**Al-Furqan : Jurnal Agama, Sosial, dan Budaya**
https://publisherqu.com/index.php/Al-Furqan
Vol. 5, No. 5 September 2026
P-ISSN : 2830-7755; E-ISSN:2830-7844

# BEYOND FAIRNESS: A QUR'ANIC–PROPHETIC MODEL OF ʿADL, QISṬ, AND RAḤMAH FOR JUST AND INCLUSIVE ISLAMIC EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

**Hilwa Bahriyah[1*], Muhammadiyah Amin[2], Mursalim[3]**
Doctoral Program in Islamic Education Management
Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Aji Mihammad Idris Samarinda, Indonesia
Email: hilwabahri97@gmail.com[1] , amindirjenbi@gmail.com[2] ,
mursalimfuaduinsi@gmail.com[3]

**Abstract**

Purpose: This study formulates a Qur'anic–prophetic model of justice for Islamic education management by clarifying ʿadl, qisṭ, and raḥmah and positioning them against equality, equity, and justice in contemporary theory. Method: A qualitative, library-based design combined thematic exegesis (tafsīr mauḍūʿī) of Q 4:58, 16:90, 5:8, and 49:13, analysis of hadith on just leadership, compassion, and the prohibition of injustice, and an instrumental case study of inclusion services at an Islamic university drawn from institutional documents. Data were analysed through content and thematic analysis with source triangulation. Results: ʿAdl denotes proportional placement of rights, qisṭ its measurable and auditable expression, and raḥmah–iḥsān the relational completion of justice. They correspond to equity, distributive and procedural justice, and interpersonal justice, yet rest on amānah and transcendent accountability. A five-layer model is proposed: theocentric foundation, ʿadl–qisṭ, raḥmah–iḥsān, equal dignity and inclusion, and accountability with remedy. The case shows institutionalised inclusion, but funding and proactive outreach remain limited. Implications: Institutions can translate the model into auditable indicators, and future research can develop Islamic justice instruments.

Keywords: *ʿadl; qisṭ; raḥmah; educational justice; Islamic education management; inclusive education*

**Abstrak**

Tujuan: Penelitian ini merumuskan model keadilan Qur'ani–profetik bagi manajemen pendidikan Islam dengan menjernihkan konsep ʿadl, qisṭ, dan raḥmah serta memosisikannya terhadap equality, equity, dan justice dalam teori kontemporer. Metode: Penelitian kualitatif berbasis kepustakaan ini memadukan tafsir tematik (tafsīr mauḍūʿī) QS. 4:58, 16:90, 5:8, dan 49:13, analisis hadis tentang kepemimpinan yang adil, kasih sayang, dan larangan zalim, serta studi kasus instrumental layanan inklusi pada sebuah universitas Islam berdasarkan dokumen kelembagaan. Data dianalisis dengan analisis isi dan tematik disertai triangulasi sumber. Hasil: ʿAdl bermakna penempatan hak secara proporsional, qisṭ merupakan ekspresinya yang terukur dan dapat diaudit, sedangkan raḥmah–iḥsān menyempurnakan keadilan secara relasional. Ketiganya sepadan dengan equity, keadilan distributif dan prosedural, serta keadilan interpersonal, tetapi bertumpu pada amanah dan akuntabilitas transendental. Model lima lapis diusulkan: fondasi teosentris, ʿadl–qisṭ, raḥmah–iḥsān, kesetaraan martabat dan inklusi, serta

akuntabilitas dan pemulihan. Studi kasus menunjukkan pelembagaan inklusi, namun pendanaan dan penjangkauan proaktif masih terbatas. Implikasi: Lembaga dapat menerjemahkan model ini menjadi indikator yang dapat diaudit, dan penelitian lanjutan dapat mengembangkan instrumen keadilan berbasis nilai Islam.
Kata kunci: *ʿadl; qisṭ; raḥmah; keadilan pendidikan; manajemen pendidikan Islam; pendidikan inklusif*

## INTRODUCTION

Justice is among the most contested yet indispensable concepts in the governance of education. Scholars of social justice in education have shown that the term carries distributive, relational, and recognitional meanings that are frequently conflated, so that institutions invoke justice rhetorically without specifying what is to be distributed, to whom, and through which procedures. Educational systems also reproduce advantage when selection, funding, and assessment favour already privileged groups. Inside organizations, the experience of unfair treatment is far from trivial: meta-analytic evidence links perceived injustice to lower job satisfaction, commitment, trust, and performance, and to higher withdrawal and counterproductive behaviour (Colquitt et al., 2001; North, 2006; Reay, 2012).

These concerns are acutely visible in Islamic educational institutions. In the Islamic tradition, justice is not an ancillary virtue but a purpose of revelation, and education is conceived as the cultivation of a person who places everything in its proper place. Yet universities and schools in Muslim societies, like those elsewhere, manage public trust in the form of funds, positions, curricula, and services, and they are vulnerable to favouritism, opaque recruitment, and unequal access. Students with disabilities, in particular, depend on institutional goodwill to realise rights that the Qur'anic discourse on human dignity and the Prophet's correction of exclusionary attitudes would seem to guarantee. Such tensions raise the question of how Islamic normative sources can be translated into everyday management decisions (Bazna & Hatab, 2005; Halstead, 2004; Heyneman et al., 2008).

