Reconstructing Prophetic Pedagogy in the AI Era: Safeguarding '*Aql, Tazkiyat al-Nafs*, and Moral Agency in Islamic Education

Muhammad Bahrudin Kurniawan
Universitas Islam Negeri K.H. Abdurrahman Wahid Pekalongan, Indonesia
Email: muhammad.bahrudin.kurniawan326026@mhs.uingusdur.ac.id

Abstract

The rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) into education is changing how learners search for information, compose arguments, and encounter instructional authority. In Islamic Religious Education (PAI), the challenge is not simply whether AI can produce plausible religious explanations, but whether its use supports the formation of intellect ('aql), spiritual self-purification (tazkiyat al-nafs), and accountable moral agency (amanah). This conceptual study reconstructs Prophetic Pedagogy (manhaj al-tarbiyah al-nabawiyyah) as a normative framework for human-centred AI-supported learning. It employs a hermeneutic-philosophical approach and a critical narrative review of scholarship on Islamic educational thought, AI in education, cognitive offloading, academic integrity, and international AI governance. The synthesis identifies four contingent risks of unbounded GenAI use: premature delegation of reasoning, over-trust in fluent but unverified output, obscured authorship and responsibility, and the weakening of relational learning. In response, the paper develops a curriculum framework grounded in dialogue (hiwar), exemplary conduct (uswah hasanah), contemplation (tafakkur), gradual instruction (tadarruj), and consultation (shura). The framework is operationalized through five phases: intention and independent inquiry, bounded AI consultation, source verification, dialogical deliberation, and reflective unaided reassessment. It argues that AI should function as a bounded learning aid rather than a religious authority or substitute for teachers. The proposed model offers testable design propositions for PAI curriculum development while acknowledging that its educational effects require empirical evaluation.

Keywords: prophetic pedagogy, generative AI, *'aql, tazkiyat al-nafs,* moral agency

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has rapidly entered learning environments through systems that can summarize, translate, draft, explain, and simulate dialogue. Such capabilities may improve access to learning resources and provide timely practice, but they also raise questions about learner agency, transparency, privacy, bias, and the evidential value of submitted work. A systematic review of AI in higher education shows that the field has expanded quickly while retaining uneven attention to pedagogical theory and ethical implications (Crompton & Burke, 2023; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). A meta-review similarly calls for stronger methodological rigour, collaboration, and ethical reflection in AI-in-education research (Bond et al., 2024). UNESCO's human-centred guidance emphasizes that educational

use should be age-appropriate, privacy-protective, equitable, and aligned with educational purposes rather than driven by novelty (Miao & Holmes, 2023; UNESCO, 2021a, 2021b, 2023).

These concerns are especially significant for Islamic Religious Education (PAI), whose purposes extend beyond information acquisition to include adab, worship, ethical conduct, responsibility, and beneficial action. Islamic educational thought has discussed ta'lim, tarbiyah, and ta'dib as overlapping yet distinctive dimensions of knowing, nurturing, and cultivating proper relations between knowledge and conduct (Al-Attas, 1991; Halstead, 2004; Sahin, 2018). From this perspective, a fluent answer is not by itself evidence that a learner has understood a concept, formed a sound disposition, or accepted responsibility for acting upon it.

This paper uses the term Prophetic Pedagogy (manhaj al-tarbiyah al-nabawiyyah) to denote a contemporary normative reconstruction of educational principles associated with the Prophet Muhammad's teaching practice. The focus is on dialogue (hiwar), exemplary conduct (uswah hasanah), contemplation (tafakkur), gradual instruction (tadarruj), compassion, and consultation (shura). These principles are not treated as a ready-made historical recipe for digital classrooms; rather, they are interpreted as ethical criteria for deciding what educational work may be delegated to AI and what must remain a human responsibility.

The concept of 'cognitive debt' is used here as a provisional description of the risk that repeated delegation may reduce opportunities to practise independent reasoning, not as a settled or universal effect of GenAI. Research on cognitive offloading shows that external aids can reduce immediate cognitive demands, while the consequences depend on task design and how learners regulate their reliance on tools (Risko & Gilbert, 2016). Research on automation also documents the possibility of misuse, disuse, and over-reliance when users fail to calibrate trust to system capability (Parasuraman & Riley, 1997). These findings justify careful instructional design, but they do not warrant the claim that every use of AI diminishes cognition.

