ENLEKTURER: Journal of Islamic Studies
E-ISSN: 2988-7259
Volume x, No. x, Januari - Juni 202x (Filled Out by the Editor)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.71036/ejis.v4xix.xxx (Filled Out by the Editor)

Received: 02-04-2026 | Accepted:16-06-2026 | Published: 19-06-2026 (Filled Out by the Editor)

THE TITLE SHOULD BE CONCISE, INFORMATIVE AND CLEAR, ALLOWED TO INCLUDE A SUBTITLE
(Center, Bold, Garamond 12, No more than 14 words)

Author Name[1]; Author Name[2]; Author Name[3]
[1,3]John Molson School of Education, Concordia University, Canada
[2]Faculty of Cultural Studies, University of Rijeka, Croatia
[1]Correspondence Email: authoremail@example.com

Abstract: Abstracts should provide a clear and pertinent overview of the manuscript, enabling readers to understand the scope and contribution of the study. The abstract must contain 150–200 words and be written in a logical and precise manner, without subheadings. Authors are strongly encouraged to follow this structure: first, present the research issue or topic, emphasizing its importance and the gap addressed; second, state the aim of the study or the formulated hypothesis; third, briefly describe the research methods applied; fourth, summarize the main results or findings; and finally, highlight the key points from the discussion that lead to the major conclusions or interpretations. The abstract must objectively represent the article, avoid claims not supported by the main text, and not exaggerate the conclusions. Formatting requirements: the abstract should be written in single-spaced, font size 12, using Garamond. Keywords should immediately follow the abstract. Authors are required to provide 3–5 specific keywords, derived from the article's scope and translated into concrete

research variables or thematic focuses (see the example). Avoid abbreviations, general words, or plural terms (such as "and", "of"). Each keyword should be separated by a semicolon (";"). The title, abstract, and author information must all appear on the first page of the manuscript.
Keywords: Inclusive Education; Decentralization; Social Inequality; Financial Technology; Cultural Construction.

A. Introduction

The manuscript written in English US or Indonesian IN. The main text (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion) should range between **4,000 and 7,000 words**. References and appendices are not included in the word count. All contents must be prepared using Garamond font, size 12, with 1 -line spacing. The journal prioritizes manuscripts that demonstrate clear novelty, substantial academic contributions, sound methodological rigor, and strong alignment with its aims, focus, and scope. Authors are therefore encouraged to ensure that their research topics and designs meet these requirements prior to submission.

Before developing the Introduction, authors are strongly encouraged to formulate a clear, concise, and academically meaningful **TITLE**. As the first element encountered by readers, editors, and reviewers, the title plays a crucial role in communicating the focus, significance, and intellectual direction of the study. It may include subtitles when necessary and should **not exceed 14 words**. A strong title should clearly communicate the main focus of the study while attracting scholarly interest.

For this reason, the title should be built around three key elements: the formal object (the academic issue or perspective being examined), the material object (the phenomenon, institution, group, or variable under investigation), and the research context where relevant. Authors are encouraged to develop titles that reflect one or more elements of **CCTES (Controversy, Change/Transformation, Trend, Emergency, and Solution),** thereby highlighting the relevance, significance, urgency, or intellectual focus of the research. Titles that merely indicate a location, method, or list of variables without a clear scholarly focus should be avoided.

The **INTRODUCTION** should **not exceed 20% of the total manuscript length** and **is generally expected to be around 750–1000 words**. In writing the Introduction section, authors are expected to clearly articulate the research problem and establish its academic significance within the broader scholarly landscape. Authors should avoid excessively broad background discussions, lengthy theoretical descriptions, or literature summaries that do not directly contribute to the development of the research argument. Every paragraph should serve a clear purpose in building a logical progression from the research phenomenon to the study's contribution and objective.

Authors are strongly encouraged to begin the Introduction with a compelling opening paragraph that immediately demonstrates why the issue under investigation deserves scholarly attention. The opening should present a **significant** phenomenon, challenge, contradiction, trend, policy concern, empirical inconsistency, or societal consequence that highlights the importance and **urgency** of the study. Such arguments should be grounded in credible empirical evidence, statistical data, policy reports, or relevant scholarly literature rather than general statements, unsupported opinions, or dictionary-style definitions. A strong opening paragraph should capture the reader’s attention, establish the significance of the topic, and position the issue within a broader academic and societal context.

