



Beyond Chatbots: Islamic Epistemology, Human Agency, and Ethical Responsibility in AI-Mediated English Language Education

AHMAD HISHAM BIN AZIZAN1*

Akademi Pengajian Islam Kontemporari, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Sarawak, Kampus Samarahan, 94300 Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia
ahmadhisham@uitm.edu.my

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping English language education, but the apparent sophistication of AI-assisted texts complicates judgments about knowledge, learning, and responsibility. Existing scholarship addresses AI literacy, autonomy, and integrity; the more precise unresolved question examined here is how linguistic performance, epistemic justification, and accountable authorship relate when learners accept and communicate AI-generated claims. Drawing on an integrative, non-systematic review of English language education and Islamic epistemology literature, this study uses critical conceptual analysis to compare language-education scholarship with selected Islamic epistemological concepts. Five analytical findings concern fluent yet unjustified claims, task-dependent cognitive delegation, morally significant verification, unequal cultural representation, and the evidential limits of finished assignments. The contribution is an argument that *'ilm*, *adab*, *amanah*, and *sidq* deepen the normative interpretation of verification and authorship without replacing established AI ethics. The conclusions are conceptual, not empirically validated.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, Generative AI, English language education, Islamic epistemology, Ethical responsibility

1. Introduction

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly changed contemporary English language education. Large language models and AI-supported applications increasingly support language production, automated writing feedback, vocabulary development, conversational practice, translation, and the preparation of instructional materials. Unlike earlier forms of computer-assisted language learning, which often relied on rigid drills and programmed instruction in early computer-assisted systems (Habib et al., 2026), generative AI lets learners engage in open-ended dialogue, request explanations, revise written texts, and explore linguistic alternatives through natural-language interaction. These capabilities have expanded opportunities for individualized learning while simultaneously raising fundamental questions about the changing relationship between learners, teachers, knowledge, and intelligent technologies (Koç & Savaş, 2025; Lee et al., 2025; Qiao et al., 2025). Recent research has explored how generative AI can help students build language skills, receive feedback, stay engaged, and access more language-learning resources (Kim et al., 2024). However, as AI becomes more common in English education, new challenges emerge beyond its effectiveness. AI-generated language might be correct and persuasive, but it can still be factually wrong, culturally insensitive, or ethically questionable (Creely, 2024). Furthermore, when students rely more on automated tools to generate ideas, build arguments, and edit their writing, it can affect how they think for themselves, claim ownership of their work, and judge what counts as knowledge (Duc, 2026; Zhai et al., 2024). These issues show that the value of generative AI in education cannot be assessed solely by its effectiveness in teaching language or its efficiency. Learning English is not just about grammar and speaking skills. Language teaching is widely argued to aim at intercultural communicative competence rather than linguistic competence alone (Byram & Wagner, 2018; Fang & Baker, 2017). It also means learning to interpret information, think critically, understand other cultures, and take part responsibly in communities that create knowledge. Thus, the main question is not just whether generative AI helps students learn English, but how using it affects students' sense of responsibility when learning and communicating in English. This question is especially important in schools and universities that follow Islamic intellectual and moral traditions. In Islamic education, knowledge is closely linked to truth, responsibility, ethics, and the purpose of life. The Qur'an often stresses deep thinking, seeking knowledge, and carefully verifying information. For example, it tells people to verify information before acting (49:6), warns against following things without knowledge (17:36), and encourages learning and inquiry (96:1–5). These teachings provide a strong basis for thinking about how knowledge relates to moral responsibility. These teachings do not give specific instructions on using modern AI technologies. Still, they set important standards for judging how knowledge is created, shared, accepted, and used. As a result, Islamic educational ideas offer a useful framework for thinking about the deeper questions and ethical issues that come with using AI in English education.

1.1 Problem statement

One main issue with using AI in English language education is that students may confuse strong language skills with reliable knowledge, a tendency consistent with research showing that processing fluency makes messages seem more convincing and more likely to be true (Hoeken et al., 2022). Generative AI can create clear explanations, convincing



arguments, and polished writing (Pervez et al., 2026). Still, just because the language sounds good does not mean the information is accurate, well-supported, or ethically sound (Lozić & Štular, 2023). If students treat AI-generated content as fact rather than something to question, it becomes harder to distinguish between producing language and justifying knowledge. Another concern is that AI might shift responsibility for thinking. AI tools can help students build arguments, check grammar, and improve their writing. However, if students rely too much on these tools, they might stop thinking for themselves and let the AI do most of the work (Zhai et al., 2024). The real challenge is figuring out how to use AI in ways that help students think independently instead of making them dependent on technology. A third issue is the ethical side of language education. Research on AI-supported English teaching often evaluates it by how well it improves skills, saves time, keeps students interested, or makes learning more accessible (Kartal & Yeşilyurt, 2024; Yang & Kyun, 2022). While these are important, they do not address the ethical side of communication, such as being truthful, respectful, fair, and accountable, or considering the impact of what we say. This matters especially in schools, where learning a language also means building character and acting responsibly. Within this framework, responsible AI use in English education therefore requires attention to the moral dispositions that shape how learners judge, verify, and attribute the knowledge they produce with these tools.

1.2 Research gap

This study addresses an explanatory gap, not just a disciplinary one. Research on generative AI in language education already covers writing quality, feedback, learner autonomy, and critical thinking (Arif & Naeem, 2025). Studies on AI literacy also discuss verification, critical evaluation of AI systems, and ethical responsibility (Allen & Kendeou, 2023). Thus, it is not accurate to say ethical concerns are missing, or that simply using Islamic terms makes the work original. The key question is how educators should distinguish fluent language from justified acceptance of claims, and how responsibility is shared when students use AI for different parts of reasoning and writing. Three main limits shape this inquiry. First, an AI-assisted text may be more accurate or polished, but that does not mean the student has lasting language skills or real understanding unless evidence shows otherwise. Second, discussions of learner agency often fail to clarify which tasks matter most for learning, since assignment formats and students' regulative skills mediate the effects of AI tools (Li, 2026). For example, correcting a sentence, suggesting counterarguments, and choosing evidence each relate differently to learning goals. Third, simply disclosing AI use does not show whether the student can understand, check, and defend their work (Minh, 2026; Pérez-Pérez et al., 2026). Disclosure itself can also shape how teachers judge the writing (Tan et al., 2025). These points do not claim that no one has discussed these issues before; rather, they highlight relationships that the literature review here needs to compare in more detail. Islamic epistemology is important because it treats accepting and sharing knowledge as meaningful moral actions (Ali et al., 2025). In early Muslim intellectual traditions, *ilm* is understood as justified knowledge, described as firm true belief supported by evidence (Valeh, 2020), and *amanah* and *sidq* are framed as responsibility for entrusted knowledge and as truthfulness (Setiawan & Cholili, 2023); *adab* is treated as a context-sensitive ethical disposition rather than a rule set (Kalia & Jackson, 2025). These values go beyond source verification: they explain why checking, giving credit, and making responsible judgments remain necessary, even if a machine writes the text. Therefore, if a student says they used AI but cannot defend their argument, the issue is who is truly responsible for the work, not just whether they followed disclosure rules. The study connects these normative insights to concrete English-language practices. It links these ethical ideas to argumentative writing, feedback, intercultural representation, and assessment. It clearly separates facts from interpretations. The study is original because it explains how language skill, justified belief, and ethical responsibility connect, rather than proposing a new framework. The gap discussed here remains tentative because the review is integrative and non-systematic: it combines insights from different fields rather than aiming to cover every published source, so its coverage is purposive rather than exhaustive (Roman et al., 2023).

2. Literature review

2.1 Artificial intelligence and evidence of language learning

Generative AI can offer helpful explanations, examples, revisions, and simulated conversations, broadening how students can practice language (Koç & Savaş, 2025; Lee et al., 2025). Still, a key difference exists between improving a piece of writing and improving a learner's skills. An AI-polished essay shows what is possible in certain situations, but it does not always mean the student can use the language independently or explain their ideas on their own (Minh, 2026). On the other hand, AI-generated feedback can help students revise their writing (Meyer et al., 2023). As a result, research does not fully support either strong enthusiasm or outright rejection (Lo et al., 2024; Smerdon, 2024). The value of AI depends on how tasks are designed, what learning evidence is collected, and what is assessed. This relates to Hymes's notion of communicative competence, where appropriate language use can take precedence over grammatical correctness (Subandowo, 2022).



2.2 AI literacy, critical literacy, and epistemic authority

AI literacy already includes critical evaluation and ethical responsibility, as UNESCO's human-centered competency guidance shows (UNESCO, 2024). This argument does not dispute that progress. Instead, it asks a specific question: why should a fluent, machine-generated statement count as knowledge? Critical literacy helps us see whose views are included, what assumptions are hidden, and how language can influence power (Vidotto, 2026). Epistemic evaluation examines evidence, sources, uncertainty, and why a claim deserves acceptance. A model's confident tone is just a rhetorical feature, not proof of truth (Küçükuncular, 2026). Therefore, students need to distinguish between judging English expression and judging the claim itself. These skills are related but not interchangeable.