The paper addresses three questions: (1) how should PAI distinguish algorithmic output from the formation of 'aql, tazkiyat al-nafs, and moral agency? (2) which Prophetic pedagogical principles can guide bounded and accountable GenAI use? and (3) how can these principles be translated into a curriculum protocol? Its contribution is conceptual: it proposes a coherent, ethically grounded sequence that can be examined empirically in subsequent studies.

Methods

Research Design

The study adopts a qualitative hermeneutic-philosophical design combined with a critical narrative literature review. Hermeneutic interpretation is used to examine Islamic educational concepts as normative resources, while the narrative review connects those concepts to research on AI in education, cognition, academic integrity, and governance. The study does not test causal effects or claim to be a systematic review.

Participants (Source)

Sources were selected purposively for their relevance to six themes: Islamic conceptions of knowledge and education; Prophetic teaching and moral formation; GenAI and AI literacy; cognitive offloading and automation; academic integrity and assessment; and human-centred AI governance. The corpus includes classical and contemporary Islamic educational scholarship, peer-reviewed research reviews, foundational cognitive-science literature, and international guidance from UNESCO. Selection was guided by conceptual relevance and traceability of publication details rather than an exhaustive database search.

Outcome 1: Distinguishing Algorithmic Output from Formed Intellect

GenAI systems can generate coherent text, summarize sources, propose arguments, and imitate explanatory styles. These outputs may support learning, but their fluency does not establish factual accuracy, contextual understanding, ethical intention, or the learner's independent mastery. Research has raised concerns about hallucinated references, bias, and the tendency to mistake plausible language for reliable knowledge (Bender et al., 2021; Kasneci et al., 2023). Consequently, assessment should not treat a polished product as sufficient evidence of learning. Cognitive taxonomies can clarify the complexity of learning objectives, but the apparent sophistication of a generated response cannot independently verify that a student has achieved those objectives (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom et al., 1956).

In this framework, 'aql is understood as responsible discernment: the ability to evaluate evidence, recognize uncertainty, weigh competing interpretations, and relate knowledge to justified action. It is not reduced to speed of processing or the production of an answer. Ma'rifah, likewise, is not equated with information retrieval; within the paper's normative Islamic framing, it involves deeper recognition shaped by reflection, humility, ethical practice, and relationship. The relevant contrast is therefore not a simplistic opposition between human and machine intelligence, but between accountable formation and output whose grounds and consequences remain unexamined.

Four contingent risk pathways are identified. First, premature delegation occurs when learners consult AI before attempting their own interpretation. Second, automation over-trust occurs when fluent output is accepted without verification. Third, responsibility becomes opaque when AI contributions and sources are not disclosed. Fourth, learning may become privatized when learner–chatbot exchanges replace dialogue with teachers, peers, and qualified scholars. These risks are not inevitable: AI may also support language access, generate counterarguments, and help students identify gaps in understanding. The key design question is whether the learner remains responsible for evidence, reasoning, attribution, and consequences (Ng et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2023).

Table 1 Algorithmic risks and Prophetic-pedagogical safeguards

Dimension	Risk of unbounded AI use	Prophetic-pedagogical safeguard
Knowledge acquisition	Instant retrieval replaces inquiry	Require initial questions, reading, and provisional reasoning before AI consultation.
'Aql	Fluent output is mistaken for understanding	Require evidence, counterarguments, source checks, and unaided explanation.
Moral agency (amanah)	Authorship and responsibility become opaque	Require disclosure, process records, oral defence, and accountable attribution.
Spiritual formation	Religion is reduced to decontextualized information	Connect learning to intention, adab, self-accounting, worship, and service.
Religious authority	AI displaces qualified guidance	Require scholarly and teacher verification for consequential religious claims.

Outcome 2: Reconstructing Prophetic Pedagogy for AI-Rich Learning

The synthesis identifies five mutually reinforcing principles. Hiwar makes learning a process of questioning, listening, reason-giving, and respectful disagreement. Uswah hasanah emphasizes that education includes visible ethical example, not only correct verbal information.