Following the opening phenomenon, the Introduction should progressively focus on the **specific problem** addressed by the study. The problem should be clearly articulated, academically significant, and positioned within broader scholarly discussions. The problem should be presented not only as a practical concern arising from empirical realities but also as a scholarly issue that remains insufficiently understood within existing knowledge. Rather than merely describing the existence of a problem, authors should critically problematize the issue by demonstrating why current explanations, assumptions, or interpretations remain insufficient to fully account for the observed phenomenon. This process helps establish the intellectual significance of the study and clarifies why further investigation is necessary. A convincing rationale is therefore built through the interaction between empirical evidence and scholarly evidence, demonstrating both the real-world importance of the issue and the limitations of current academic understanding.

The Introduction should position the problem within existing scholarship by critically engaging with relevant **previous studies**. Rather than presenting prior research as a collection of summaries, authors should evaluate how the issue has been understood, explained, and investigated over time, while identifying conceptual weaknesses, methodological limitations, inconsistent findings, analytical blind spots, or other unresolved issues. This discussion should establish the current state of knowledge by highlighting dominant perspectives, theoretical developments, and methodological trends within the field. Through this critical evaluation, authors should clearly identify a **research gap** by explaining what remains underexplored, contested, or insufficiently understood. The research gap should not be based solely on differences in research location or setting. Instead, it should demonstrate the study's position within ongoing scholarly conversations and justify the need for further investigation.

Based on this gap, the **novelty of the study** should be explicitly articulated and justified through a clear scholarly rationale rather than presented as a normative claim. The novelty may take the form of a new perspective, conceptual refinement, theoretical extension, methodological innovation, interdisciplinary integration, or empirical insight. Authors should then explain the **contribution of the study** by demonstrating how the proposed novelty advances current knowledge, theory, methodology, policy, or practice. As emphasized by Elsevier (2023), a strong introduction should position the study within both local and global scholarly discourse while clearly demonstrating its academic significance. The introduction should conclude by presenting the **research objective(s)** that logically emerge from the identified gap, proposed novelty, and expected contribution.

For **quantitative studies**, hypotheses may be formulated when theoretically and empirically justified. Such hypotheses should emerge logically from the theoretical framework, previous studies, critical evaluation, and identified research gaps, and should be integrated into the narrative flow of the Introduction rather than presented as a separate section.

The Introduction should conclude with a clear statement of the research objective. The objective should emerge naturally from the identified problem, discussion of previous studies, critical evaluation of existing knowledge, research gaps, and expected contribution of the study. Research questions may be included when necessary, provided they are incorporated into the narrative flow rather than presented as bullet points.

It is important to note that in the Journal ENLEKTURER, the Introduction section **must not contain separate subheadings** such as "Literature Review" or other sub structured headings. All elements of literature, including conceptual definitions, theoretical frameworks, previous research findings, and gap analysis—must be integrated into a cohesive, reflective, and argumentative narrative. The Introduction should demonstrate a logical and structured flow of thought, thereby forming a unified argumentative framework, rather than a fragmented one. Theories or concepts must be selected based on their relevance and analytical utility, not merely as decorative citations. Where a study employs a specific theory, conceptual model, or analytical framework, authors should clearly introduce and position it within the Introduction, explaining its relevance to the research problem and its role in guiding the analysis and interpretation of findings. The writing should also reflect an **interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approach, in line with the character of Journal ENLEKTURER,** and should utilize academically credible and up-to-date sources (ideally published within the last 5–10 years).

B. Method

The Method section should not exceed 10% of the total manuscript length. The purpose of the Method section is not to explain methodological theories but to demonstrate transparently how the research was conducted, how the data were generated, and how the findings were produced. A strong Method section demonstrates that the research was conducted systematically, transparently, ethically, and in a manner that is appropriate for answering the research problem and producing credible findings.