2.3 Islamic epistemology in critical comparison with educational ethics

Islamic epistemology includes a range of theological, philosophical, and educational views on revelation, reason, testimony, and experience. It is not a single, unified theory (Doko & Turner, 2023; Zacky & Moniruzzaman, 2023). Qur'an 49:6 addresses verification in a specific context, and 17:36 connects knowledge claims to accountability. Applying these teachings to AI outputs is an interpretive educational approach, not a direct rule for technology. Certain concepts highlight different parts of the issue: *ilm* considers what makes something acceptable; *adab* looks at how learners should interact with sources and disagreements; *amanah* focuses on who is responsible for work presented as original; and *sidq* asks whether the communication honestly reflects both claims and contributions. Academic ethics also values verification and honesty (Resnik et al., 2017). The main difference lies in the basis for these values and how knowing relates to moral duty, not in exclusive ownership of the values themselves. A deeper study of classical tafsir and Islamic educational sources is needed before making stronger historical or doctrinal statements.

2.4 Human agency, cognitive delegation, and authorship

Agency in educational technology concerns learners' capacity to act on their own learning, which takes multiple forms and levels, with control over learning and decisions as one dimension (Brod et al., 2023). The main issue is not how often students use AI, but which cognitive tasks it performs on their behalf and whether they can judge its value. When AI feedback encourages revision, it can improve revision performance (Meyer et al., 2023). On the other hand, if AI generates entire arguments, it might prevent students from building the skills the assignment is meant to teach (Zhai et al., 2024). Still, these results do not occur simply because students use the tool. Such outcomes may also depend on factors such as the learner's experience, the task type, the clarity of the process, and how assessments are designed. *Amanah* shifts authorship to responsibility for what is submitted (Ritonga et al., 2025), rather than simply acknowledging that help was used (Eaton, 2023). Disclosing AI use matters when rules require it, but disclosure alone does not prove understanding or justify accepting the work (Herman & Lara-Steidel, 2025).

2.5 Unresolved debates and analytical direction

Four related debates shape this study: whether improved AI-assisted products lead to better learning, how persuasive outputs can seem authoritative, what religious perspectives add to ethical AI literacy, and which intellectual tasks should remain under learners' control. Instead of proposing a new instructional model, the study compares these ideas conceptually. It is important not to treat fluency, justification, and accountability as the same thing. Fluency concerns how something is expressed, justification concerns the reasons behind claims, and accountability concerns the responsibilities of those who communicate.

3. Research Questions

The following overarching research question guides the study:

How can Islamic epistemology contribute to a critical understanding of knowledge reliability, human agency, and ethical responsibility in AI-mediated English language education? Its principal contribution is an interdisciplinary epistemological analysis, not a new instructional model or an empirically validated educational intervention. The study therefore reserves judgment on whether these distinctions will hold under real assessment conditions, and it treats the conceptual map offered here as a starting point for that work rather than as a finished account of AI-mediated learning.

4. Significance of Study

This study has three objectives:

To critically examine the distinction between AI-generated linguistic performance, epistemic reliability, and independent learner competence in English language education. To analyze how selected Islamic epistemological principles illuminate questions of knowledge justification, human agency, and ethical accountability in AI-mediated learning. To critically evaluate the implications of these relationships for learner authorship, teacher judgment, assessment, and responsible communication.



5. Research Methodology

Research design

This study uses a qualitative, conceptual research design grounded in an integrative literature review and critical, interdisciplinary analysis. An integrative review suits research questions that cross disciplines and require synthesis of empirical findings, theoretical arguments, policy perspectives, and philosophical scholarship (Torraco, 2016). The review follows established practice for synthesizing heterogeneous literatures, in which the review does not weight studies solely by design strength but reads them for their conceptual contribution and for the assumptions they carry about learners, authority, and responsibility (Fu & Weng, 2024). This study differs from a typical systematic review, which follows a structured, pre-specified protocol to review and synthesize prior literature on a defined topic (Kraus et al., 2020). By contrast, this study explores the conceptual links between generative AI, English language education, Islamic epistemology, and ethical responsibility. The focus is on interpretation and analysis, not statistics. Therefore, the study does not measure intervention effects, evaluate a specific AI tool, or try to show a direct link between Islamic educational principles and language-learning results. The analysis uses three main approaches. First, conceptual analysis clarifies the meanings and connections among key ideas such as knowledge, epistemic authority, human agency, and ethical accountability. Second, comparative analysis looks at similarities and differences between current AI education research and certain Islamic epistemological views. Third, thematic synthesis groups the arguments around common educational challenges. This study aims to offer a critical, evidence-based interpretation, not to create a new educational framework.

Literature identification and selection

This manuscript draws on four main areas: generative AI in English language education; AI literacy and educational ethics; Islamic epistemology and educational philosophy; and Islamic ethical views on technology. Sources include peer-reviewed articles, conceptual studies, literature reviews, international policy documents, Qur'anic passages, and scholarship on Islamic intellectual traditions. The review mainly covers research from 2020 to 2026 to reflect the fast changes in generative AI and its use in education. Older works are included if they offer important conceptual or methodological foundations. We identified sources by searching Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using combinations of terms such as "generative AI," "large language models," "English language education," "AI literacy," and "Islamic education," and supplemented these searches with backward citation chaining from included works. We ran all database searches in [month year], and we screened [N] records by title and abstract and included [N] sources after full-text review (Gonot-Schoupsky et al., 2021; Sukhera, 2022). We group the literature by relevance to the research question, not just by publication date. We focus on sources that discuss AI-mediated language production, language-learning effectiveness, epistemic reliability, learner agency, educational ethics, source verification, Islamic views on knowledge, and moral responsibility. In practice, we screened initial records by title and abstract against these focal topics and read sources that passed this stage in full to confirm their relevance before inclusion. Sources that focus only on technical AI performance or unrelated automation are less relevant unless they help explain a key issue in language education. We treat primary Islamic sources separately from empirical educational research. When using Qur'anic passages, we focus on their ethical and epistemological meanings, recognizing that applying them today requires thoughtful interpretation rather than direct comparison with modern technology.

Source appraisal

Four main factors guide the literature appraisal: relevance, credibility, analytical depth, and contextual applicability. Relevance looks at whether a source directly answers the research questions or adds important ideas. Credibility assesses whether the source is published in a reputable venue, uses clear methods, provides strong evidence, and reports accurately. Analytical depth asks whether the source goes beyond description and instead critically examines educational or knowledge-related issues. Contextual applicability considers whether findings or arguments from one educational setting can reasonably inform English language education in Muslim learning environments. These factors were applied together: sources were retained only if they addressed at least one focal topic (relevance), appeared in peer-reviewed journals, edited volumes, or documents from recognized international and religious-scholarly bodies (credibility), offered explicit analysis rather than product description (analytical depth), and either reported findings from language education settings or developed arguments that could reasonably transfer to Muslim learning contexts (contextual applicability). When reviewing empirical studies, we focus on the research design, participants, educational context, and limitations. Conceptual studies are judged by the clarity, consistency, and defensibility of their arguments. We view policy publications as guidance from institutions or authorities, not as direct evidence of an educational approach's effectiveness. Islamic primary and classical sources require a different kind of appraisal that considers the text's context, established interpretations, and differences between intellectual traditions. This approach helps prevent mixing up empirical findings, philosophical arguments, and religious teachings as if they were the same kind of evidence.



Analytical synthesis

This synthesis reviews the literature by making a series of conceptual comparisons. First, it separates claims about generative AI's educational benefits from those about knowledge reliability and intellectual development. This matters because better language production does not always mean better reasoning or judgment; readily available AI-generated text may lead learners to bypass drafting and engage less critically with language (Strobl et al., 2024). Next, it compares current ideas about AI literacy, critical literacy, and human agency with selected Islamic views on knowledge, responsibility, and ethics. It then highlights where these perspectives agree or differ. The study examines how technology relates to independent judgment, how language skills connect to justified knowledge, and how effective communication relates to moral responsibility. Finally, it considers what these relationships mean for English language teaching, assessment, teacher roles, and institutional management of AI. The analysis separates arguments into three levels: claims supported by educational literature, interpretations grounded in Islamic epistemology, and teaching implications drawn from comparing the two. This matters because an idea can be conceptually plausible yet remain empirically untested (Muñoz & Decorte, 2026).

6. Findings

This section presents five conceptual findings, each following the same structure: the educational problem, relevant scholarship, Islamic epistemological interpretation, and the resulting analytical insight. These findings are not based on new empirical data. Rather, they come from a critical comparison of educational research, established theories, and selected Islamic intellectual traditions. The analysis is guided by a key distinction: linguistic fluency concerns how well something is expressed, epistemic justification concerns the reasons for accepting a claim, and ethical accountability concerns responsibility for decisions made when using or sharing that claim. These areas are connected, but one does not automatically lead to the others.

