

Against this background, the present study approaches peace education as an interpretive framework for examining the ethical organization of educational relationships, not as a doctrine explicitly formulated by Abū Ghuddah. The connection rests on a question of consistency: how might educational interaction embody the responsiveness, responsibility, and recognition of others that peace-oriented education seeks to cultivate? This question shifts attention from whether a text contains explicit statements about peace to whether its account of teaching can illuminate the ways authority and participation are organized.

Three analytical implications follow. First, responsiveness to questions raises the issue of whether educational authority attends to the concerns that learners actually bring to an interaction. Responsiveness does not require the educator to accept every premise or provide every requested answer. It requires that the question be treated as an intelligible point of departure rather than dismissed merely because it does not conform to the educator's preferred agenda. Second, the redirection or qualification of an inquiry raises the question of how educators exercise judgment without reducing the learner to a passive recipient. Redirection may be pedagogically warranted, but its justification depends on the relevance and adequacy of the explanation, not simply on the educator's superior status. Third, the delegation of intellectual responsibility raises the issue of whether learners and other participants are recognized as capable of contributing to the production and evaluation of knowledge. Such recognition need not abolish differences in expertise or responsibility; it requires that authority be examined in terms of how it structures opportunities for meaningful participation.

These implications should not be mistaken for evidence that the practices examined in this study automatically produce peaceful outcomes. The present research is textual and conceptual, not an empirical evaluation of classroom behaviour or student development. It cannot establish whether teachers who adopt comparable practices achieve lower levels of conflict, greater student agency, or more inclusive learning environments. Nor can the

selected reports establish that every form of redirection, correction, or delegation is ethically justified. The relevance to peace education lies instead in the analytical questions these practices make available for further educational reflection and empirical investigation.

This qualification is essential because participation alone is not a sufficient criterion for peaceful pedagogy. A learner may be invited to speak while having little influence over the direction of discussion; an answer may be delegated while the authority to evaluate it remains entirely centralized. Conversely, a teacher's intervention may preserve an asymmetry of roles while enabling more responsible and informed participation. The relationship between authority and peace therefore requires attention to the purposes, procedures, and consequences of educational interaction rather than reliance on labels such as dialogic, democratic, or learner-centred.

The study's contribution to peace education is consequently one of conceptual clarification rather than direct application. By reading Abū Ghuddah's presentation through the relationship between pedagogical authority and participation, the article identifies a framework for asking how authority can guide learning while allowing others to exercise intellectual responsibility. This framework does not resolve the broader normative question of what constitutes Islamic educational values, nor does it establish a universal model of peaceful teaching. It does, however, suggest that the ethical significance of educational practice cannot be assessed solely by the values declared in a curriculum. It must also be examined through the organization of the relationships in which knowledge is communicated, questioned, interpreted, and evaluated. In this sense, the study provides a historically grounded point of departure for considering how the practice of teaching may become a site for examining the relationship between Islamic educational thought and contemporary approaches to peace-oriented education.

Pedagogical Participation Does Not Eliminate Authority

The pedagogical practices examined in this study should not be interpreted as evidence that Prophetic teaching abolished the asymmetry between teacher and learner. The opportunity to ask questions, receive explanations beyond the immediate question, or respond to a question through delegated authority does not necessarily establish an egalitarian educational relationship. These practices instead illustrate how participation may

be accommodated within a relationship in which the educator retains responsibility for directing the learning process and evaluating the adequacy of responses.

This distinction is particularly important in interpreting the delegation of an answer to another person. Such delegation creates an opportunity for the other person to demonstrate understanding and exercise intellectual judgment. However, the opportunity remains situated within a pedagogical relationship structured by the educator's authority. The educator determines when to delegate, to whom the task is assigned, and how the resulting answer is evaluated. Participation, therefore, does not automatically entail an equal distribution of pedagogical authority.