It should be written in a concise, clear, and coherent narrative form without the use of bullet points or subheadings, while providing sufficient methodological detail and maintaining a logical flow of information to ensure transparency, reproducibility, and the possibility of replicating the study under similar conditions. Furthermore, authors are expected to demonstrate that the chosen approach aligns with the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary orientation of the Journal ENLEKTURER.

The Method section should begin by clearly describing the research design employed, whether qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods, along with a brief academic justification for its selection. The rationale should demonstrate how the chosen design aligns with the research objectives, questions, or hypotheses. This should be followed by a description of the research subject or object and the context in which the study was conducted, including a clear justification for these choices. Authors should then explain the data collection procedures, including the sources of evidence, instruments employed, stages of implementation, and any measures taken to ensure the quality, validity, reliability, or trustworthiness of the data. The process of data analysis must be described systematically and step by step, with reference to relevant theories or concepts that provide an academic foundation for interpretation.

In qualitative studies, authors should describe how the data were organized, coded, categorized, interpreted, and validated. In quantitative studies, authors should explain the statistical techniques used, the variables analyzed, the software employed where relevant, and the basis for interpreting the results. In mixed-methods studies, authors should clarify how qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed and integrated. The analytical procedures should be presented systematically and aligned with the research objectives, providing a clear foundation for the results reported in the subsequent section.

Furthermore, authors must ensure that any research involving human or animal participants has been approved by an appropriate ethics committee and includes informed consent (Elsevier, 2023). **It is important**

to note that simply providing the ethical approval number is not sufficient. The ethical statement must be written in a concise, narrative form, seamlessly integrated into the flow of the Methods section, and not presented as bullet points or under separate subheadings, in accordance with the writing style of Journal ENLEKTURER, as illustrated in the example below.

Suggested example: *"This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of [Name of Institution], with approval number [approval code]. All participants provided written informed consent prior to data collection, and their identities were protected under strict confidentiality principles".*

If the research did not involve human or animal subjects, authors are still encouraged to state this explicitly, for example: *"This study did not involve human or animal participants and therefore did not require ethical approval. However, all data were collected in accordance with institutional ethical standards".*

C. Results and Discussion

The results section is presented before the discussion section, with each standing as a separate subheading. **The results and discussion together should comprise no less than 65% of the entire body of the manuscript.** Before presenting the findings and discussion, authors are expected to provide a brief introduction that outlines the overall structure of this section. This introductory paragraph may include a description of the types of data analyzed, the analytical approach employed, and how the presentation of findings and their discussion will be organized. This is intended to provide readers with an initial understanding of the logical flow of this section, ensuring that the results and discussion are perceived as an integrated whole rather than as disjointed parts.

1. Results

The Results section should **not exceed 25% of the total manuscript length**. The Results section answers a fundamental question: What was found? Its purpose is to present the empirical findings generated through the research process in a clear, systematic, evidence-based manner, and consistent with the approach and data collection techniques previously outlined in the Methods section. A strong Results section reports what was discovered, demonstrates the evidence supporting each finding, and maintains a clear distinction between empirical findings and theoretical interpretation. Authors must respect the boundary of the Results section as a space for presenting data and factual findings, not for expressing opinions or scholarly arguments.

The Results section should begin with a brief introductory paragraph that provides an overview of the findings before moving into the detailed presentation of the data. Findings should then be organized logically according to the research objectives, research questions, hypotheses, variables, themes, categories, or analytical dimensions used in the study. The structure should enable readers to follow the progression of evidence and understand how the findings address the focus of the research.

All findings must be supported by appropriate empirical evidence derived from interviews, observations, questionnaires, surveys, tests, documentation, archival records, digital sources, or other instruments relevant to the research design. The presentation should focus on reporting the evidence rather than explaining its broader implications. Conceptual interpretation, theoretical discussion, and comparison with previous studies should be reserved for the Discussion section.