Contemporary management and education research offers rich frameworks for answering that question, including equity theory, organizational justice, social justice, and inclusive education. However, these frameworks were largely developed within Western social and philosophical contexts and tend to define justice through the perceptions and exchanges of actors. Reviews of organizational justice research emphasise perceived fairness as the central construct, and they pay little attention to normative sources that exist independently of perception. A problem gap therefore emerges: Islamic educational institutions use the

vocabulary of ʿadl and amānah, but the literature has rarely derived operational constructs from the Qur'an and hadith and tested them against established theory, leaving a conceptual space between sacred text and managerial instrument (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Greenberg, 1987; Sahin, 2018).

Previous studies have confirmed the empirical relevance of justice in Islamic higher education. Research on state Islamic higher education institutions in Indonesia found that distributive and procedural justice in remuneration were perceived as fair and positively affected staff job satisfaction. Studies in Muslim-majority business contexts show that Islamic work ethic moderates the effect of organizational justice on job outcomes, and a meta-analysis established the broad link between justice and work attitudes across settings. On the student side, research on students with disabilities at an Indonesian Islamic university documented accessibility barriers and reliance on the disability office, indicating that justice for learners is as consequential as justice for staff. These works, however, treat Islamic values mainly as moderators or contexts rather than as the source of the justice construct itself (Ibrahim et al., 2022; Khan et al., 2015; Ro'fah et al., 2020).

The novelty of this study lies in three moves. First, it derives a justice architecture directly from tafsīr mauḍūʿī of four pivotal verses and from hadith on leadership, compassion, and injustice, rather than adding an Islamic variable to a Western model. Second, it distinguishes ʿadl, qisṭ, and raḥmah analytically, mapping them onto equality, equity, and justice and onto the four dimensions of organizational justice. Third, it tests the resulting model against an inclusion programme in an Islamic university, thereby linking scriptural analysis with institutional practice and extending Islamic leadership scholarship from the staff domain to the student domain (Beekun & Badawi, 2005; Shah, 2006; Tikly & Barrett, 2011).

Accordingly, this study focuses on the integration of ʿadl, qisṭ, and raḥmah as a framework for justice in Islamic education management. It seeks (1) to clarify the meaning and mutual relation of the three concepts and their correspondence with equality, equity, and justice; (2) to analyse the managerial implications of Q 4:58, 16:90, 5:8, and 49:13 and of relevant hadith; (3) to examine their dialogue with equity theory, organizational justice, social justice, and inclusive education; and (4) to propose and illustrate an operational model through a case of inclusion services. Conceptual clarity on equality and equity is a precondition, because treating all learners identically is not the same as treating them justly (Espinoza, 2007; Unterhalter, 2009).

The argument advanced here is that a justice framework for Islamic institutions should be theocentric without being detached from measurement. Islamic educational thought places the ordering of each thing in its rightful place (ta'dīb) at the heart of education, so that justice becomes a condition of knowledge, not merely of administration. At the same time, contemporary inclusion scholarship demonstrates that equity requires differentiated provision backed by policy and practice, and the organizational justice literature shows that ethical commitments weaken when they are not tied to observable conduct. Combining these insights yields a model that is normatively anchored in revelation, operationally auditable, and attentive to the dignity of the least advantaged (Ainscow, 2020; Al-Attas, 1980; Murtaza et al., 2016).

## RESEARCH METHOD

**A. Research approach and type.** This study employs a qualitative, descriptive–interpretive approach with a library-based design, combined with an instrumental single-case study. A qualitative approach was chosen because the object of inquiry consists of meanings, concepts, and institutional practices, not quantifiable variables. Library research suits the analysis of scriptural and theoretical texts, while the case study allows the proposed concepts to be examined in a bounded, real-life setting and generates context-dependent knowledge that is valuable for theory building. The case is instrumental in that it is used to illuminate the model and not to generalise statistically (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Crowe et al., 2011; Flyvbjerg, 2006).

**B. Research location and rationale.** The case was situated in Kutai Kartanegara Regency, East Kalimantan, Indonesia, where a state Islamic university operates. This location was selected purposively for three reasons. First, the university is a recently transformed institution whose expanded academic mandate enlarges the demand for fair access, workload distribution, and services. Second, the region is a rapidly developing area in the vicinity of the national capital development zone, which brings greater diversity among students and staff and heightens the need for inclusive governance. Third, the institution has issued a written guideline for a disability study and service centre, so documentary evidence on justice-related practice was available and accessible to the researcher (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Palinkas et al., 2015; Tracy, 2010).

**C. Data collection techniques.** Data were collected through documentation and library research. Primary sources comprised the Qur'an, classical and modern exegesis, canonical hadith collections, and classical lexicons for the linguistic analysis of ʿadl, qisṭ, and raḥmah.

Secondary sources comprised peer-reviewed literature on organizational justice, equity theory, social justice, and inclusive education, retrieved from international and national indexed journals. Institutional data were drawn from national statutes and regulations on education, higher education, and disability rights, the presidential and ministerial regulations on institutional transformation and statutes, and the rector's decree on the disability service guideline. No interviews or observations were conducted at this stage; the case therefore rests on document evidence, which is treated as a limitation. Multiple document types were compared to reduce single-source bias (Bowen, 2009; Carter et al., 2014).