The analytical significance of these practices lies not in the disappearance of authority but in the ways authority organizes participation. Authority can determine the boundaries of acceptable responses while also creating opportunities for others to contribute. This perspective complicates the assumption that meaningful participation requires the educator to relinquish authority. It also avoids the opposite assumption that the presence of authority necessarily excludes learner participation.

Accordingly, the findings do not warrant describing the practices examined here as democratic or student-centered pedagogy in the contemporary theoretical sense. Such classifications would require additional conceptual and historical justification. A more defensible interpretation is that the selected accounts demonstrate different ways of organizing the relationship between pedagogical direction and participation. This distinction enables the study to examine the educational significance of the reported practices without imposing contemporary educational categories on the historical material.

Implications and Limits for a Global Peace Agenda

The relevance of this study to the seminar's global peace agenda lies in its examination of pedagogical interaction rather than in the identification of an explicit theory of global peace in *al-Rasūl al-Mu'allim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Ta'lim*. The selected accounts invite reflection on how educational relationships are organized through responses to questions, the framing and completion of explanations, and the allocation of opportunities to contribute. These practices provide a textual basis for discussing the relationship between

pedagogical authority and participation, both of which are relevant to broader debates about peaceful educational relationships.

This connection should nevertheless be understood as interpretive rather than causal. The analysis does not demonstrate that the pedagogical practices discussed in Abu Ghuddah's work necessarily produce peaceful dispositions, reduce conflict, or improve relationships in contemporary classrooms. Nor does it establish that the practices constitute a comprehensive model of peace education. Rather, the study identifies dimensions of pedagogical interaction that may inform further discussion about how educational authority can be exercised while allowing meaningful participation.

The distinction matters because peace education involves more than the quality of individual teaching encounters. Its aims and outcomes also depend on institutional arrangements, curricular priorities, social conditions, and the ways conflict and power are addressed within educational settings. A textual study of selected pedagogical accounts cannot independently establish how these wider dimensions operate. The contemporary relevance of the findings must therefore be explored through further conceptual work or empirical research rather than assumed from the textual material alone.

The connection to sustainable civilization is more indirect still. This study does not investigate environmental sustainability, institutional continuity, or long-term social outcomes. Its contribution to the broader theme is limited to the possibility that educational relationships constitute one dimension of social life in which habits of participation, responsiveness, and authority are negotiated. Whether, and under what conditions, such practices contribute to more peaceful and sustainable societies remains an open question. By maintaining these limits, the study offers a focused contribution to the seminar theme without claiming that a textual analysis can establish outcomes beyond its evidentiary scope.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined selected pedagogical practices presented in 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah's *al-Rasūl al-Mu'allim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Ta'lim*, focusing on the relationship between pedagogical authority and participation. The analysis identifies several ways in which teaching is organized through interaction: responding to questions, extending explanations beyond their immediate scope, redirecting attention toward a more relevant consideration,

revisiting an answer to clarify or qualify it, and delegating the task of answering to another person. Taken together, these practices suggest that pedagogical judgment involves not only the transmission of knowledge but also decisions about the scope of an explanation, the framing of a question, and the distribution of opportunities to contribute.

The analysis also shows that participation does not necessarily eliminate pedagogical authority. In the selected accounts, opportunities to respond and contribute remain situated within a relationship in which the educator directs the interaction and evaluates the adequacy of answers. Authority and participation are therefore not necessarily opposing principles. Their relationship depends, in part, on how authority is exercised and what roles it permits others to occupy. This interpretation avoids treating the selected practices as straightforward evidence of democratic or student-centered pedagogy while recognizing their significance for understanding the organization of teaching and learning.

In relation to peace education, the study offers a textually grounded conceptual perspective on educational relationships. It draws attention to how questions are handled, how explanations are framed and completed, and how responsibility for answering may be shared without assuming that pedagogical authority must disappear. These dimensions provide a basis for further reflection on the organization of participation and authority in peaceful educational relationships. However, the analysis does not demonstrate that the practices examined necessarily produce peaceful dispositions or social outcomes, nor does it establish a comprehensive model of peace education.