The results must be written in a coherent, flowing narrative, with a logical structure that aligns with the type of data and the methodological approach employed. In **qualitative research**, findings may be presented through narrative descriptions, thematic categories, direct quotes from participants, observational records, or other forms of qualitative evidence that illustrate emerging social patterns or meanings from field data. For Interview quotations should be introduced by a contextual statement and followed by a brief descriptive explanation that clarifies their relevance to the finding being presented. In **quantitative research,** results may include descriptive and inferential statistics, such as frequencies, means, standard deviations, t-tests, ANOVA, regression analyses, and others depending on the instruments and analytical design used. Statistical outputs should be reported clearly and selectively, emphasizing the results most relevant to the research objectives. For **mixed-methods research**, authors should present both qualitative and quantitative findings in a balanced and non-overlapping manner while maintaining a logical and proportionate narrative flow.

Data presented in tables, charts, or figures must be accompanied by sufficient narrative explanation, enabling readers to understand the meaning and relevance of the data without having to guess or interpret independently. Authors should avoid copying the entire content of tables into the narrative. Instead, they should highlight key points from the data, such as trends, comparisons, or significant findings that support the research objectives.

All data presented in the Results section must be directly related to the research questions and should exclude any information that will not be analyzed in the Discussion. In qualitative research, direct quotes from participants must be chosen carefully to represent the diversity and essence of the findings. Such quotes should be presented ethically by protecting participants' identities (e.g., using initials or codes instead of full names) and by ensuring that the excerpts genuinely illustrate the themes being discussed. When presenting interview quotations, authors should not allow them to stand alone. Each quotation must be introduced with a contextual sentence and followed by a brief explanation to highlight its relevance to the research theme. This explanation is descriptive rather than analytical, ensuring that readers understand the quotation's place within the flow of the results. Deeper interpretation should be reserved for the Discussion section, where quotations serve as living, contextual data integrated into the researcher's broader narrative. **For example:**

The findings show that supervisors view the internalization of values as extending beyond formal classroom instruction. One supervisor explained this perspective by stating: *"The internalization of religious values in learning is not only carried out through courses but also through extracurricular activities of a spiritual and social nature"* (Interview with TB, August 2024).

This statement highlights that the process of value internalization is perceived as more effective when supported by practical and collective activities, not merely by theoretical teaching. Students also stressed that social engagement is the best way to experience values like togetherness. One student reflected:

In my opinion, the value of togetherness taught on campus is not only conveyed through lectures or classroom discussions, but it becomes much more meaningful when we are involved in collective activities. Such as preparing campus events as a team, the sense of unity and cooperation becomes very real. I feel that togetherness is not just an abstract concept but something that shapes our character and strengthens the bond among us as students. (Interview with NS, September 2024).

The structure of the Results section may include sub-sections if necessary, especially when findings are organized into major categories or thematic groups. However, the presentation should maintain narrative continuity and avoid fragmenting the data into disjointed pieces. Coherence between sections is crucial to preserve the logical flow of the writing and to guide readers toward the discussion. As this section serves as the argumentative foundation for theoretical analysis in the following part of the article, authors must write the Results section carefully, accurately, and comprehensively to provide readers with a complete understanding of the empirical evidence obtained in the study.

From a technical standpoint, the presentation of tables and figures must follow established scientific conventions. Tables should not contain vertical lines, and horizontal lines should only be used at the top and bottom of the table. Font sizes in tables may be adjusted for efficiency, provided they remain legible. Figures and tables should not be redundantly repeated in the narrative; only the key points contained within them need to be discussed. All figures, graphs, and tables must be numbered, given informative titles, and explicitly referred to in the main text using consistent formatting, such as in "Table 1," "Figure 1," or "Graph 1."

Table 1. Recommended length of each section in the manuscript

No.	Section	Length (%)	Note
1.	Introduction	20	Maximum, including Title and Abstract
2.	Method	10	Maximum

No.	Section	Length (%)	Note
3.	Results and Discussion		Maximum, customized
	a. Results	25	
	b. Discussion	40	
5.	Conclusion (include References)	5	Maximum

Source: Guidelines for Authors of the Journal ENLEKTURER, *2023*

You can also include a figure in the body of the script. Schemes follow the same formatting. Format example for Figure is as follows.

Figure 1. This is a figure. Schemes follow the same formatting

You may have to describe briefly with a clear narrative about the contents of the tables and figures. Ensure that figures and tables are accompanied by clear, explanatory narratives to support interpretation.