6.1 Language fluency does not guarantee that the information shared is reliable.

In education, generative AI can write grammatically correct, clear, and convincing English even when the information is wrong, poorly supported, or misleading (Vidotto, 2026). This makes it hard for English language educators because sophisticated-sounding writing can seem trustworthy even when its content is unreliable (Palese, 2026). This issue matters especially in academic writing, where teachers often judge both from the same essay, as widely used scoring rubrics rate content, language use, and other aspects together (Jian-hua et al., 2023). A student might write a convincing essay with weak arguments or incorrect references, and strong English could hide a lack of solid evidence. Research on communication shows that using language well involves more than correct grammar. Communicative competence models (Kowal, 2016; Mao, 2021) explain that language skills also include communicating effectively in different situations. This illustrates why fluent speaking or writing does not always mean the message succeeds. Generative AI complicates this issue because a text that sounds sophisticated may not reflect the writer's strong language or thinking skills (Walczak & Cellary, 2023). Research on epistemic beliefs, such as Hofer & Pintrich's model (as cited in Schiefer et al., 2022), shows that justification for knowing is one dimension of epistemic beliefs, alongside certainty, simplicity, and the source of knowledge (Baytelman et al., 2020). For AI-generated writing, this means that checking whether a response makes sense is not the same as checking whether evidence supports it. These theories help us understand the difference, but they do not show how often students confuse fluent AI writing with reliable information. This question requires further research. From an Islamic perspective, Qur'an 49:6 teaches the importance of checking important information. Classical scholars like al-Tabari and Ibn Kathir discuss this verse in terms of ensuring reports are reliable and considering the consequences of acting on unchecked information (Thottupurath, 2025). This idea parallels how we use generative AI, though the verse is not directly about technology. The main point is our responsibility to check information before we believe it or use it. Qur'an 17:36 also links how we handle knowledge to accountability for our actions (Zulfikar, 2019). It is important to interpret this verse within its religious context, not just as advice to fact-check AI. Al-Ghazali adds another view, saying in *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din* that knowledge is inseparably linked with ethics and virtue, and its ultimate aim is the purification of the soul (Suddahazai, 2023). This challenges the idea that convincing writing always justifies knowledge. The main insight is that the problem is not just that AI can make up false information. When AI writes fluently, it can sound trustworthy, and students might believe it without enough reason (Walczak & Cellary, 2023). The Islamic concept of *amanah* (trust) adds that checking claims is not just about avoiding mistakes in school, but also about being responsible to others who might be affected (Zubair et al., 2019). So, it is important to judge AI-generated English for trustworthiness, separate from how good the language sounds. Teachers should look at language quality and evidence separately. This is a logical suggestion, but this study does not prove it. Because this study relies on conceptual comparison rather than empirical data, classroom settings should test its recommendations for separating linguistic quality from epistemic justification before adopting them as assessment policy.



6.2 What matters most is the kind of cognitive task students delegate, not just whether they use AI.

Some worry that generative AI could make students too dependent, weaken their critical thinking, or reduce their intellectual autonomy. However, not all uses of AI are the same. For example, using AI to fix punctuation differs greatly from asking it to write an argument, choose evidence, interpret a text, or create an entire essay. The key question is not just whether students use AI, but which tasks they hand over and whether they still take responsibility for judging the results. Research on learner autonomy shows that students need to take responsibility for their own learning decisions (Al-Khasawneh et al., 2024). Studies on self-regulated learning also point out that planning, monitoring, evaluating, and adjusting strategies are key parts of learning independently (Fan et al., 2024). These ideas suggest that autonomy does not mean students must always work alone. Support from teachers, dictionaries, peers, or digital tools can help, as long as students stay in control of their learning. Generative AI complicates things because it can now handle higher-level tasks that were previously hard to delegate: whereas many earlier digital tools were primarily used for storing or retrieving information, generative AI can also process and generate information, so students can now offload ideation, synthesis, drafting, and even first-order reasoning to AI (Duc, 2026). For example, if AI gives grammar feedback, students can spend more time on building arguments. However, if students let AI choose and judge evidence, they might fail to develop the reasoning skills that writing assignments are meant to build. Therefore, whether AI assistance is useful or harmful depends on how the delegated task fits with the learning goal. Al-Zarnuji's Ta'lim al-Muta'allim addresses the ethical and practical sides of learning, including having the right intention, working hard, choosing good teachers, and behaving properly while gaining knowledge (Hulawa, 2019). Although these ideas come from a different time, they show that learning is more than producing a finished product. It requires students to engage in the process actively. Ibn Khaldun's Muqaddimah adds that intellectual skills develop gradually and that teaching should progress in steps (Demir, 2017). While Al-Zarnuji focuses on the learner's ethics and attitude, Ibn Khaldun looks at the bigger picture of teaching and learning. Both agree that students need to take an active role in building their knowledge and abilities.

AI assistance can support learning when students remain actively engaged in the cognitive work behind their output; when it replaces that engagement, its educational value may diminish (Duc, 2026; Minh, 2026). If a student uses AI to suggest different ways to phrase something and then chooses carefully, they are still making important decisions. However, if a student accepts an AI-generated argument without understanding or checking it, they miss key parts of learning. Islamic educational ideas clarify this by viewing active thinking as part of both ethical learning and growth (Saputra et al., 2026). Therefore, we should look at what kind of work is being delegated, how much, and how it connects to learning goals, not just whether AI is used.

6.3 In Islamic epistemology, judging knowledge is seen as morally important.

The educational challenge is that while current AI literacy highlights the need for verification, transparency, academic integrity, and human oversight (Chiu & Rospigliosi, 2026; Crompton et al., 2026), simply following these rules does not prove that students truly understand what they are sharing. For example, a student might say they used generative AI but still submit an argument they have not checked themselves. Likewise, a learner could follow AI policies but not be able to explain their own reasoning. This shows a difference between following procedures and taking responsibility for understanding the knowledge (Minh, 2026). Current scholarship and guidance on AI skills, such as UNESCO's 2024 AI Competency Framework for Students, already include ethics and human responsibility (Dong et al., 2025). Critical literacy also encourages us to question the assumptions, interests, and power behind texts (McNicol, 2016). So, Islamic epistemology is not suggesting that educational research ignores ethics or critical thinking. Instead, the main question is more specific: what does it mean to be a responsible author if the learner did not create all the content themselves? Academic integrity rules can require students to disclose AI use and define what help is allowed. Still, disclosure and justification are not the same. Disclosure shows how AI was used, while justification is about whether the student can support and defend the claims in their work. A student might meet one requirement but not the other. From an Islamic perspective, *amanah* helps us see responsibility as more than following disclosure rules. *Amanah*, being trustworthy with what is entrusted to a person, highlights that students are responsible for the work they submit as their own. *Sidq* adds the need for truthfulness. In the context of AI in education, this means students should be honest about their use of technology and avoid exaggerating their understanding, evidence, or contribution. *Adab* stresses careful study, respect for expertise, and humility about one's knowledge. At the same time, *'ilm* focuses on real knowledge, not just plausible-sounding statements. While these ideas are connected, they are not the same. *'Ilm* is about knowledge (Sulaiman, 2022), *adab* about proper behavior (Ismail & Matthews, 2024), *amanah* about responsibility, and *sidq* about truthfulness (Setiawan & Cholili, 2023); these are working distinctions rather than exhaustive definitions, since their meanings overlap within the Islamic tradition. Each concept raises different questions about how we use AI to help us communicate. The main insight is that Islamic epistemology does not add new practical duties to current AI ethics already recognizes: judging knowledge, being truthful, and taking responsibility for authorship (Ali et al., 2025). For instance, *amanah* does not replace the duty to disclose AI use but deepens it (Ritonga et al., 2025): beyond disclosure, students must understand, explain, and defend their work (Eaton, 2023). This suggests that ethical authorship is not just about disclosing where a



text comes from, but also about the person's responsibility for what they share. This is a value-based argument, and accepting it does not mean that teaching *amanah* will automatically improve academic integrity without more research.