The study is limited to Abū Ghuddah's pedagogical interpretation of selected Prophetic reports. It does not examine every aspect of his book, establish the historical development of a broader Islamic educational theory, or empirically investigate the effects of applying these practices in contemporary classrooms. Its implications for global peace and sustainable civilization must consequently remain interpretive and provisional. The article's contribution is thus a focused conceptual reading of pedagogical authority and participation within an Islamic pedagogical text, offering a perspective that may inform further discussion of peace education without claiming to provide a comprehensive theory of Islamic education or a demonstrated model for producing peaceful societies.

REFERENCES

- Abdoh, M. M., & Obeid, A. H. (2022). Al-aḥādīṣ al-‘aḳadiyyah al-wāridah fī al-ḥiwār ba‘da al-bi‘ṣah wa al-hijrah al-nabawiyyah jam‘an wa takhrījan wa dirāsatan. *Ma‘ālim al-Qur‘ān wa al-Sunnah*, 18(1), 210–231. <https://doi.org/10.33102/jmq.v18i1.358>
- Abū Dāwūd, S. ibn al-Ash‘ath. (1972). *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* (M. M. al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, Ed.). Al-Maktabah al-‘Aṣriyyah. <https://shamela.ws/book/1726>
- Abū Ghuddah, ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ. (1996). *Al-Rasul al-mu‘allim wa asālibuhu fī al-ta‘līm* (1st ed.). Dār al-Bashā‘ir al-Islāmiyyah.
- Al-Bukhārī, M. ibn I. (2001). *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Al-Sulthaniyyah.
- Al-Hamad, M. A. A. (2015). Asālib al-ta‘bīr ‘an al-dhāt wa-al-ra’y wa-ḍawābiṭihimā: Dirāsah tarbawiyyah fī ḍaw’ al-sunnah al-nabawiyyah. *Majallat Jāmi‘at al-Quds al-Maftūḥah lil-Baḥūth al-Insāniyyah wa-al-Ijtima‘iyyah*, 2(35), 201–240. <https://journals.qou.edu/index.php/jrresstudy/article/view/736>
- Al-Quhiaz, A. bint M. bin H. (2024). Madā taḍmīn qiyam al-salām fī muḥṭawā kutub al-dirāsāt al-Islāmiyyah fī al-marḥalah al-mutawassitah bi-al-Mamlakah al-‘Arabiyyah al-Sa‘ūdiyyah: Dirāsah taḥlīliyyah. *Majallat al-‘Ulūm al-Tarbawiyyah*, 10(4), 18–53.
- Al-Qusyairī an-Naisābūrī, A. al-Ḥusain M. bin al-Ḥajjāj. (1955). *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.
- Al-Yazidi, A. binti A. bin M. (2022). Thaqāfat al-ḥiwār fī al-sunnah al-nabawiyyah wa-atharuh ‘alā al-fard wa-al-mujtama. *Majallat al-Ādāb*, (24), 415–453. <https://journal.tu.edu.ye/index.php/artsmain/article/view/908>
- Arystanbek, A., Bukutova, A., Toleu, G., Parmenter, L., Cremin, H., & Ospanbek, A. (2026). Implementing positive peace education in schools: A systematic literature review of global practices. *Educational Research Review*, 50, Article 100759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100759>
- Batula, A. W., Surahman, C., Sumarna, E., Rahmania, P., & Karimah, I. W. (2025). The Qur’anic concept of teachers and its educational principles in contemporary educational contexts. *Journal of Islamic Education Research*, 6(4), 493–508. <https://doi.org/10.35719/jier.v6i4.531>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braden, E., Long, S., Wynter-Hoyte, K., Boutte, G., Frazier, J., Mosso-Taylor, S., & Volk, D. (2023). Curricular violence and the education of Black children: Working toward positive peace through pro-Black practices. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 55(3), 347–367. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-023-00379-6>
- Daud, A. L. H., Ismail, W. M., & Zailani, M. A. (2021). Taḍmīn manāḥij al-tarbiyah al-Islāmiyyah li-mafhūm al-silm min wijhat naẓar al-mu‘allimīn: Al-madāris al-‘Arabiyyah bi-Kūālā Lūmbūr namūdḥajan. *Journal of Islamic Educational Research*, 6(1), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jier.vol6no2021.6>
- Ferrer Ariza, E. (2025). *Peace education: Exploring educational possibilities* [Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University]. Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports (ETD). <https://doi.org/10.33915/etd.12850>
- Halik, H., Yusuf, R., Idris, J., Darusman, D., Sahlan, M., Fazal, K., & Rusdi, M. (2025). Cultivating peace through education: A case study of social studies in Aceh’s junior high schools. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, 13(3), 2171–2194. <https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v13i3.1494>