Tafakkur protects time for reflection, observation, and self-examination. Tadarruj recognizes sequencing, developmental readiness, and the need to build understanding step by step. Shura locates judgment within consultation and shared responsibility. These principles complement the Islamic educational emphasis on moral and social formation (Halstead, 2004; Sahin, 2018) and wider accounts of education as more than qualification or measurable performance (Biesta, 2015). Classical discussions of disciplined knowledge and ethical self-cultivation, including works associated with al-Ghazali and al-Nawawi, can provide further interpretive resources for this connection between learning and practice (Al-Ghazali, 2015; Al-Nawawi, 2014).

These principles do not require eliminating digital tools. They distinguish support functions from responsibilities that should not be automated. AI may help generate discussion questions, compare non-authoritative explanations, translate instructional materials, or suggest counterexamples. It should not be treated as the final authority for creed, worship, law, or sensitive personal circumstances; nor should it substitute for a teacher's relational judgment or a learner's own ethical responsibility. Maqasid-oriented reasoning offers a useful lens for assessing technology in relation to the protection of intellect, dignity, faith, and public benefit rather than efficiency alone (Auda, 2008).

Table 2 Prophetic Pedagogical Principles as Criteria For Bounded AI Use

Principle	Educational expression	Possible AI assistance	Human responsibility
Hiwar	Questioning, listening, reason-giving	Suggest alternative questions or cases	Facilitate dialogue and assess reasoning and etiquette.
Uswah hasanah	Integrity, humility, verification modelled by teachers	Administrative and resource support	Provide embodied ethical example and relational trust.
Tafakkur	Slow reading, reflective writing, self-examination	Offer reflection prompts after independent work	Protect reflective time and mentor interpretation.
Tadarruj	Sequenced challenge and developmental sensitivity	Suggest differentiated practice	Make pedagogical and pastoral judgments.
Shura	Collective deliberation and shared responsibility	Generate non-authoritative scenarios	Moderate participation and support accountable conclusions.

Outcome 3: A Curriculum Framework for Safeguarding 'Aql, Tazkiyat al-Nafs, and Agency

The proposed framework has three connected safeguards. Safeguarding 'aql requires initial inquiry, evidence-based reasoning, verification, and opportunities to transfer learning without AI assistance. Safeguarding tazkiyat al-nafs links knowledge to intention, humility, muhasabah (self-accounting), adab, worship, and service. Safeguarding moral agency makes learners answerable for their decisions, sources, disclosures, and the foreseeable consequences of their work. These safeguards are interdependent: verification without responsibility can become a checklist, while spiritual language without critical inquiry may leave learners vulnerable to misinformation.

The framework is operationalized through five phases. Phase 1, niyyah and inquiry: learners state the purpose of the task, formulate questions, and write an initial position before AI drafting. Phase 2, bounded consultation: learners use AI to compare explanations or generate counterarguments, while recording prompts and outputs. Phase 3, verification: claims are checked against primary texts, credible scholarship, and relevant contextual sources. Phase 4, hiwar and shura: learners deliberate in a seminar, halaqah, or structured discussion, defending

their reasoning and responding to peers. Phase 5, muhasabah and reassessment: learners reflect on their reliance on AI and complete a short unaided task that demonstrates what they can explain independently.

Table 3 Five-phase Prophetic Pedagogy Protocol for AI-Assisted PAI

Phase	Learner Activity	AI Boundary	Evidence of Learning
1. Niyyah and inquiry	State purpose, formulate questions, write an initial position	No AI-generated draft before initial reasoning	Intention statement and question map
2. Bounded consultation	Compare explanations and identify counterarguments	Disclose prompts and outputs; no final religious ruling accepted without verification	Annotated interaction record
3. Verification	Check claims against primary texts and credible scholarship	AI is not the sole authority	Verification grid with APA citations
4. Hiwar and shura	Discuss cases and defend conclusions with peers	AI may suggest scenarios but not determine judgment	Oral defence and peer response
5. Muhasabah and reassessment	Reflect on reliance and complete an unaided transfer task	No real-time AI in the final reassessment	Unaided explanation and reflective journal