6.4 AI-generated English can reinforce existing imbalances in language and cultural authority.

The challenge in English language education goes beyond learning grammar. It also involves understanding cultural meanings, social identities, and different views of what constitutes appropriate communication. Generative AI can create fluent English explanations of religious practices, historical traditions, and cultural customs (S, 2025). However, fluency does not mean accuracy or fairness (Bauer et al., 2025). This issue matters especially when learners treat AI-generated descriptions as neutral or reliably accurate, since students' trust in generative AI strongly shapes how much they rely on it (Wang et al., 2025). Critical literacy research shows that texts are not always neutral reflections of reality (Kaya et al., 2022). Language can reveal certain assumptions, institutional interests, and social power imbalances. Studies on linguistic inequality and English language education highlight the need to look at which language practices are seen as legitimate and which cultural views are favored (Lin & Zhang, 2021; Reagan, 2016). These ideas help us think critically about AI-generated cultural content. This study does not argue that Islamic epistemology is the only way to spot cultural bias. Instead, it asks how learners should act responsibly when sharing interpretations of traditions or communities with debated meanings. In Islamic educational scholarship, *adab* is conceptualized as an integrative moral–epistemic framework whose dimensions include the ethics of inquiry, listening, referencing, and knowledge transmission (Silaturahim et al., 2025), and it can serve here as an ethical framework for representing knowledge and navigating intellectual disagreements. In AI communication, it encourages careful interpretation, recognition of scholarly differences, and avoidance of broad generalizations. As a hypothetical illustration, an AI-generated explanation of an Islamic practice (Buzelin et al., 2026; Tsuria & Tsuria, 2024) might present one view as universally accepted, even though Islamic scholars and traditions differ. Responsible communication means learners should distinguish between a simple explanation and one that provides sufficient context. No single interpretation of a contested question should be seen as the only Islamic view, since Islamic scholarship includes many legal, theological, educational, and interpretive differences (Karimullah, 2023), even where scholars agree on fundamental matters (Zulkifli, 2023). The main issue with AI-generated cultural content is how language authority relates to the legitimacy of interpretation. A fluent explanation can seem culturally reliable but may hide its own limits (Palese, 2026). Responsible use of AI in English communication means paying attention to whose knowledge is shown, which views are favored, and whether important differences are recognized. In teaching, this means comparing AI-generated cultural descriptions with trustworthy and relevant sources. Whether these activities work well is something future research should explore.

6.5 The final language product might not clearly show whether a student has developed their skills independently.

Educational problem. Language assessments often use written or spoken work to judge student competence. Generative AI makes this harder because a finished assignment may show heavy technological support (Yan et al., 2024). For example, an essay could use advanced vocabulary, have a clear structure, and use correct grammar, but that does not prove the student can create or explain these features on their own. The issue is not always dishonesty. Instead, it is about whether the observed performance supports an inference about the student's abilities (Goldhammer et al., 2021). Relevant scholarship and analytical comparison. Traditional language assessment methods separate what we can observe from the skills being measured. Norris's (2018, as cited in Liao et al., 2023) work on communicative language ability is a key reference for this idea. When AI is involved, technological help changes how students produce their work. If the goal is to assess a student's independent argument-building skills, heavy use of AI-generated arguments can weaken evidence of that skill (Chan & Hu, 2023). On the other hand, if the goal is to see how well a student can review and improve AI-assisted writing, then allowing AI use may be appropriate. This is proposed here as a task–goal alignment principle rather than an evidenced conclusion. For example, one study suggests assessing students on their ability to use GenAI to write and improve academic papers, while cautioning that poorly designed tasks may not reflect students' actual effort and skills (Chan & Lee, 2023). So, assessment validity depends on how well the task, allowed help, and learning goals fit together. Islamic epistemological interpretation. *Amanah* matters here because assessment involves trust and responsibility for students, teachers, and institutions. Students should honestly show what they have done. Teachers need to judge learning fairly and interpret results correctly. Institutions must set clear expectations and avoid making false claims about what students can do. *Sidq* also stresses the need to be truthful and not conceal facts (Setiawan & Cholili, 2023; Shuhari et al., 2019), which supports—normatively, as an ethical application rather than a prescribed assessment rule—clearly showing what a student did alone and what they did with help. These ideas do not provide a specific assessment method, but they do offer ethical reasons to care about assessment validity and honest reporting. The resulting conceptual insight is that an AI-assisted product, by itself, is not evidence of independently acquired competence (Oliveira et al., 2025; Yao, 2026). This does not mean that all assisted work is useless in education. Instead, it means we need to be clear about what we want to measure. The main point is that assessment validity depends on whether the evidence supports the claims we want to make about a student's skills, especially when AI is involved. Keeping records of the process, asking for oral explanations, and having students demonstrate their skills independently might help. Still,



these solutions also raise questions about workload, resource intensity, and equitable access (Nicola-Richmond et al., 2025; Perkins et al., 2025; Roe et al., 2025). Further research is needed to determine whether these methods work. Until such evidence is available, institutions should treat any claim that AI-assisted assessment reliably measures independent competence as provisional, and should document clearly which parts of a student's work were produced without assistance.

Integrated synthesis of the findings

Analytical finding	Basis of the argument	Islamic epistemological contribution	Nature of conclusion
Linguistic plausibility does not establish epistemic authority	Communicative competence and epistemic cognition	Knowledge evaluation as accountable conduct	Conceptual and normative
The type of cognitive delegation matters	Learner autonomy and self-regulated learning	Disciplined intellectual participation	Conceptual
Ethical authorship exceeds procedural disclosure.	AI literacy and academic integrity	<i>Amanah</i> , <i>sidq</i> , <i>adab</i> , and <i>'ilm</i> clarify responsibility	Normative
Cultural fluency does not guarantee interpretive legitimacy	Critical literacy and cultural representation	Responsible representation and intellectual humility	Conceptual and normative
Final texts may not establish independent competence	Language assessment validity	Truthful representation and entrusted responsibility	Methodological inference

The findings do not show a direct cause-and-effect link between Islamic epistemological instruction and better educational results. Instead, they show how certain Islamic concepts can help interpret issues already evident in today's AI-based language education. The main point is that linguistic production, epistemic justification, and ethical accountability are connected but separate parts of educational practice.

7. Discussion

The epistemological problem of AI-generated fluency

The main issue is that generative AI changes how we link language production to the intellectual skills we usually expect. While theories of communicative competence show that language use involves more than just grammar (Subandowo, 2022), generative AI adds a new challenge. It can produce sophisticated language whose fluency does not guarantee the knowledge, reasoning, or language skills the text appears to reflect (Duc, 2026; Poibeau, 2025; Tenakwah et al., 2023). This challenge means we need to ask three separate questions: Is the language appropriate? Does good evidence support its claims? Can the learner clearly explain and defend what it says? These are different issues. A text might use advanced grammar but still be unreliable. It could present accurate facts that the learner does not fully understand. Alternatively, it might show strong independent thinking, even if AI helped create it. These differences matter in education because they can lead to wrong assumptions about what learners know and can do. This analysis adds to current debates about AI literacy by showing that critical evaluation is not just about spotting mistakes. It also examines how evidence, justification, understanding, and responsibility connect. Islamic epistemology offers a framework for understanding this relationship. Some Qur'anic and classical traditions stress that handling knowledge comes with responsibilities beyond making statements (Ali et al., 2025). This view does not turn religious teachings into technical rules for judging AI. Ali et al. argue that trusteeship ethics provides spiritual accountability and ethical intentionality, filling gaps in existing AI ethics frameworks (Ali et al., 2025). This analysis advances a narrower claim: it does not hold existing AI ethics to be deficient, but shows why accepting and sharing knowledge claims matters morally.

The redistribution of intellectual responsibility

Another important question is how generative AI changes the way learners, teachers, texts, and technology share intellectual tasks. Educational help has always involved sharing thinking across different sources. Students learn from teachers, textbooks, dictionaries, peers, and other resources (Blas, 2022). So, using outside help does not automatically take away a student's agency. Generative AI, however, lets students hand off more tasks to technology. It can create arguments, suggest evidence, organize ideas, and draw conclusions that students would normally do themselves (Duc, 2026). The impact on learning depends on what kind of work is delegated. If AI handles routine tasks while still letting students think deeply, it can support their independence. However, if AI takes over the core thinking required for learning, it can diminish the value of the student's work (Fan et al., 2024). This difference also makes authorship harder to define. In AI-supported education, authorship is not just about whether a person or a machine wrote the text. Students might help by choosing, questioning, editing, or judging what AI creates. Still, not all input carries the same level of responsibility.



For example, a student who carefully reviews an AI-generated argument shows more agency than one who copies it without understanding. The idea of *amanah* helps explain this issue. Responsibility does not stop when a student says they used AI. It also includes how the student accepts, changes, and shares what the AI produced. Islamic scholarship treats *amanah* this way: *al-amanah* is paired with *al-mas'uliyah* as accountability for how what is entrusted is handled, not merely held (Shuhari et al., 2019), and exegetes read knowledge itself as a trust whose bearer answers for how it is used and disseminated (Ritonga et al., 2025). This view reframes responsible authorship as a question of how entrusted knowledge is handled, rather than simply whether technology was used. It also means teachers have duties too. Teachers need to clarify what kinds of help are allowed, what skills are being tested, and what evidence is needed to assess learning. So, sharing intellectual tasks in new ways does not remove human responsibility. Instead, it makes it harder to decide and explain who is responsible for what.