2. **Discussion**

The **Discussion** section should **not exceed 40% of the total manuscript length**. The Discussion section answers two fundamental questions: What do the findings mean, and why do they matter? Its purpose is not to repeat the results but to interpret, explain, and critically analyze the findings in relation to theory, previous studies, and broader scholarly debates. A strong Discussion section demonstrates the intellectual contribution of the research by explaining the significance of the findings and their implications for knowledge, practice, policy, and society. Each finding must be critically interpreted and logically connected to the theoretical or conceptual framework employed, ensuring that the discussion is structured, meaningful, and academically sound. A strong discussion typically moves from the meaning of the findings to their explanation, theoretical engagement, scholarly contribution, implications, international relevance, and limitations.

This section should be written in an analytical and systematic style, reflecting a strong relationship between the data, research methods, theoretical foundation, and the contextual issues being studied. The discussion should remain grounded in the empirical evidence presented in the Results section, using the findings as the basis for interpretation and argumentation. Repetition of data presentation must be avoided; the discussion is not a space for restating results but rather a platform for reflection, conceptual reasoning, and the strengthening of scholarly arguments. The discussion should begin by explaining the principal meaning of the findings. Authors are encouraged to establish a clear academic position regarding the results rather than merely restating what was reported in the Results section. Empirical evidence may be briefly revisited when necessary to support the argument, but the focus should remain on interpretation rather than repetition. Readers should be able to understand why the findings are important and how they contribute to understanding the issue under investigation.

The discussion must move beyond description to explain why the findings emerged and why they matter. Authors should critically analyze the factors, mechanisms, conditions, and processes that shape the observed outcomes. Arguments must be developed through logical reasoning supported by empirical evidence and scholarly literature. Findings should be interpreted through relevant theories, concepts, or analytical frameworks to demonstrate how they confirm, extend, refine, challenge, or reposition existing knowledge. Theory should function as an analytical lens rather than a collection of citations. Engagement with previous studies must be critical and reflective, examining similarities, differences, and the contextual factors that may explain them.

Authors should avoid confirmation bias —(in Indonesia commonly referred to as *cocokology*)— the practice of listing previous studies that support the findings without critical analysis. For example, statements such as "These findings are consistent with Budi (2020), Ali (2021), and Sari (2022)" without explaining the relevance, implications, or theoretical significance of such alignments represent weak argumentation. A discussion is not strengthened by the number of supporting citations, but by the quality of interpretation and scholarly dialogue. Authors are encouraged to engage selectively with the most relevant studies, critically examining points of convergence, divergence, and their implications for advancing knowledge and theory.

Scholarly dialogue should strengthen the argument, clarify the study's contribution, and demonstrate its significance for advancing theoretical and academic discussions within the field. **The contribution of the study should be clearly articulated within the flow of the discussion.** Authors are expected to demonstrate how the findings advance existing knowledge through theoretical development, conceptual refinement, methodological insight, empirical evidence, or alternative perspectives on the issue under investigation. Contribution should emerge from the analytical process rather than be presented as a separate claim. Novelty should not be presented merely as a claim but demonstrated through the study's contribution to theory, evidence, methods, or scholarly understanding. Authors should also explain the theoretical, practical, social, educational, organizational, or policy **implications of the findings** where relevant, highlighting their significance for knowledge, practice, and society.

Journal ENLEKTURER requires authors to demonstrate the international relevance of their findings, including how evidence from a local context contributes to broader scholarly conversations and global debates or enrich cross-cultural approaches. This is a mandatory editorial requirement and a defining characteristic of articles published in Journal ENLEKTURER. A distinctive expectation of the journal is that local evidence should generate knowledge that is meaningful beyond the immediate research setting. This component must be substantively integrated into the discussion rather than mentioned only in passing. Authors are expected to show how findings derived from a specific context contribute to wider theoretical, empirical, policy, or disciplinary debates. Where appropriate, authors are encouraged to articulate how their findings contribute to addressing global challenges, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), international policy agendas, or other strategic issues of global concern. Such connections should emerge naturally from the study's findings and arguments rather than being presented as superficial or symbolic references. Studies that merely describe local phenomena without establishing their broader significance are unlikely to demonstrate a strong scholarly contribution. Such arguments should be supported by relevant and up-to-date scholarly sources to ensure that claims are analytically grounded and academically credible.