Discussion

The proposed framework responds to a central problem in AI-supported education: successful production is not synonymous with learning or formation. Biesta's account of education highlights that educational purposes include qualification, socialization, and subjectification; the latter concerns how learners become responsible subjects rather than merely efficient performers (Biesta, 2015). Prophetic Pedagogy adds an Islamic normative vocabulary by connecting knowledge to adab, intention, accountability, and care for others. This position avoids both technological determinism and an uncritical rejection of digital tools. This emphasis also resonates with experiential accounts of education and inquiry, including Dewey's (1938) argument that educational experience must be judged by its capacity to support further growth, Bruner's (1960) account of the structure of knowledge, and Freire's (2000) dialogical critique of passive learning. Aristotle's account of practical wisdom provides a comparative philosophical vocabulary for deliberation and action, though it is not treated here as equivalent to Islamic concepts (Aristotle, 2009).

The model's contribution is procedural. Rather than offering a generic call for ethical AI, it places AI between a learner's initial inquiry and subsequent verification, dialogue, and unaided reassessment. The sequence is consistent with human-centred AI guidance, which emphasizes educational purpose, privacy, human oversight, and age-appropriate use (Miao & Holmes, 2023; UNESCO, 2021a, 2021b, 2023). It also responds to academic-integrity debates by treating process evidence—drafts, prompt records, source checks, oral defence, and reflection—as legitimate assessment material (Cotton et al., 2024; Perkins, 2023).

The framework has implications for religious authority. AI systems may synthesize heterogeneous materials and produce persuasive statements, but they do not hold recognized scholarly authorization or bear the moral accountability expected of a teacher, scholar, or religious adviser. For consequential questions involving belief, worship, law, family, finance,

or conflict, AI output should be treated as a preliminary object of scrutiny and referred to qualified persons and reliable sources. This is an epistemic boundary, not a claim that technology is intrinsically harmful.

Institutional policy should distinguish permitted support from prohibited substitution; require transparent disclosure; protect personal and religiously sensitive data; teach students to identify unsupported claims and fabricated citations; and ensure that accessibility uses do not lead to exclusion. AI literacy must include technical understanding, critical evaluation, ethical awareness, and practical capacity to use tools appropriately (Long & Magerko, 2020; Ng et al., 2021). Teacher development is central because educators need confidence in designing dialogical learning, reflective tasks, verification routines, and assessments that reveal actual understanding (Crompton & Burke, 2023; Holmes et al., 2022). The wider AI-in-education literature similarly argues that tools should augment rather than erase teacher expertise and pedagogical relationships (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016; Selwyn, 2019). The importance of teachers' professional knowledge also remains central to evaluating and explaining educational content (Shulman, 1986).

The proposed safeguards also need to be evaluated against equity concerns. AI access, language proficiency, disability, digital infrastructure, and institutional rules may shape students' opportunities to benefit from or comply with AI policies. A human-centred approach should therefore avoid treating every use as misconduct or assuming that one policy fits all contexts (UNESCO, 2023). A maqasid-oriented evaluation can help institutions ask whether a tool promotes or undermines intellect, dignity, fairness, and public benefit, while still requiring evidence about real classroom effects (Auda, 2008; Floridi et al., 2018).

Limitations and Future Research

The study is conceptual and does not establish improvement in reasoning, integrity, spiritual formation, or learner well-being. Its selective corpus permits interpretive depth but cannot demonstrate exhaustive coverage. Hermeneutic reconstruction also permits competing interpretations; the selected principles do not constitute a comprehensive historical account of the Prophet's pedagogy (Gadamer, 2004; Snyder, 2019).

The article combines heterogeneous evidence. Findings in mathematics, language education, or general higher education cannot automatically be transferred to religiously sensitive PAI tasks. Reviews may include overlapping primary studies, so their study counts should not be added to imply independent evidence (Bastani et al., 2025; Deng et al., 2025; Wang & Fan, 2025).

No particular AI platform is evaluated for Indonesian or Arabic accuracy, privacy arrangements, accessibility, or theological bias. Teacher capacity and workload may also limit the feasibility of prompt documentation and oral assessment. Sampling oral defence, using concise verification grids, and protecting accommodations are possible adaptations requiring evaluation (Chan, 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023).