**D. Data analysis techniques.** Analysis proceeded in three stages. First, verses were analysed through thematic exegesis (tafsīr mauḍūʿī): relevant verses were gathered, their linguistic and contextual meanings examined with reference to exegetes, and their managerial implications derived. Hadith were examined for authenticity through their canonical collections before interpretation. Second, textual and institutional data were coded and grouped into themes using content and thematic analysis, with theoretical dimensions (distributive, procedural, interpersonal, informational; equality, equity) serving as sensitising categories. Third, themes were synthesised into a model and compared with the case evidence. Trustworthiness was supported through source triangulation, an audit trail of sources, and explicit reporting of limitations (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Carter et al., 2014; Nowell et al., 2017).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Conceptual Architecture: ʿAdl, Qisṭ, and Raḥmah

The analysis shows that ʿadl, derived from the root ʿ-d-l, denotes straightness, balance, and the placement of something where it belongs. Qur'anic usage does not equate ʿadl with identical treatment. Quraish Shihab distinguishes four senses: equality in rights, balance, attention to the rights of individuals and their delivery to the owners, and the divine justice that preserves existence. This proportional sense is consistent with the principle that no one is burdened beyond capacity (Q 2:286) and with the cosmic balance (mīzān) in Q 55:7–9. Classical and modern Islamic accounts of justice likewise treat it as a comprehensive moral order rather than a narrow rule of equal shares, and Islamic ethics in management literature positions it as a core obligation of leaders toward stakeholders (Al-Attas, 1980; Beekun & Badawi, 2005; Khadduri, 1984).

Qisṭ is the second term and is distinguished by its practical and measurable character. It appears in contexts of testimony (Q 4:135), weights and measures (Q 11:85), reconciliation (Q 49:9), and fair treatment of non-hostile outsiders (Q 60:8). Lexicographers describe it as a just portion, and some exegetes consider it the visible, assessable side of ʿadl, whereas ʿadl may include inner balance, as shown by Q 4:129 on the limits of inward impartiality. For management, this difference is useful. Qisṭ corresponds to what organizational justice research calls fair outcomes and fair procedures, such as consistent criteria, accurate information, and correctability, while ʿadl adds the integrity of the decision maker (Colquitt, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2007; Leventhal, 1980).

Raḥmah and iḥsān complete the structure. The Qur'an describes the Prophet as a mercy to all worlds (Q 21:107) and attributes the cohesion of his community to his gentleness (Q 3:159). In Q 16:90, justice is paired with iḥsān, which exegetes read as goodness beyond what is strictly owed, such as forgiving, giving more, and facilitating. Scholarship on Islamic educational leadership underlines that compassion and ethical exemplarity are inseparable from authority in the Islamic conception of the educator and leader, and the literature on Islamic business ethics makes the same pairing of justice with benevolence. Justice without mercy risks legalism; mercy without justice risks partiality. The two function as minimum standard and manner of execution respectively (Halstead, 2004; Rice, 1999; Shah, 2006).

Contemporary literature distinguishes equality (the same resources for all), equity (resources adjusted to needs, contributions, or starting points), and justice as the encompassing normative concept. Deutsch showed that the preferred distribution rule depends on the goal: contribution when productivity is paramount, equality when solidarity is paramount, and need when welfare is paramount. Educational institutions pursue all three goals, so no single rule is always just. The mapping in Table 1 is analogical rather than identical because the epistemological bases differ: Islamic justice is bound to tawḥīd, amānah, and accountability before God, whereas modern theories typically begin from social rationality and actors' perceptions (Deutsch, 1975; Espinoza, 2007; Unterhalter, 2009).

**Table 1. Mapping of Islamic Justice Concepts to Contemporary Concepts**

| Islamic concept | Contemporary counterpart | Meaning and implication |
|---|---|---|
| ʿAdl | Equity; justice | Placing things where they belong; proportional to right, need, and capacity |
| Qisṭ | Distributive and procedural justice | Just portion; firm and measurable in distribution, testimony, and sanction |
| Raḥmah and iḥsān | Interpersonal justice; ethic of care | Compassion and goodness beyond obligation; facilitating and not burdening |
| Karāmah insāniyyah (Q 17:70; 49:13) | Equality of dignity | Equal human dignity; honour measured by piety |
| Amānah | Accountability; merit-based allocation | Positions and resources entrusted to the qualified and answerable |

**Four Pivotal Verses and Their Managerial Implications**

Q 4:58 orders believers to deliver trusts (amānāt) to those entitled to them and to judge between people with justice. Classical exegetes read the verse as general despite its occasion of revelation concerning the keys of the Kaʿbah, so it governs all trusts, including office, knowledge, and resources. Three managerial principles follow. The first is fit between position and competence; the hadith in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (no. 59) warns that when affairs are entrusted to the unqualified, one should await the Hour. The second is procedural fairness in every decision that affects people, such as appraisal, sanction, and dispute resolution. The third is transcendent accountability, since the verse closes by recalling that God hears and sees. This reading provides a scriptural basis for merit-based staffing, an issue that evidence on corruption and favouritism in higher education shows to be damaging, and for fair procedures that research links to acceptance of unfavourable decisions (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Heyneman et al., 2008; Shah, 2006).