- Harber, C., & Sakade, N. (2009). Schooling for violence and peace: How does peace education differ from 'normal' schooling? *Journal of Peace Education*, 6(2), 171–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400200903086599>
- Harjunen, E. (2011). Students' consent to a teacher's pedagogical authority. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 55(4), 403–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.587325>
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Ihsan, Z., & Fitriani, W. (2022). Perspektif Hadis tentang Teori Belajar Behavioristik (Studi Kitab Ar-Rasul Al-Muallim). *Istinarah: Riset Keagamaan, Sosial dan Budaya*, 4(2), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.31958/istinarah.v4i2.7695>
- Kullenberg, T., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2023). Democratic education and dialogic pedagogy: Synergies and dissonances. *Dialogic Pedagogy: A Journal for Studies of Dialogic Education*, 11(2), A158–A164. <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2023.480>
- Mālik ibn Anas. (1985). *Al-Muwatṭaʿ*. Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāṡ al-ʿArabī.
- Mannan, M., & Salabi, A. S. (2024). Prinsip-Prinsip Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam dalam Kitab ar-Rasūl al-Muʿallim wa Asālibuhu fī al-Taʿlīm. *Pase: Journal of Contemporary Islamic Education*, 3(2), 99–127. <https://journal.uinsuna.ac.id/index.php/Pase/article/view/646>
- Matusov, E., Smith, M., Soslau, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A., & von Duyke, K. (2016). Dialogic education for and from authorial agency. *Dialogic Pedagogy: A Journal for Studies of Dialogic Education*, 4, A162–A197. <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2016.172>
- Millican, J., Kasumagić-Kafedžić, L., Masabo, F., & Almanza, M. (2021). Pedagogies for peacebuilding in higher education: How and why should higher education institutions get involved in teaching for peace? *International Review of Education*, 67(5), 569–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-021-09907-9>
- Mousa, A. N. A. G. M., Mohamad, S. A. H. R., Hassan, R. I. M., Said, M. H. M., & Khayat, M. H. M. E. (2024). The sublime dialogue and its influence on the others in the light of Prophetic Sunnah. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(5), 800–810. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v14-i5/21310>
- Mubashir, K. S., & PC, M. S. (2026). Prophetic pedagogy in practice: A holistic teaching model for enhancing learning in Indian primary schools: Prophetic pedagogy for effective teaching and learning. *Primary Education Insight*, 2(1), 53–65. <https://doi.org/10.65779/pedi.v2i1.78>
- Munir, F. (2025). Functions of teacher authority in classroom interaction: Investigating contexts for language learning. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 44(2), 388–401. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v44i2.81313>
- Nicoson, C., Magalhães Teixeira, B., & Mårtensson, A. (2024). Re-imagining peace education: Using critical pedagogy as a transformative tool. *International Studies Perspectives*, 25(4), 448–468. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekad023>
- Sarid, A. (2014). Calling balls and strikes: The question of authority and power in dialogical education. *Power and Education*, 6(3), 241–252. <https://doi.org/10.2304/power.2014.6.3.241>
- Skidmore, D. (2000). From pedagogical dialogue to dialogical pedagogy. *Language and Education*, 14(4), 283–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780008666794>