The distinctive contribution and limits of Islamic epistemology

The third issue looks at what Islamic epistemology can add to AI-mediated English education. This study does not claim that Islamic traditions alone value truthfulness, verification, accountability, or intellectual discipline. These ideas are already important in educational philosophy, academic integrity, critical literacy, and human-centered AI ethics (Bittle & El-Gayar, 2025; Chang-Bacon, 2018; Fu & Weng, 2024; Pritchard, 2023). So, it is hard to argue that current educational thinking lacks these values. Some scholars go further, arguing that Islamic ethics supplies distinct normative grounding, including spiritual accountability and ethical intentionality, that procedural secular approaches lack (Ali et al., 2025). This article takes a more limited position: it does not claim that the broader literature identifies no additional normative content, but that its own contribution is interpretive, in how responsibility is understood. In some Islamic intellectual traditions, knowledge is linked to broader ideas about ethics, human duty, and the goals of learning. *Ilm* refers to knowledge, *adab* to proper intellectual and ethical behavior, *amanah* to responsibility, and *sidq* to truthfulness (Khasani, 2026). These ideas help us distinguish between simply following educational rules and taking on the deeper ethical responsibilities that come with decisions about knowledge. For example, academic integrity policies might ask students to say if they used AI. This is important for transparency and fairness (Pérez-Pérez et al., 2026). However, *amanah* asks another question: Has the student carefully considered and accepted the work they submit? Similarly, *sidq* is not just about whether AI was used, but also about whether the student honestly shows the strength of their evidence, what they do not understand, and what they have contributed.

So, the main contribution is not adding new practical rules for how AI should be used. Instead, it offers a distinct account of why verification and accountability matter (Ali et al., 2025), linking how we judge knowledge to the moral responsibility of the person communicating it. It is also important to remember that Islamic epistemology is not just one way of thinking. Al-Ghazali, al-Zarnuji, and Ibn Khaldun each discuss knowledge and education for different reasons and in different settings. Al-Ghazali connects knowledge to ethics and spiritual growth (Firdasari & Bakar, 2025). Al-Zarnuji focuses on how students should behave and learn with discipline (Mariati & Walidin, 2025). Ibn Khaldun examines how people learn and develop intellectually, as well as the conditions that help them gain knowledge (Bolatito, 2025). Their ideas can inform education today, but they should not be treated as a single theory or as direct models for using AI in teaching. Moreover, the present study does not establish that religiously grounded educational reasoning necessarily produces better results. It also does not show that religious ways of thinking about education always yield better results than secular or other religious approaches. Proving that would need careful comparison and research. So, in this paper, the value of Islamic epistemology is in how it helps us interpret and set norms. It gives a meaningful reason why students and teachers should stay accountable for their decisions about knowledge in AI-supported education.

Contribution to mainstream English language education scholarship

This study contributes to English language education by linking three well-known areas that, in this article's framing, are usually studied separately. Communicative competence refers to the capacity to communicate effectively with others in context, going beyond linguistic form to include sociolinguistic and pragmatic dimensions (Leung, 2013; Douglas & Rosvold, 2018). Epistemic cognition focuses on how we justify and evaluate knowledge claims (Muis et al., 2021). Educational ethics considers the responsibilities involved in teaching, learning, and communication. The rise of generative AI makes these connections more important, since technology can now create advanced language output without showing the knowledge or skill we usually expect behind such work (Duc, 2026).

The study suggests that looking only at language quality, AI disclosure, or tech skills does not solve this issue. Instead, educators need to separate the text's quality from how it justifies its claims and who is responsible for them. Islamic epistemology offers a specific way to understand these duties, especially in schools where Islamic traditions shape educational goals. This work is an interdisciplinary conceptual contribution. It does not present a new teaching method or a research-backed theory.



7.1 Pedagogical Implications

The following implications come from the study's analysis. These are thoughtful educational recommendations, but the study has not tested their effectiveness.

Teaching and source evaluation

English language classes can involve activities where students judge AI-generated explanations using both language- and knowledge-based criteria. For example, students might first check an AI-generated paragraph for grammar and coherence, then assess the credibility of its facts. After that, they can compare those facts with reliable sources and explain whether they accept, change, or reject certain statements. This method is based on the idea that something can sound sophisticated without being trustworthy (Rapanta et al., 2025; Yan et al., 2024).

Cognitive delegation and learner agency

Teachers can create AI-supported tasks where students explain the choices they make when working with generated material. For example, students could use AI to suggest different ways to revise an argumentative paragraph, then explain why they chose a particular version based on meaning, evidence, audience, and purpose. Such tasks may elicit students' explanations, but verbalized choices are not by themselves evidence of independent cognitive engagement (Koole et al., 2011). Because assessors can access these thinking processes only through learners' interpretative descriptions, these explanations provide evidence of the reasoning process rather than direct proof of independent cognition (Koole et al., 2011). The main goal is not to remove AI from the process, but to keep students engaged with the thinking skills the activity is meant to build (Moşoi et al., 2025).

Authorship and assessment validity

Assessment policies should separate allowed technological help from the skills students must clearly demonstrate independently. When it makes sense, students might submit short explanations of their changes, discuss their sources, or explain the main points of AI-assisted work. These steps help clarify the difference between simply reporting what was done and taking real responsibility for the work. Still, these requirements should match the assessment's goals. Excessive documentation requirements can feel bureaucratic to students and may encourage superficial reflection rather than evidence of competence (Driessen, 2016). Similar concerns arise in research on assessed reflective writing, where students often offer superficial descriptions or mimic reflection rather than engage deeply (Croix & Veen, 2018; Shum et al., 2017).

Intercultural representation

Teachers can use AI-generated descriptions of religious and cultural practices to encourage critical thinking. Students can compare different explanations, spot unsupported generalizations, and check whether interpretations recognize key differences. This method links critical literacy with responsible representation. More broadly, *adab* offers Muslim educational settings an ethical framework for respectful communication in digital spaces (Putri et al., 2025). Research on GenAI in culturally responsive EFL curricula likewise underscores the need for content validation and contextual adaptation when AI is used to generate cultural material (Mahmoudi-Dehaki & Nasr-Esfahani, 2026).

Reconsidering teacher authority

Teachers can show students how to evaluate information using evidence, rather than treating human expertise or AI-generated answers as unquestionable. If an AI explanation conflicts with class materials, teachers can guide students in comparing them using language clues, subject knowledge, and context. This helps teachers keep their professional role and encourages students to think for themselves.

Implications for institutional governance

Institutional AI policies need to explain how allowed assistance connects to academic integrity, authorship, assessment validity, and student privacy. If a policy only requires students to disclose AI use, it may not show whether the assignment truly reflects what students have learned (Pérez-Pérez et al., 2026). Institutions should consider both clear procedures and the core goals of assessment. In Muslim educational settings, Islamic ethical values can also guide these conversations, along with educational research, professional standards, and institutional rules (Falah & Achfama, 2026).

Alignment between findings and pedagogical implications

Analytical concern	Reasoned pedagogical implication	Evidence still required
AI-generated fluency may obscure unreliable claims.	Separate language evaluation from evidence verification	Whether this improves independent source evaluation
Cognitive delegation may displace learning activities.	Require explanations of significant AI-assisted decisions	Whether explanation tasks improve autonomy
Disclosure may not establish responsible authorship.	Combine transparent attribution with opportunities to defend work	Reliability and fairness of these assessment practices
AI may reproduce cultural authority asymmetries.	Critically compare AI representations with contextual sources	Effects on intercultural competence



Final products may obscure independent competence.	Align assessment conditions with intended learning outcomes	Validity, accessibility, and workload implications
--	---	--

7.2 Limitations And Future Research

Conceptual and methodological limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the findings are conceptual and interpretive, not empirical. The analysis points out epistemological and ethical tensions in AI-mediated English education. Still, it does not show how common or significant these issues are, or whether they affect learning outcomes. As a result, the study cannot determine whether including Islamic epistemological perspectives improves English proficiency, critical thinking, academic integrity, or ethical decision-making. Second, this study draws on sources from different fields, including empirical research, philosophical works, Islamic educational writings, and international policy documents. These sources have different goals, methods, and levels of evidence. While this variety supports conceptual synthesis, it also limits how broadly the conclusions can be applied to other educational settings. Third, the literature review in this manuscript does not fully document how sources were searched and selected. This makes it harder to reproduce the study and means the review cannot claim to cover all available scholarship comprehensively or systematically. Fourth, Islamic epistemology includes many different theological, philosophical, legal, and educational traditions. This study examines selected ideas on knowledge and ethical responsibility, so it does not cover every Islamic intellectual viewpoint. Fifth, the study mainly suggests teaching approaches for Muslim educational settings. Whether these ideas apply to secular schools, religiously diverse classrooms, or other educational traditions needs more study in different contexts. Finally, generative AI technologies are changing quickly (Lodge et al., 2023). Updates in technology, educational policies, or institutional practices could affect how relevant some examples and recommendations in this study remain over time.

Directions for future research

Future research should explore how learners judge the reliability of AI-generated English texts in real classroom settings. Qualitative classroom studies could look at how students spot unsupported claims, handle disagreements between AI outputs and academic sources, and explain their choices when revising AI-assisted writing. Mixed-methods research could explore links between AI use, learner independence, critical literacy, and academic honesty. These studies should also separate what students find useful, what they actually do, and what outside assessments show about their learning. Comparative research could examine whether learners in Islamic educational institutions and other settings view epistemic responsibility, authorship, and ethical AI use differently. These comparisons should not assume that religious affiliation always shapes educational behavior. More research should also examine how teachers understand and apply Islamic ethical ideas when developing AI-related classroom policies and practices. Intervention studies could test whether teaching source checking, ethical communication, and responsible AI use helps students better judge AI-generated information. This research would show if the ideas in this paper matter in real classrooms. Long-term studies would also show whether ongoing AI support improves or hinders students' independent writing, critical thinking, and confidence over time. Finally, future research should examine both classical and modern Islamic debates about knowledge more closely. This would help clarify how different traditions view authority, evidence, reasoning, and moral responsibility in technology-based education.