Q 16:90 combines three commands (ʿadl, iḥsān, and giving to relatives) with three prohibitions (faḥshā', munkar, and baghy). Managerially, ʿadl sets the minimum standard that

all policies must meet: rights fulfilled, rules applied consistently, and sanctions proportionate. Iḥsān refers to quality beyond the minimum, for example flexibility for a staff member in hardship or mentoring for a struggling student. Giving to relatives must be read together with the prohibition of baghy, so that concern for kin does not become nepotism; the boundary is drawn by the principle of amānah in Q 4:58. Abuse of authority, discrimination, and exploitation are institutional forms of baghy. The verse therefore supports a leadership ethic that combines firmness in enforcing rules with gentleness in applying them, a combination also emphasised in research on Islamic work ethic and organizational management (Ali & Al-Owaihan, 2008; Beekun & Badawi, 2005; Cropanzano et al., 2007).

Q 5:8 calls believers to be steadfast upholders of qisṭ for God and warns that hatred toward a people must not lead to injustice, adding that justice is closer to piety. The form qawwāmīn indicates sustained, active commitment. In educational organizations, personal liking and antipathy are among the most common sources of bias, for instance in performance appraisal, selective discipline, or grading. Leventhal's procedural rules of consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality effectively operationalise this injunction. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that fair procedures and fair interpersonal treatment influence trust and behaviour independently of outcomes. Because the verse links justice to taqwā, the pursuit of fairness is also part of the spiritual formation of institutional members (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Leventhal, 1980).

Q 49:13 addresses all humankind, affirming a common origin, diversity of peoples and tribes for the purpose of mutual recognition (taʿāruf), and piety as the criterion of honour. The Prophet's farewell sermon expresses the same principle by denying any superiority of Arab over non-Arab except by taqwā. The verse offers a theological basis for equality of dignity and rejects discrimination by ethnicity, social status, or gender in admission, recruitment, and services. It resonates with social-justice scholarship that insists on recognition alongside redistribution, and with inclusion research that views diversity as a resource, not a deficit. It also supports multicultural and inclusive education, in which dignity is not conditional on ability or origin (Ainscow, 2020; North, 2006; Sahin, 2018).

**Prophetic Traditions on Justice, Compassion, and Injustice**

Hadith literature reinforces the Qur'anic mandate with concrete examples. The just leader is listed first among those shaded by God on the Day without shade (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 660;

Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim no. 1031), and every person is a shepherd answerable for those in his or her charge (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 893; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim no. 1829), which extends accountability to rectors, deans, and teachers. The case of the woman of Banū Makhzūm demonstrates equal application of rules regardless of status (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 3475; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim no. 1688), and the instruction to Nuʿmān ibn Bashīr to treat his children equitably (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 2587) is analogically relevant to educators' treatment of students. These reports align with research on ethical and social-justice leadership, which emphasises consistency, courage against bias, and accountability for outcomes of marginalised groups (Beekun & Badawi, 2005; Shah, 2006; Theoharis, 2007).

Compassion appears as a pedagogical method. The Prophet's statement that those who do not show mercy will not be shown mercy (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 5997; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim no. 2318) anchors a relational ethic, and the report of Muʿāwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam, who spoke during prayer and was neither rebuked nor struck by the Prophet, illustrates teaching without humiliation (Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim no. 537). Likewise, the Prophet restrained those who wished to reprimand the Bedouin who urinated in the mosque and said that they were sent to make things easy (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 220). Such narratives form the basis of an interpersonal justice that respects dignity and explains decisions, and they are consistent with conceptions of Islamic education as the nurturing of the whole person and with dialogic leadership that rejects silencing of marginal voices (Halstead, 2004; Sahin, 2018; Shields, 2004).

The prohibition of injustice forms the firm side of the same ethic. A hadith qudsī records that God has forbidden injustice for Himself and made it forbidden among people (Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim no. 2577), injustice is described as darkness on the Day of Resurrection (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 2447), and the supplication of the oppressed is to be feared (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 2448). The Prophet also instructed believers to help the wrongdoer by restraining him (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī no. 2444). Institutionally, such texts require preventive and corrective mechanisms, namely codes of conduct, internal supervision, safe complaint channels, protection of whistle-blowers, and remedies for those harmed. These are the managerial practices that organizational justice research recommends, and evidence from Islamic work ethic studies suggests that such ethical commitments strengthen cooperative behaviour (Cropanzano et al., 2007; Greenberg, 1990; Murtaza et al., 2016).

**Dialogue with Contemporary Justice Theories**

Equity theory proposes that individuals compare the ratio of their inputs to outcomes with the ratio of a referent and are motivated to restore balance when it is perceived as unequal. In education, this can be seen when a lecturer reduces commitment after perceiving that heavier workload yields the same incentive as a colleague's lighter one. Later research showed that people differ in equity sensitivity, with some tolerating under-reward and others expecting over-reward. The theory therefore explains why proportionality matters in workload, remuneration, and recognition, and why institutions must publish transparent formulas and criteria (Adams, 1965; Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Huseman et al., 1987).