As the final component of the discussion, authors should explicitly **acknowledge the limitations of the study**, whether methodological, contextual, or conceptual. Identifying these limitations demonstrates academic rigor, transparency, and an awareness of the boundaries of the research findings. Suggestions for future research should be reserved for the conclusion section.

Ultimately, a strong discussion demonstrates the scholarly significance of the findings through critical analysis, theoretical engagement, intellectual contribution, and broader relevance. Reflective, analytical, and internationally oriented writing is a key determinant of a manuscript's eligibility for publication in Journal ENLEKTURER.**{Ђ}**

D. Conclusion

The Conclusion section should **not exceed 10% of the total manuscript length** and is generally expected to be around **350–450 words**. The Conclusion section answers two fundamental questions: What can be concluded from the study? And what remains to be explored? Its purpose is to provide a concise synthesis of the principal findings and arguments developed throughout the article while reaffirming the study's contribution and significance. A strong conclusion does not simply restate what was found; it **synthesizes the principal findings** and insights derived from the study, reaffirms the study's principal **contribution** and broader **implications**, identifies meaningful directions for **future research**, and concludes with a clear **take-home message** that communicates the essence of the study.

The conclusion should **synthesize the principal findings** in relation to the research objectives and explain their overall meaning and significance. Authors should avoid repeating data, statistical results, interview excerpts, or detailed arguments already presented in previous sections. The conclusion should focus on synthesizing the study's key insights and articulating the overarching conclusions rather than repeating individual findings.

Authors should **reaffirm the main contribution** of the study and, where relevant, briefly highlight its broader **implications**. Unlike the Discussion section, where contributions and implications are developed through analysis and scholarly argumentation, the Conclusion should present them in a concise and synthesized form as the principal takeaways of the study. The conclusion is intended to emphasize what the study contributes and why it matters, not to repeat the analytical discussion.

Based on the limitations acknowledged in the Discussion section, authors are encouraged to identify directions for **future research**. These suggestions should arise logically from the boundaries of the current study and indicate meaningful opportunities for further scholarly investigation.

The conclusion should end with a short and clear **take-home message**. This final statement should not merely repeat the findings but should communicate the central insight, broader meaning, or key lessons emerging from the study. A strong take-home message leaves readers with a clear understanding of why research matters and what is most important to remember from the article.

Importantly, the Conclusion is not an abstract and must not duplicate it. The Conclusion should be written as a coherent narrative in paragraph form rather than as bullet points or lists.

Acknowledgment

If there is any, acknowledgment can be stated here. This section displays authors' appreciation to sponsors, fund donors, resource persons, or parties who have an important role in conducting research.

Declaration of Competing Interests

Authors must disclose any financial or non-financial competing interests that could be perceived as influencing the research or the interpretation of its findings. This declaration is mandatory. Example statement (choose one, do not modify the wording):

If no competing interests exist:

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial or non-financial interests that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

If competing interests exist:

The author(s) declare the following competing interests: [brief description of the competing interest].

Declaration of Generative AI Use

Authors are required to complete this section only if generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used in the writing process (e.g., language editing or improving readability). The use of AI tools for data analysis, interpretation, or drawing scientific conclusions is not covered by this declaration. If no generative AI tools were used, this section must be removed from the manuscript. Example statement (choose one, do not modify the wording):

If generative AI was used:

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used [name of tool/service] to improve the clarity and readability of the text. Output generated by the tool were carefully reviewed and edited by the authors, who take full responsibility for the content of this article. All substantive intellectual contributions, including conceptualization, analysis, interpretation of data, and final decisions regarding content, arguments, and conclusions, were carried out solely by the authors. The authors take full responsibility for the integrity, originality, and academic quality of this article.

If generative AI was not used:

(Remove this section entirely)

Bibliography

Before preparing the reference list, authors should recognize that references are not merely technical requirements but essential components of scholarly argumentation. References provide the intellectual foundation for identifying research problems, positioning the study within existing knowledge, establishing theoretical perspectives, and demonstrating scholarly contribution. Therefore, references should be selected based on their relevance, quality, credibility, and contribution to the manuscript.