Future studies should compare bounded protocols with ordinary classroom practice while documenting initial knowledge, tool access, instructional fidelity, and delayed unaided outcomes. Participatory design with teachers, students, scholars, and disability-support specialists can examine acceptability and unintended consequences. Cognitive measures should include verification quality and transfer, not merely final writing quality.

Ethical and spiritual inquiry should use contextual qualitative evidence and modest claims. Reflective accounts can illuminate responsibility and experience, but should not be

equated with comprehensive measures of sincerity or faith. Longitudinal studies may explore whether responsible practices persist after formal assessment requirements end.

Conclusion

Prophetic Pedagogy can inform AI-assisted Islamic education by specifying the purposes and responsibilities that technological assistance must serve. The study distinguishes generated performance from the formation of ‘aql, locates tazkiyat al-nafs within reflective and embodied educational opportunities, and preserves moral agency through accountable decisions and authorship.

The framework does not establish that all GenAI use weakens learning or that all traditional practices improve it. Contemporary evidence instead indicates that outcomes depend on instructional and technological arrangements. The proposed approach therefore seeks appropriate assistance rather than either indiscriminate automation or categorical rejection.

Reconstructing Prophetic Pedagogy in the AI era means neither treating technology as inherently corrupting nor allowing it to define the ends of Islamic education. GenAI can support access, practice, and inquiry, but it cannot replace the learner’s intention, self-accounting, embodied ethical example, or responsibility for judgment. PAI should therefore distinguish fluent algorithmic output from the formation of ‘aql, tazkiyat al-nafs, and amanah.

The paper proposes five linked practices: intention and independent inquiry, bounded consultation, verification, dialogical deliberation, and reflective unaided reassessment. Hiwar, uswah hasanah, tafakkur, tadarruj, and shura provide normative criteria for keeping AI within an ethical-spiritual ecosystem of human guidance. The model is a set of design propositions—not a proven intervention—and its value must be established through transparent empirical evaluation. Its central claim is that technology should serve responsible knowing and moral flourishing, not displace the human relationships through which these purposes are cultivated.

Reference

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

Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1991). *The concept of education in Islam: A framework for an Islamic philosophy of education*. International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization (ISTAC).

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.

Aristotle. (2009). *The Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

Auda, J. (2008). *Maqasid al-Shariah as philosophy of Islamic law: A systems approach*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248–287. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90022-L

Bastani, H., Bastani, O., Sungu, A., Ge, H., Kabakcı, Ö., & Mariman, R. (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 122*(26), Article e2422633122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2422633122

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922

Biesta, G. (2015). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. David McKay.

Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press.

Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20*, Article 38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3

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*, Article 43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228–239.

Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20.

Deng, R., Jiang, M., Yu, X., Lu, Y., & Liu, S. (2025). Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Computers & Education, 225*, Article 105224. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28, 689–707.

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.; 2nd rev. ed.). Continuum.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum. (Original work published 1970)

Halstead, J. M. (2004). An Islamic concept of education. *Comparative Education*, 40(4), 517–529.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holstein, K., Sutherland, E., Baker, T., Shum, S. B., Santos, O. C., Rodrigo, M. T., Cukurova, M., Bittencourt, I. I., & Koedinger, K. R. (2022). Ethics of AI in education: Towards a community-wide framework. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*.

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). *ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education*. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, Article 102274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727

Luckin, R. (2018). *Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century*. UCL Institute of Education Press.

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson.

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO.

Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, Article 100041.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

OECD. (2023). *OECD digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem*. OECD Publishing.

Parasuraman, R., & Riley, V. (1997). Humans and automation: Use, misuse, disuse, abuse. *Human Factors*, 39(2), 230–253.

Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(2).

Rahman, F. (1982). *Islam and modernity: Transformation of an intellectual tradition*. University of Chicago Press.

Risko, E. F., & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(9), 676–688.

Sahin, A. (2018). *Critical issues in Islamic education studies: Rethinking Islamic and Western liberal secular values of education*. Routledge.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.

UNESCO. (2021a). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers*. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2021b). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 39.