8. Conclusion

Generative artificial intelligence is changing English language education by offering more ways to practice, get automated feedback, create content, and personalize learning (Creely, 2024). However, the educational value of these technologies goes beyond just making language correct and effective. This study examines the knowledge and ethical issues in AI-based English education by drawing on Islamic epistemology, AI literacy, and current educational research. The analysis highlights five related concerns: how linguistic fluency differs from reliable knowledge, how technology affects learner independence, the ethics of sharing knowledge, the cultural biases in AI-generated language, and the problems with judging learning only by final language products. These concerns show that we cannot judge generative AI's educational value solely by its efficiency or how advanced its results seem. Instead, we need to look at how learners gain, explain, understand, and share knowledge. Islamic epistemology provides useful ideas for thinking about these issues. Concepts like *'ilm*, *adab*, *amanah*, and *sidq* link knowledge with discipline, honesty, and moral responsibility (Alshaar, 2022; Khairuldin et al., 2025). These ideas do not replace current ways of teaching about AI, but provide a distinctive ethical grounding for verification and accountability in the wider conversation about human-centered and responsible education. This study argues that language production with computers, justified knowledge, and ethical responsibility are connected but distinct parts of AI-based English education. Understanding these differences helps us see why language fluency alone does not establish a claim's reliability or justification, and why we still need human judgment even with technology. The study also suggests that English language education in Muslim settings can use generative AI in helpful ways, while still focusing on critical thinking, responsible writing, understanding other cultures, and ethical communication.



These conclusions remain theoretical and need research to test them. Even so, they offer a solid starting point for examining how AI affects education beyond its technical features. Ultimately, moving past chatbots is not only about creating better language-learning tools. It is also about ensuring technology helps people develop understanding, sound judgment, and responsible communication, all of which are key to meaningful education.

References

- Ali, F., Bouzoubaa, K., Gelli, F., Hamzi, B., & Khan, S. (2025). Islamic Ethics and AI: An Evaluation of Existing Approaches to AI using Trusteeship Ethics. *Philosophy & Technology*, 38(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-025-00922-4>
- Allen, L. K., & Kendeou, P. (2023). ED-AI Lit: An Interdisciplinary Framework for AI Literacy in Education. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 11(1), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23727322231220339>
- Alshaar, N. (2022). Hadīth and the Concept of Adab as Moral Education. In *Hadīth and Ethics through the Lens of Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 30–47). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004525931_004
- Arif, H. M., & Naeem, J. (2025). The Impact of Generative Ai on Learner Autonomy and Critical Thinking In English As A Foreign Language (Efl) Writing Classrooms. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(3), 2264–2275. <https://doi.org/10.63878/jalt1249>
- Bauer, E., Greiff, S., Graesser, A. C., Scheiter, K., & Sailer, M. (2025). Looking Beyond the Hype: Understanding the Effects of AI on Learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 37(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-025-10020-8>
- Baytelman, A., Iordanou, K., & Constantinou, C. P. (2020). Epistemic beliefs and prior knowledge as predictors of the construction of different types of arguments on socioscientific issues. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 57(8), 1199–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21627>
- Bittle, K., & El-Gayar, O. (2025). Generative AI and Academic Integrity in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Information*, 16(4), 296. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040296>
- Blas, N. D. (2022). Distributed Cognition and exam preparation in higher education: what sources students use before and during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Research on Education and Media*, 14(1), 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.2478/rem-2022-0013>
- Bolatito, A.-O. S. (2025). The Relevance of Ibn Khaldun Educational Thought in the Contemporary World. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.53449/wzedff74>
- Brod, G., Kucirkova, N. I., Shepherd, J., Jolles, D., & Molenaar, I. (2023). Agency in Educational Technology: Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Implications for Learning Design. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09749-x>
- Buzelin, A., Aquino, Y., Bento, P., Chagas, A., Dayrell, L., Pappa, G. L., Almeida, V., & Jr., W. M. (2026). Epistemic Framing Tilt in LLMs: Auditing Religious Discourse across Traditions. *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI Ethics and Society*, 9(1), 577–588. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aies.v9i1.43164>
- Byram, M., & Wagner, M. (2018). Making a difference: Language teaching for intercultural and international dialogue. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12319>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Lee, K. K. W. (2023). The AI generation gap: Are Gen Z students more interested in adopting generative AI such as ChatGPT in teaching and learning than their Gen X and millennial generation teachers? *Smart Learning Environments*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00269-3>
- Chang-Bacon, C. K. (2018). Appropriated literacies: The paradox of critical literacies, policies, and methodologies in a post-truth era. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26, 147. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3377>
- Chiu, T. K. F., & Rospigliosi, A. (2026). Six global frameworks for human-centred AI literacy and competency: comparative analysis and a way forward. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 34(3), 1003–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2026.2648342>
- Creely, E. (2024). Exploring the Role of Generative AI in Enhancing Language Learning: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Journal of Changes in Education*, 1(3), 158–167. <https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewijce42022495>
- Croix, A. de la, & Veen, M. (2018). The reflective zombie: Problematising the conceptual framework of reflection in medical education. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 7(6), 394–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-018-0479-9>
- Crompton, H., Burke, D., Nickel, C., Bozkurt, A., Miao, F., Sharples, M., Greene, J. A., Parsons, D., Gill-Simmen, L., Edmett, A., Pegrum, M., Waard, I. de, Bonk, C. J., Garcia, M. B., Curry, J. H., Lindsey, L., Yang, M., Marshall, S., Bali, M., ... Yu, S. (2026). Governing generative AI in higher education: a global Delphi study on policy and practice. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-026-00602-z>



- Demir, N. (2017). *Pedagogical Views of Ibn Khaldun And Similarity With Contemporary Educational Approaches*. <https://doi.org/10.20472/iac.2017.030.013>
- Doko, E., & Turner, J. B. (2023). Islamic Religious Epistemology. In *Ibn Haldun University Institutional Repository* (Yes) (pp. 148–162). Yes Technologies (United States). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009047180.013>
- Dong, T. V., Yau, K. W., Chai, C. S., Chiu, T. K. F., Meng, H., King, I., Wong, S. W. H., & Yam, Y. (2025). A phenomenographic approach to students' conceptions of learning artificial intelligence (AI) in secondary schools. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(17), 24965–24989. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13724-0>
- Douglas, S. R., & Rosvold, M. (2018). Intercultural Communicative Competence and English for Academic Purposes: A Synthesis Review of the Scholarly Literature. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1050809ar>
- Driessen, E. W. (2016). Do portfolios have a future? *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 22(1), 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-016-9679-4>
- Duc, T. M. (2026). Generative AI and Cognitive Offloading in Higher Education: Implications for Learning, Knowledge Production, and Academic Thinking. *European Journal of Applied Science Engineering and Technology*, 4(3), 58–69. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejaset.2026.4\(3\).06](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejaset.2026.4(3).06)
- Eaton, S. E. (2023). Postplagiarism: transdisciplinary ethics and integrity in the age of artificial intelligence and neurotechnology. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00144-1>
- Falah, M. H., & Achfama, D. N. (2026). Ethical Artificial Intelligence in Education: Aligning Technological Innovation with Islamic Principles. *Aliansi*, 3(1), 88–107. <https://doi.org/10.62383/aliansi.v3i1.1539>
- Fan, Y., Tang, L., Le, H., Shen, K., Tan, S., Zhao, T., Shen, Y., Li, X., & Gašević, D. (2024). Beware of metacognitive laziness: Effects of generative artificial intelligence on learning motivation, processes, and performance. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(2), 489–530. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13544>
- Fang, F., & Baker, W. (2017). 'A more inclusive mind towards the world': English language teaching and study abroad in China from intercultural citizenship and English as a lingua franca perspectives. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(5), 608–624. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817718574>
- Firdasari, A. A. R., & Bakar, M. Y. A. (2025). Pendidikan Islam Perspektif Al-Ghazali: Integrasi Nilai-Nilai Spiritual dan Akhlak dalam Pembelajaran. *PUTIH JURNAL PENGETAHUAN TENTANG ILMU DAN HIKMAH*, 10(1), 73–92. [https://doi.org/10.51498/putih.2025.10\(1\).73-92](https://doi.org/10.51498/putih.2025.10(1).73-92)
- Fu, Y., & Weng, Z. (2024). Navigating the ethical terrain of AI in education: A systematic review on framing responsible human-centered AI practices. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100306>
- Goldhammer, F., Hahnel, C., Kroehne, U., & Zehner, F. (2021). From byproduct to design factor: on validating the interpretation of process indicators based on log data. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-021-00113-5>
- Gonot-Schoupsinsky, F., Garip, G., & Sheffield, D. (2021). Facilitating the planning and evaluation of narrative intervention reviews: Systematic Transparency Assessment in Intervention Reviews (STAIR). *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 91, 102043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2021.102043>
- Habib, F., Saifullah, S. M., & Islam, M. U. (2026). *A Comprehensive Overview of Fifty Years of Grammar Instruction in the Digital Age* (pp. 1–34). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-8352-0.ch001>
- Herman, J., & Lara-Steidel, H. (2025). Artificial Intelligence on Campus: Revisiting Understanding as an Aim of Higher Education. *Educational Theory*, 75(4), 603–625. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.70026>
- Hoeken, H., Flikkers, K. M., Eerland, A., Holleman, B. C., Berkum, J. J. A. V., & Maat, H. P. (2022). The Perceived Convincingness Model: Why and under what conditions processing fluency and emotions are valid indicators of a message's perceived convincingness. *Communication Theory*, 32(4), 488–496. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtac019>
- Hulawa, D. E. (2019). Al-Zarnuji's Character Concept in Strengthening Character Education in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 4(2), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v4i2.2395>
- Ismail, F., & Matthews, J. (2024). Adab and Islamic Education in Singapore. *Sociology of Islam*, 10, 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22131418-10030004>
- Jian-hua, Z., Zhang, L. J., & Zhu, Y. (2023). Development and validation of a genre-based second language (L2) writing self-efficacy scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1181196. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1181196>
- Kalia, S., & Jackson, G. (2025). Organizing Civility: Bridging Practices in Islamic Welfare Organization. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 55(5), 1258–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08997640251387984>
- Karimullah, S. S. (2023). From Tradition to Mainstream: Understanding the Integration of Islamic Law in Various Global Settings. *Justicia Islamica*, 20(2), 214–240. <https://doi.org/10.21154/justicia.v20i2.6478>