In Journal ENLEKTURER, the reference list is not included in the manuscript's total word count. Authors are expected to manage references in a balanced and purposeful manner. **The ideal number of references ranges between 35 and 60 sources,** depending on the complexity of the topic and depth of analysis. References should be current, relevant, and of high scholarly quality, reflecting recent developments and debates within the field. At least 80% of all references should be derived from nationally accredited journals and reputable international journals. The remaining references may consist of scholarly books, conference proceedings, policy reports, legal documents, or other credible academic sources.

All citations and references must follow the APA 7th Edition style. Authors are required to use Mendeley or a similar citation management application to ensure consistency and formatting accuracy. **Every source listed in the reference list must be cited in the manuscript, and every in-text citation must appear in the reference list**. Examples of in-text citations: (Tabrani, 2020) for a single author, (Badarch & Zanabar, 2017) for two authors, and (Tabrani et al., 2024) for three or more authors. Author names may also be incorporated into the narrative, such as "Tabrani (2020)". Direct quotations should include page numbers where applicable, although paraphrasing is generally preferred. Authors must ensure that all references are complete, accurate, and traceable. Journal articles should include a DOI whenever available; otherwise, a valid URL must be provided.

Reference

Examples of reference entries:

(Type: book, by a Corporate (Group) author)

American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th Ed.). American Psychological Association

(Type: *e-book*)

National Research Council. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition*. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/9853

(Type: *edited book, two* editors or more)

Tobias, S., & Duffy, T. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Constructivist Instruction: Success or Failure?,* Routledge.

(Type: *book section*)

Idris, S., Tabrani ZA., Sulaiman, F., & Amsori. (2020). Emerging Perspectives and Trends in Innovative Technology for Quality

Education 4.0. In Kusmawan et al. (Eds.). *Assessment of Critical Education Concepts in the Perspective of Islamic Education*. London: Routledge, pp. 66-70. https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429289989-18

(Type: *book*, in English translated into Indonesian, original title intact)

Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (E. Hamdiah & R. Fajar, Trans.). Pustaka Pelajar. (Original work published 2012).

(Type: *book, Indonesian,* not translation, an original title retained)

Tabrani ZA. (2017). *Menggugat Logika Nalar Rasionalisme Aristoteles*. Mizan.

(Type: *book*, one author)

Tabrani ZA (2015). *Persuit Epsitemology of Islamic Studies*. Penerbit Ombak.

(Type: *book*, two authors)

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (Fifth ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

(Type: *book*, three authors)

Walidin, W., Idris, S., & Tabrani ZA. (2015). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif & Grounded Theory*. FTK Ar-Raniry Press.

(Type: journal article, *online*)

Nuribadah, & Muksalmina. (2024). Penegakan Hukum Pemilu di Indonesia Dalam Mewujudkan Pemilu Yang Adil, Transparan, dan Berkualitas. *ENLEKTURER: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *2*(2), 87–108. https://doi.org/10.71036/ejis.v2i2.350

Oknita, Kamaruzzaman, & Nidhra Safila. (2024). Komunikasi dan Interaksi Perempuan Paruhbaya di Warung Kopi Dalam Persepsi Masyarakat Kota Lhokseumawe. *ENLEKTURER: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *2*(2), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.71036/ejis.v2i2.361

Mohd Yusoff, M. Z., Hamzah, A., Fajri, I., Tabrani ZA., & Yusuf, S. M. (2022). The Effect of Spiritual and Social Norm in Moral Judgement. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, *27*(1), 555–568. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2022.2156799

(Type: *journal article,* three authors)

Oknita, Kamaruzzaman, & Nidhra Safila. (2024). Komunikasi dan Interaksi Perempuan Paruhbaya di Warung Kopi Dalam Persepsi Masyarakat Kota Lhokseumawe. *ENLEKTURER: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *2*(2), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.71036/ejis.v2i2.361

Appendix

Appendices are optional and should be included only when they provide essential supplementary information that would otherwise interrupt the flow of the main text. They should be concise, directly relevant to the study, and should not exceed three pages.