The dialogue with Islam reveals convergence and difference. Convergence lies in proportionality, expressed in the command to give full measure (Q 11:85) and the prophetic instruction to pay workers before their sweat dries. The differences are threefold. Equity theory is exchange-based, whereas Islam treats resources as trusts with a social function, so that wealth must not circulate only among the rich (Q 59:7) and basic needs are not wholly contingent on contribution. Equity theory depends on subjective perception, whereas Islam supplies objective standards from revelation. And Islamic justice is reinforced by transcendent motivation: leaders act justly because they are answerable to God and not only to avoid dissatisfaction. Empirical work in Muslim contexts supports the relevance of religiously grounded ethics to how justice shapes job outcomes (Ali & Al-Owaihan, 2008; Khan et al., 2015; Murtaza et al., 2016).

Organizational justice research has developed from distributive justice to procedural justice, interactional justice, and the now widely accepted four-dimensional model: distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational. Colquitt's validation and the meta-analytic evidence indicate that each dimension predicts satisfaction, commitment, trust, and performance. The dimensions map readily onto Qur'anic and prophetic concepts, as summarised in Table 2. Distributive justice parallels ʿadl and qisṭ in allocation; procedural justice parallels amānah, impartial judgment, and consultation (shūrā); interpersonal justice parallels raḥmah and iḥsān; and informational justice parallels truthful testimony and honest speech (Q 5:8; 6:152) (Bies & Moag, 1986; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt, 2001).

**Table 2. Organizational Justice Dimensions and Their Qur'anic–Prophetic Counterparts**

| Dimension | Qur'anic–prophetic concept | Implication in educational institutions |
|---|---|---|
| Distributive | ʿAdl and qisṭ (Q 16:90; 5:8) | Proportional distribution of workload, incentives, scholarships, and facilities |
| Procedural | Amānah and just judgment (Q 4:58); neutrality (Q 5:8); shūrā (Q 42:38) | Transparent, consistent, bias-free recruitment, promotion, and assessment with appeal |
| Interpersonal | Raḥmah and iḥsān (Q 16:90); compassion hadith | Leaders respect the dignity of staff and students |
| Informational | Truthful testimony and speech (Q 5:8; 6:152) | Policies explained honestly, openly, and on time |

A critical point concerns the focus of this literature on perceived justice. Perceptions may be biased by self-interest or incomplete information, and a high level of perceived fairness does not necessarily show that decisions are right. Islam provides an external standard against which complaints can be weighed and requires decision makers to uphold justice even when no one demands it. Conversely, organizational justice research corrects a tendency in religious institutions to assume that good intentions suffice, by showing that fairness must be measured, communicated, and responsive to stakeholders' voices. Procedural voice and transparent explanations are particularly important because they influence reactions to unfavourable outcomes (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2007; Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Social-justice theory enlarges the frame from organizations to society. Rawls grounds justice as fairness in equal basic liberties, fair equality of opportunity, and arrangements that benefit the least advantaged; Sen shifts attention to the capabilities people have to live lives they value; and Fraser identifies three dimensions, namely redistribution, recognition, and representation. Islamic thought has comparable commitments: zakat, ṣadaqah, and waqf as redistributive instruments, the prohibition of usury and hoarding, and the injunction that wealth not remain among the wealthy. The correspondence with Fraser's three dimensions can be

drawn to equitable access and financing, recognition of diverse identities through taʿāruf, and participation through shūrā (Fraser, 2005; Rawls, 1971; Sen, 2009).

For education, these perspectives imply that justice concerns more than access. Young argues that injustice also includes domination and oppression, and capability-oriented analysis of education suggests that quality should be judged by what learners are actually able to do and be. Applying this to Islamic higher education, justice requires affirmative scholarships and financing for disadvantaged students, institutional recognition of diverse backgrounds, and mechanisms through which staff and students participate in decisions. Education is thus both a right and a means by which other rights are realised, and the Islamic notion of education as the ordering of human beings toward their proper ends supplies a moral purpose to these requirements (Robeyns, 2006; Tikly & Barrett, 2011; Young, 1990).

Inclusive education reframes barriers to learning as products of interaction between learners and environments. The Salamanca Statement identifies inclusive schools as the most effective means to combat discriminatory attitudes, and the Index for Inclusion organises inclusion into cultures, policies, and practices. Inclusive pedagogy research argues that the response is to extend what is ordinarily available to all, not to mark some learners as different. From the Qur'anic perspective, inclusion is rooted in human honour (Q 17:70), equal dignity (Q 49:13), and the divine admonition in Q 80:1–10 to the Prophet, who frowned at a blind man who came to learn while he was occupied with Quraysh elites. Exegetes derive from this incident that access to learning must not be reduced because of physical limitation or social rank, and this makes equity, understood as differentiated accommodation, a religious as well as a pedagogical requirement (Booth & Ainscow, 2002; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; UNESCO, 1994).