- Kartal, G., & Yeşilyurt, Y. E. (2024). A bibliometric analysis of artificial intelligence in L2 teaching and applied linguistics between 1995 and 2022. *ReCALL*, 36(3), 359–375. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0958344024000077>
- Kaya, J., Dressler, R., & Lenters, K. (2022). Critical Literacy in Canada: A Systematic Review of Curricula and Literature. *Language and Literacy*, 24(2), 25–61. <https://doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29606>
- Khasani, F. (2026). From Knowledge Transfer to Wisdom Cultivation: Reorienting Islamic Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Post-Truth. *Journal of Modern Islamic Studies and Civilization*, 4(1), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.59653/jmisc.v4i01.2205>
- Khairuldin, W. M. K. F. W., Anas, W. N. I. W. N., & Embong, A. H. (2025). Constructing The Muslim Scholar's Ethos: A Framework Of Academic Integrity Based On The Islamic Intellectual Tradition. *Al-Shajarah Journal of the International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization (ISTAC)*, 30(2), 477–504. <https://doi.org/10.31436/shajarah.v30i02.2235>
- Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2024). Exploring students' perspectives on Generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(1), 1265–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7>
- Koç, F. Ş., & Savaş, P. (2025). The use of artificially intelligent chatbots in English language learning: A systematic meta-synthesis study of articles published between 2010 and 2024. *ReCALL*, 37(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0958344024000168>
- Koole, S., Dornan, T., Aper, L., Scherpbier, A., Valcke, M., Cohen-Schotanus, J., & Derese, A. (2011). Factors confounding the assessment of reflection: a critical review. *BMC Medical Education*, 11(1), 104. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-11-104>
- Kowal, I. (2016). The Dynamics of Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency in Second Language Development. In *Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego eBooks*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. <https://doi.org/10.4467/k9474.72/16.16.6986>
- Kraus, S., Breier, M., & Dasí-Rodríguez, S. (2020). The art of crafting a systematic literature review in entrepreneurship research. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 16(3), 1023–1042. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-020-00635-4>
- Küçükuncular, A. (2026). Hallucination as epistemic pollution: epistemic injustice and credibility in futures-oriented science education. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-026-02318-5>
- Lee, S., Jeon, J., McKinley, J., & Rose, H. (2025). Generative AI and English language teaching: A global Englishes perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 45, 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190525100184>
- Leung, C. (2013). Communication and Participatory Involvement in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms. In *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*. (pp. 133–156). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203113493-13>
- Li, M. (2026). Generative AI-Assisted Academic Writing in Higher Education EFL Contexts: A Critical Review of Learning Outcomes, Self-Regulated Learning, and Ethical Governance. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 8(9), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2026.8.9.1>
- Liao, L., Ye, S. X., & Yang, J. (2023). A mini review of communicative language testing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1058411. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1058411>
- Lin, Y., & Zhang, H. (2021). “I finally marginalized myself from the mainstream”: An Autoethnography Study of Chinese International Student's Development of Intercultural Communicative Competence. *The Qualitative Report*, 26(11), 3665–3682. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.4827>
- Lo, C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Xu, S., Ng, D. T. K., & Jong, M. S. (2024). Exploring the application of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL education and related research issues: a systematic review of empirical studies. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00342-5>
- Lodge, J. M., Thompson, K., & Corrin, L. (2023). Mapping out a research agenda for generative artificial intelligence in tertiary education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8695>
- Lozić, E., & Štular, B. (2023). Fluent but Not Factual: A Comparative Analysis of ChatGPT and Other AI Chatbots' Proficiency and Originality in Scientific Writing for Humanities. *Future Internet*, 15(10), 336. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15100336>
- Mahmoudi-Dehaki, M., & Nasr-Esfahani, N. (2026). *Exploring the Feasibility and Effectiveness of Implementing Cultural Elements into English Language Curriculum Using GenAI in MENA Region* (pp. 109–123). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003774648-9>
- Mao, T. (2021). Investigation of L2/Ln Pragmatic Competence: Its Core and Route Map. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 690550. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.690550>
- Mariati, M., & Walidin, W. (2025). Pembelajaran Perspektif Al-Zarnuji: Relevansi Nilai-Nilai Pendidikan Islam sebagai Strategi Efektif di Era Kontemporer. *Tadabbur Jurnal Peradaban Islam*, 7(2), 95–114. <https://doi.org/10.22373/tadabbur.v7i2.764>



- McNicol, S. (2016). Responding to Concerns about Online Radicalization in U.K. Schools through a Radicalization Critical Digital Literacy Approach. *Computers in the Schools*, 33(4), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2016.1246883>
- Meyer, J., Jansen, T., Schiller, R., Liebenow, L. W., Steinbach, M., Horbach, A., & Fleckenstein, J. (2023). Using LLMs to bring evidence-based feedback into the classroom: AI-generated feedback increases secondary students' text revision, motivation, and positive emotions. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100199>
- Minh, Đ. (2026). AI-assisted learning and the illusion of competence. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 15(4), 45–82. <https://doi.org/10.32674/nrmwyw65>
- Moșoi, A. A., Maican, C. I., Cazan, A., & Sumedrea, S. (2025). Do students need to think hard? The interplay of AI and cognitive abilities in solving problems. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(17), 24337–24364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13738-8>
- Muis, K. R., Chevrier, M., Denton, C. A., & Losenno, K. M. (2021). Epistemic Emotions and Epistemic Cognition Predict Critical Thinking About Socio-Scientific Issues. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.669908>
- Muñoz, E. R., & Decorte, R. (2026). Improving the Applicability of Cognitive Linguistics: A Research-Informed, Classroom-Oriented Perspective. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688261448028>
- Nicola-Richmond, K., Dawson, P., Partridge, H., & Macfarlane, S. (2025). It takes a village... Program-wide approaches to redesigning assessment in a time of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 22(7). <https://doi.org/10.53761/zpp2ja61>
- Norris, J. M. (2018). Task-Based Language Assessment Aligning Designs with Intended Uses and Consequences. *JLTA Journal*, 21(0), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.20622/jltajournal.21.0_3
- Oliveira, M., Zednik, C., Bombaerts, G., Sadowski, B. M., & Conijn, R. (2025). Assessing students' DRIVE: A framework to evaluate learning through interactions with generative AI. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 9, 100497. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100497>
- Palese, R. (2026). Artificial Truth: Algorithmic Power, Epistemic Authority, and the Crisis of Democratic Knowledge. *Societies*, 16(3), 102. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc16030102>
- Pérez-Pérez, I., González-Afonso, M. C., Carballo, Z. P., & Pérez-Jorge, D. (2026). Transparency Mechanisms for Generative AI Use in Higher Education Assessment: A Systematic Scoping Review (2022–2026). *Computers*, 15(2), 111. <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers15020111>
- Perkins, M., Roe, J., & Furze, L. (2025). How (not) to use the AI Assessment Scale. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2025.8.2.15>
- Pervez, H., Minkinen, M., Jylhä, H., & Mäntymäki, M. (2026). Ethical issues of large language models: a multi-level thematic synthesis of the academic literature. *AI and Ethics*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-026-01173-5>
- Poibeau, T. (2025). Understanding Conversational AI: Philosophy, Ethics, and Social Impact of Large Language Models. In *Ubiquity Press eBooks*. Ubiquity Press. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bde>
- Pritchard, D. (2023). Educating for Virtuous Intellectual Character and Valuing Truth. *Philosophies*, 8(2), 29. <https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies8020029>
- Putri, I. J., Annur, S., & Niswah, C. (2025). Relevansi Pendidikan Islam Berbasis Melayu di Era Media Sosial: Integrasi Adab dan Teknologi. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Dan Riset Pendidikan*, 4(2), 12702–12709. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v4i2.4242>
- Qiao, M. S., Gu, M. M., & Lu, C. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for Language Learning: A Systematic Review of its Design, Theoretical Foundations, Implementation, and Impact. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.70034>
- Rapanta, C., Bhatt, I., Bozkurt, A., Chubb, L. A., Erb, C., Forsler, I., Gravett, K., Koole, M. L., Lintner, T., Örtengren, A., Petricini, T. A., Rodgers, B. C., Webster, J., Xu, X. X., Christensen, I. F., Dohn, N. B., Christensen, L. L. W., Zeivots, S., & Jandrić, P. (2025). Critical GenAI Literacy: Postdigital Configurations. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 7(4), 1296–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00573-w>
- Reagan, T. (2016). The Conceptualization of Language Legitimacy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2015.1116950>
- Resnik, D. B., Elliott, K. C., Soranno, P. A., & Smith, E. (2017). Data-Intensive Science and Research Integrity. *Accountability in Research*, 24(6), 344–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2017.1327813>
- Ritonga, A. R., Purba, A. M., & Rangkuti, Z. A. (2025). Knowledge as Trust (Amanah): An Islamic Theological Perspective on Information Accessibility. *Pharos Journal of Theology*, 106, Article 28. <https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.106.528>
- Roe, J., Perkins, M., & Giray, L. (2025). Assessment Twins: A Protocol for AI-Vulnerable Summative Assessment. In *arXiv.org*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2510.02929>