**An Integrative Model of Islamic Justice in Education Management**

Synthesising the findings, justice in Islamic education management is conceptualised as five interdependent layers. The first is a theocentric foundation, in which justice is a divine command and a trust accounted for before God, sustained by awareness of divine oversight (murāqabah) (Q 4:58). The second is ʿadl and qisṭ, namely proportionality, consistency, and neutrality in outcomes and procedures (Q 5:8). The third is iḥsān and raḥmah, namely empathy, care, and partiality toward the weak (Q 16:90). The fourth is equal dignity and inclusion, meaning no discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, status, gender, or ability (Q 49:13). The fifth is accountability and remedy, through supervision and restoration of rights consistent with

the prohibition of injustice. The model is integrative but selective, in line with calls for critical engagement with Western educational theory from an Islamic epistemological standpoint (Al-Attas, 1980; Sahin, 2018; Shah, 2006).

The model can be applied to five management domains, summarised in Table 3. In human resources, Q 4:58 requires competence- and integrity-based recruitment and promotion with open, documented criteria. In remuneration and workload, equity and fair wages require proportional incentives that also protect basic needs. In academic affairs, objective assessment, explicit rubrics, and appeal mechanisms correspond to the injunction against bias. In student services, inclusion and affirmation require scholarships, accessibility, and counselling. In leadership and culture, raḥmah and shūrā call for leaders who listen, explain decisions, and treat members with respect. Because justice management is a matter of deliberate organizational design, these practices should be embedded in policy and routine procedures (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Cropanzano et al., 2007; Heyneman et al., 2008).

**Table 3. Application of the Islamic Justice Model to Education Management Domains**

| Domain | Scriptural basis | Justice practice | Example indicator |
|---|---|---|---|
| Human resources | Q 4:58; hadith on amānah | Competence-based selection, placement, promotion | Written criteria; selection panel; published results |
| Remuneration and workload | Q 11:85; hadith on wages | Proportional incentives that protect basic needs | Open workload formula; timely payment |
| Academic affairs | Q 5:8 | Objective and consistent assessment | Clear rubrics; appeal mechanism; consistent sanctions |
| Student services | Q 49:13; 80:1–10; 2:286 | Inclusion and affirmation | Affirmative scholarships; accessibility; counselling |
| Leadership and culture | Q 16:90; 3:159; 42:38 | Raḥmah, consultation, accountability | Consultation forums; policy explanations; justice surveys |

To avoid remaining at the normative level, justice must be translated into auditable indicators. Examples include written and public criteria for recruitment, promotion, and incentives; published workload formulas; independent appeal mechanisms for performance and academic assessments; safe complaint channels with whistle-blower protection; open data on access and outcomes by socio-economic status, gender, and disability; consultative forums that include staff and students; and periodic surveys of perceived justice analysed by the four organizational-justice dimensions and followed up. Such indicators connect the Index for Inclusion's emphasis on culture, policy, and practice with measurement traditions in organizational justice, while the quality criteria of qualitative and evaluative inquiry remind institutions to document and disclose evidence (Booth & Ainscow, 2002; Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Colquitt, 2001).

**Case Illustration: Inclusion Services at an Islamic University**

The case institution is a state Islamic university that was transformed from an institute into a university through Presidential Regulation No. 43 of 2021, a change that broadened its academic mandate and diversified its student body, and its governance is regulated by a statute issued through Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation No. 36 of 2021. Such expansion increases demands for distributive justice (access, financing, workload), procedural justice (selection, assessment, service), and inclusion. Research on higher education emphasises that inclusion depends on institutional commitments, staff capacity, and coherent policy, and evidence from Indonesian inclusive schools shows that teachers' beliefs and institutional support shape the realisation of national inclusion policy (Hewett et al., 2017; Moriña, 2017; Sheehy & Budiyanto, 2015).

The clearest practice of equity is the Pusat Studi dan Layanan Difabel (PSLD, Disability Study and Service Centre). According to the guideline issued by Rector's Decree No. 895 of 2022, PSLD was established on 2 January 2022 under the institute for research and community service and refers to Law No. 20 of 2003, Law No. 8 of 2016, Ministry of National Education Regulation No. 70 of 2009, and Ministerial Regulation No. 46 of 2017. The guideline records eight active students with disabilities at the time of drafting, covering visual, hearing, physical, and slow-learning impairments. Services include admission support, orientation and mobility, classroom and assignment assistance, examination assistance, community-service assistance, academic writing guidance, and sign-language interpretation, with two admission routes (general and affirmative). Accessible examination formats and additional time of roughly 30–

40 per cent are provided in specific cases. The studies of disabled students' experiences in higher education indicate that these are precisely the domains in which barriers emerge (Fuller et al., 2004; Hewett et al., 2017; Riddell & Weedon, 2014).

Read through the proposed model, the practice reflects several layers. The graduate competency standard is the same for students with disabilities, while teaching process and materials are modified, which expresses equality of dignity and equity at once and is in line with the Qur'anic recognition of persons with disabilities as full moral agents and with the principle of obligation according to capacity (Q 2:286). Requiring full participation in community service without placement in disability-only communities avoids stereotyping, in the spirit of the rebuke in Q 80:1–10, and the provision of academic and counselling support expresses raḥmah and iḥsān. A written guideline established by rector's decree is a form of institutionalised amānah and procedural clarity, and its publication supports informational justice. These features correspond with inclusive pedagogy's emphasis on enlarging what is available to all (Bazna & Hatab, 2005; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Unterhalter, 2009).

The document analysis also reveals critical points. First, services are on-demand and depend on students disclosing their status, which respects autonomy but risks leaving undisclosed needs unmet, so safe and proactive disclosure channels are needed. Second, note-takers and companions are student volunteers, so continuity depends on goodwill; if services are a right, they require definite budget and personnel. Third, the small number of recorded students calls for periodic open data on access, achievement, and completion so that justice can be evaluated through indicators, not narrative. Fourth, the guideline itself acknowledges that technical guidance is ineffective without an inclusive campus culture. These observations resonate with findings from other Indonesian Islamic universities regarding dependence on support offices, and with international evidence that inclusion in higher education requires systemic and not only individual-level provision (Ainscow, 2020; Moriña, 2017; Ro'fah et al., 2020).

**Implementation Challenges and Implications**

Implementing the model faces several challenges. A gap between norm and practice arises when justice appears in vision statements but not in auditable procedures. Patronage and nepotism can override merit, a risk documented in higher education systems elsewhere. Resource limits constrain redistributive and inclusive measures, which calls for transparent, needs-based prioritisation. Perceptions of fairness may be shaped by interests, so institutions

need objective data and honest communication. Leaders must also balance firmness and compassion, so that mercy does not become permissiveness and firmness does not become authoritarianism; in the model, ʿadl is the minimum and raḥmah the manner. Finally, staff capacity in ethical leadership, disability literacy, and conflict management must be developed. Education policy research warns that justice rhetoric may coexist with systems that continue to reward the advantaged unless structural change accompanies it (Cropanzano et al., 2007; Heyneman et al., 2008; Reay, 2012).

The findings have theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, they suggest that Islamic sources can supply constructs, not only moderators, for organizational justice research, which opens the possibility of developing and validating instruments that measure ʿadl, qisṭ, and raḥmah alongside established dimensions. Practically, leaders of Islamic institutions can use the five-layer model and its indicators for policy design, internal audit, and staff training. The limitations of this study, namely its reliance on documents and a single case, mean that the model should be tested through interviews, observation, and surveys with lecturers, staff, and students, and compared across madrasah, pesantren, and universities, building on empirical work on justice in Islamic higher education (Ibrahim et al., 2022; Khan et al., 2015; Sahin, 2018).

## CONCLUSION

This study concludes that ʿadl, qisṭ, and raḥmah form a unified ethic of justice in the Qur'an and hadith. ʿAdl is proportional placement of rights, qisṭ is its firm and measurable expression, and raḥmah with iḥsān completes it with compassion and benevolence. They correspond to equity, distributive and procedural justice, and interpersonal justice in contemporary theory, while equality of dignity is anchored in Q 49:13. Their distinct contribution is the foundation in amānah and transcendent accountability, which supplies objective standards where theories based on perception are silent. Four pivotal verses and the hadith on just leadership, compassion, and the prohibition of injustice together yield five layers of justice in education management (Colquitt et al., 2001; Espinoza, 2007).

The case of inclusion services demonstrates that the model can illuminate institutional practice: equal competence standards with differentiated provision, written guidelines, and supportive services realise equity and compassion, while reliance on volunteers, on-demand disclosure, and limited data indicate where accountability can be strengthened. Leaders of

Islamic educational institutions are advised to translate justice into published criteria, appeal and complaint mechanisms, structural funding for inclusion, and periodic justice surveys. Future research should develop and test an Islamic justice instrument and examine the model across institutional types through field-based inquiry (Ainscow, 2020; Shah, 2006).

## REFERENCES


### *Primary Sources and Official Documents*

Al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.

Al-Aṣfahānī, al-Rāghib. *al-Mufradāt fī Gharīb al-Qur'ān*.

Al-Ṭabarī. *Jāmiʿ al-Bayān ʿan Ta'wīl Āy al-Qur'ān*.

Ibn Kathīr, Abū al-Fidā' Ismāʿīl. *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-ʿAẓīm*.

Ibn Manẓūr. *Lisān al-ʿArab*.

Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

Shihab, M. Quraish. *Tafsir Al-Mishbah: Pesan, Kesan, dan Keserasian Al-Qur'an*. Jakarta: Lentera Hati.

Shihab, M. Quraish. *Wawasan Al-Qur'an: Tafsir Tematik atas Pelbagai Persoalan Umat*. Bandung: Mizan.

Republik Indonesia. Peraturan Menteri Agama No. 36 Tahun 2021 tentang Statuta UIN Sultan Aji Muhammad Idris Samarinda.

Republik Indonesia. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional No. 70 Tahun 2009 tentang Pendidikan Inklusif bagi Peserta Didik yang Memiliki Kelainan dan Memiliki Potensi Kecerdasan dan/atau Bakat Istimewa.

Republik Indonesia. Peraturan Menteri Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi No. 46 Tahun 2017 tentang Pendidikan Khusus dan Layanan Khusus di Perguruan Tinggi.

Republik Indonesia. Peraturan Presiden No. 43 Tahun 2021 tentang Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Aji Muhammad Idris Samarinda.