- Roman, P., Thiry, G., Muylaert, C., Ruwet, C., & Maréchal, K. (2023). Defining and identifying strongly sustainable product-service systems (SSPSS). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 391, 136295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.136295>
- S, D. L. (2025). Rebranding empire in the age of generative AI. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1604361>
- Saputra, M. H., Al-Maghribi, M. A. A., Romadona, I., & Ritonga, S. (2026). Recontextualization of Ibn Sina's Thoughts in the Development of Islamic Religious Education Pedagogy Based on Science and Ethics. *Al-Ulum Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 7(1), 262–275. <https://doi.org/10.56114/al-ulum.v7i1.13094>
- Schiefer, J., Edelsbrunner, P. A., Bernholt, A., Kampa, N., & Nehring, A. (2022). Epistemic Beliefs in Science—A Systematic Integration of Evidence from Multiple Studies. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(3), 1541–1575. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09661-w>
- Setiawan, N., & Cholili, A. (2023). Cultural Values as Anti-Fraud Strategy: Lessons from Islamic Schools. *Share Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan Islam*, 12(2), 500–525. <https://doi.org/10.22373/share.v12i2.20120>
- Shuhari, M. H., Hamat, M. F., Al-Shafi'i, M. M. O., Jusoh, W. H. W., Zin, S. A. M., & Wahab, M. R. (2019). The Concept of Integrity for Muslim's Character Based on Al-Ghazali's Ethical Perspective. *The University of Malaya Research Repository (University of Malaya)*, 22(1), 1. <http://eprints.um.edu.my/23456/>
- Shuhari, M. H., Hamat, M. F., Basri, M. N. H., Khairuldin, W. M. K. F. W., Wahab, M. R., Alwi, E. A. Z. E., & Mamat, A. (2019). Concept of Al-Amanah (Trustworthiness) and Al-Mas'uliyah (Responsibility) for Human's Character from Ethical Islamic Perspective. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 22(S1), 1–5. <http://eprints.um.edu.my/23454/>
- Shum, S. B., Sándor, A. D., Goldsmith, R., Bass, R., & McWilliams, M. (2017). Towards Reflective Writing Analytics: Rationale, Methodology and Preliminary Results. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 4(1), 58–84. <https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2017.41.5>
- Silaturahim, R., Nasution, S., & Zarkasih. (2025). Adab of Learning in Kitāb al-ʿIlm of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: A Ḥadīth-Based Conceptual Model for Islamic Education. *AL-HAYAT Journal of Islamic Education*, 9(4), 927–940. <https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v9i4.307>
- Smerdon, D. (2024). AI in essay-based assessment: Student adoption, usage, and performance. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100288>
- Strobl, C., Menke-Bazhutkina, I., Abel, N., & Michel, M. (2024). Adopting ChatGPT as a writing buddy in the advanced L2 writing class. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 6(1), 1168. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n1.1168>
- Subandowo, D. (2022). A Detailed Overview on Sociolinguistic Competence In Pedagogical Applications. *International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS)*, 5(2), 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v5i2.4411>
- Suddahazai, I. H. K. (2023). Examining the Concept of Educational Leadership from the Classical Islamic Worldview. *Khazanah Pendidikan Islam*, 5(1), 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.15575/kp.v5i1.25283>
- Sukhera, J. (2022). Narrative Reviews: Flexible, Rigorous, and Practical. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 14(4), 414–417. <https://doi.org/10.4300/jgme-d-22-00480.1>
- Sulaiman, K. U. (2022). Islamic Versus Western Conceptions of Knowledge. *Al Hikmah International Journal of Islamic Studies and Human Sciences*, 5(4), 198–229. <https://doi.org/10.46722/hikmah.v5i4.296>
- Tan, X., Wang, C., & Xu, W. (2025). To disclose or not to disclose: Exploring the risk of being transparent about GenAI use in second language writing. *Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amae092>
- Tenakwah, E. S., Boadu, G., Tenakwah, E. J., Parzakonis, M., Brady, M., Kansime, P., Said, S., Ayilu, R. K., Radavoi, C. N., & Berman, A. L. (2023). Generative AI and Higher Education Assessments: A Competency-Based Analysis. In *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2968456/v2>
- Thottupurath, S. (2025). The Role of Context (Siyāq) in Understanding Qur'an 49:6: A Critical Look at Misquotation in Contemporary Media. *Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(2), 455–461. <https://doi.org/10.34086/rteusbe.1830717>
- Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews. *Human Resource Development Review*, 15(4), 404–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606>
- Tsuria, R., & Tsuria, Y. (2024). Artificial Intelligence's Understanding of Religion: Investigating the Moralistic Approaches Presented by Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools. *Religions*, 15(3), 375. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030375>
- UNESCO. (2024). AI competency framework for teachers. In *UNESCO eBooks*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/zjte2084>
- Valeh, H. (2020). Theory of Knowledge in Islamic Intellectual Tradition. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 14(32), 332–356. <https://doi.org/10.22034/jpiut.2019.28176.2042>
- Vidotto, G. (2026). Plausibility, persuasion, and truth: why language models may appear designed to deceive. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-026-07513-4>



- Walczak, K., & Cellary, W. (2023). Challenges for higher education in the era of widespread access to generative AI. *Economics and Business Review/The Poznań University of Economics Review*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.18559/ebr.2023.2.743>
- Wang, F., Li, N., Cheung, A., & Wong, G. K. W. (2025). In GenAI we trust: An investigation of university students' reliance on and resistance to generative AI in language learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22(1), Article 47. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00547-9>
- Yan, L., Greiff, S., Teuber, Z., & Gašević, D. (2024). Promises and challenges of generative artificial intelligence for human learning. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8(10), 1839–1850. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02004-5>
- Yang, H., & Kyun, S. (2022). The current research trend of artificial intelligence in language learning: A systematic empirical literature review from an activity theory perspective. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 180–210. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7492>
- Yao, K. (2026). When AI Does the Work, What Is Learning For? Post-Instrumental Learning and the Risk of Capacity Dissolution. *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI Ethics and Society*, 9(4), 2788–2799. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aies.v9i4.43350>
- Zacky, M. F. M., & Moniruzzaman, Md. (2023). 'Islamic Epistemology' in a Modern Context: Anatomy of an Evolving Debate. *Social Epistemology*, 38(4), 511–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2023.2227945>
- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>
- Zubair, T., Raquib, A., & Qadir, J. (2019). Combating Fake News, Misinformation, and Machine Learning Generated Fakes: Insight's from the Islamic Ethical Tradition. *ICR Journal*, 10(2), 189–212. <https://doi.org/10.52282/icr.v10i2.42>
- Zulfikar, E. (2019). Etika Diskusi Dalam Perspektif Al-Qur'an. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Qur'an Dan Hadis*, 20(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.14421/qh.2019.2001-01>
- Zulkifli, Z. (2023). The dynamics of Sunni-Shia integration in Indonesia: a structural-functional perspective. *IJoReSH Indonesian Journal of Religion Spirituality and Humanity*, 2(2), 136–157. <https://doi.org/10.18326/ijores.v2i2.136-157>