Republik Indonesia. Undang-Undang No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.

Republik Indonesia. Undang-Undang No. 8 Tahun 2016 tentang Penyandang Disabilitas.

UIN Sultan Aji Muhammad Idris Samarinda. *Keputusan Rektor Nomor 895 Tahun 2022 tentang Panduan Pedoman Pusat Studi dan Layanan Difabel*. Samarinda: LPPM UINSI, 2022.

### *Secondary Sources*

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic Press.

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6*(1), 7–16.

Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1980). *The concept of education in Islam*. ABIM.

Ali, A. J., & Al-Owaihan, A. (2008). Islamic work ethic: A critical review. *Cross Cultural Management, 15*(1), 5–19.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544–559.

Bazna, M. S., & Hatab, T. A. (2005). Disability in the Qur'an: The Islamic alternative to defining, viewing, and relating to disability. *Journal of Religion, Disability & Health, 9*(1), 5–27.

Beekun, R. I., & Badawi, J. (2005). Balancing ethical responsibility among multiple organizational stakeholders: The Islamic perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 60*(2), 131–145.
Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). JAI Press.
Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40.
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.
Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41*(5), 545–547.
Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 278–321.
Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386–400.
Colquitt, J. A., & Zipay, K. P. (2015). Justice, fairness, and employee reactions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2*, 75–99.
Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425–445.
Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(4), 34–48.
Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 11*, Article 100.
Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 137–149.
Espinoza, O. (2007). Solving the equity–equality conceptual dilemma: A new model for analysis of the educational process. *Educational Research, 49*(4), 343–363.
Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 813–828.
Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 12*(2), 219–245.
Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(1), 115–130.
Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing justice in a globalizing world. *New Left Review, 36*, 69–88.
Fuller, M., Healey, M., Bradley, A., & Hall, T. (2004). Barriers to learning: A systematic study of the experience of disabled students in one university. *Studies in Higher Education, 29*(3), 303–318.
Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), 9–22.
Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*(2), 399–432.
Halstead, J. M. (2004). An Islamic concept of education. *Comparative Education, 40*(4), 517–529.

Hewett, R., Douglas, G., McLinden, M., & Keil, S. (2017). Developing an inclusive learning environment for students with visual impairment in higher education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32*(1), 89–109.
Heyneman, S. P., Anderson, K. H., & Nuraliyeva, N. (2008). The cost of corruption in higher education. *Comparative Education Review, 52*(1), 1–25.
Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D., & Miles, E. W. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(2), 222–234.
Ibrahim, A., Fitria, A., & Majid, M. S. A. (2022). Do distributive and procedural justice matter for job satisfaction? The case of state Islamic higher education institutions in Indonesia. *International Journal of Management in Education, 16*(3).
Khadduri, M. (1984). *The Islamic conception of justice*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Khan, K., Abbas, M., Gul, A., & Raja, U. (2015). Organizational justice and job outcomes: Moderating role of Islamic work ethic. *Journal of Business Ethics, 126*(2), 235–246.
Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27–55). Plenum.
Moriña, A. (2017). Inclusive education in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32*(1), 3–17.
Murtaza, G., Abbas, M., Raja, U., Roques, O., Khalid, A., & Mushtaq, R. (2016). Impact of Islamic work ethics on organizational citizenship behaviors and knowledge-sharing behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(2), 325–333.
North, C. E. (2006). More than words? Delving into the substantive meaning(s) of "social justice" in education. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(4), 507–535.
Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1–13.
Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 42*(5), 533–544.
Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
Reay, D. (2012). What would a socially just education system look like? Saving the minnows from the pool of "sharks." *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(5), 587–599.
Rice, G. (1999). Islamic ethics and the implications for business. *Journal of Business Ethics, 18*(4), 345–358.
Riddell, S., & Weedon, E. (2014). Disabled students in higher education: Discourses of disability and the negotiation of identity. *International Journal of Educational Research, 63*, 38–46.
Ro'fah, Hanjarwati, A., & Suprihatiningrum, J. (2020). Is online learning accessible during COVID-19 pandemic? Voices and experiences of UIN Sunan Kalijaga students with disabilities. *Nadwa: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 14*(1), 1–38. https://doi.org/10.21580/nw.2020.14.1.5672
Robeyns, I. (2006). Three models of education: Rights, capabilities and human capital. *Theory and Research in Education, 4*(1), 69–84.
Sahin, A. (2018). Critical issues in Islamic education studies: Rethinking Islamic and Western liberal secular values of education. *Religions, 9*(11), 335.
Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Shah, S. (2006). Educational leadership: An Islamic perspective. *British Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 363–385.
Sheehy, K., & Budiyanto. (2015). The pedagogic beliefs of Indonesian teachers in inclusive schools. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 62*(5), 469–485.
Shields, C. M. (2004). Dialogic leadership for social justice: Overcoming pathologies of silence. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1), 109–132.
Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221–258.
Tikly, L., & Barrett, A. M. (2011). Social justice, capabilities and the quality of education in low income countries. *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(1), 3–14.
Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(10), 837–851.
UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. UNESCO.
Unterhalter, E. (2009). What is equity in education? Reflections from the capability approach. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 28*(5), 415–424.
Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.