

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12426768

AI CHATBOTS (CHATGPT/LLMS) IN ISLAMIC STUDIES AND ISLAMIC EDUCATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A SYSTEMATIC SCOPING REVIEW

Fuad Alhosban¹, Samantha Ismaile², Salim Alteniji³

¹Assistant Professor, College of Computing and Intelligent Systems, University of Al Dhaid. Email: fuad.alhosban@uodh.ac.ae Phone: +971-56 2927494 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1139-0705>

²Assistant Professor, University of Al Dhaid. Email: samantha.ismaile@uodh.ac.ae; samantha.ismaile@ymail.com Phone: +971-6-8024572 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7822-2426>

³Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic History and Civilisation, College of Arts and Humanities, Al Qasimia University. Email: dr_tunaiji@yahoo.com Phone: +971-50 646 7255

Received: 19/11/2025

Accepted: 23/01/2026

Corresponding Author: Fuad Alhosban
(fuad.alhosban@uodh.ac.ae)

ABSTRACT

AI chatbots (ChatGPT/LLMs) are increasingly being adopted in higher education, yet their adoption in Islamic Studies and Islamic Education raises domain-specific questions about epistemic authority, source traceability, and academic integrity. This systematic scoping review maps how AI chatbots, including ChatGPT and non-LLM tutoring-style chatbots, are used for teaching, learning, and assessment in higher education Islamic Studies and Islamic Religious Education (IRE/PAI). Following PRISMA-ScR and PRISMA-S, we searched Scopus, ERIC (EBSCOhost), and IEEE Xplore to 28 February 2026 and conducted supplementary searching (Google Scholar queries 1-4; first 100 results per query) on 02 March 2026, 10:00 pm (Dubai time), alongside forward/backward citation searching and targeted hand searching. Across 166 database records and supplementary sources, 19 eligible evidence sources were included (18 empirical studies; 1 higher-education narrative review). AI chatbots and ChatGPT were used for Arabic writing and feedback, digital literacy and research tasks, religious literacy and tolerance-oriented learning designs, and reflective dialogue for assessment preparation. Outcome measurement varied widely (satisfaction/acceptance models, qualitative experience studies, and a small number of learning-gain evaluations). A consistent theme is governance: concerns about sanad (chain of scholarly authority) and dalil (textual evidence) verification, risks of hallucinated religious claims, plagiarism, and privacy. The evidence supports integrating AI chatbots through guided prompting, explicit evidence-checking routines, and assessment designs requiring transparent referencing. We conclude with implications for higher education policy and a research agenda for rigorous

*evaluation designs and Islamic epistemic integrity safeguards.*¹

KEYWORDS: AI Chatbots; ChatGPT; Large Language Models; Islamic Studies; Islamic Education; Islamic Religious Education (IRE/PAI); Higher Education; Systematic Scoping Review.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Synthesises higher education evidence on AI chatbots (ChatGPT/LLMs) in Islamic Studies and Islamic Education.
- Finds dominant use-cases in Arabic writing support, digital literacy/research, and course-integrated religious literacy designs.
- Identifies governance risks: sanad/dalil traceability, hallucination, plagiarism, and privacy in Islamic higher education.
- Provides design and policy implications to align AI chatbot use with Islamic epistemic integrity and academic integrity.

¹ Andrea C. Tricco et al., "PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation," *Annals of Internal Medicine* 169, no. 7 (2018): 467–473; Michele L. Rethlefsen et al., "PRISMA-S: an Extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews," *Systematic Reviews* 10 (2021): 39, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01542-z>.

1. INTRODUCTION

AI chatbots and large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT are being adopted in higher education for tutoring, drafting, feedback, and assessment-related support. In Islamic Studies and Islamic Education, adoption is shaped by additional domain requirements: religious claims should be traceable to reliable sources, and interpretive reasoning should remain accountable to recognised scholarly methods. These expectations intersect with broader debates about whether technology is value-neutral or inherently value-laden.²

JITC scholarship also shows how maqāṣid-oriented ethical reasoning has been applied to contemporary technologies by emphasising defined objectives, foreseeable consequences, and safeguards against harm. Such work provides a useful analogue for framing AI chatbot governance in Islamic higher education (e.g., defining educational objectives, constraining misuse, and requiring accountability in claims and evidence). For example, Zubair and Raquib propose a maqāṣid-oriented ethical framework for technology design, and Ramli et al. develop a Shari'ah-compliant model for an emerging biomedical technology, both reinforcing that technological adoption in Muslim contexts should be evaluated beyond instrumental utility.³

In the broader higher education literature, AI applications include intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning, and assessment support. However, many systematic reviews highlight that pedagogical and ethical implications are often underdeveloped, and educator perspectives remain limited. This gap is amplified in Islamic disciplines, where epistemic governance is central: students and instructors must distinguish between assistive text generation and authoritative religious knowledge.⁴

1.1 Background and Related Literature

Islamic higher education spans Islamic Studies (e.g., Qur'anic studies, Hadith, Fiqh, Tafsir, Sharia) and Islamic Education/IRE/PAI programmes that prepare educators and professionals. Across these programmes,

learning frequently involves interpretive practices, evidentiary reasoning, and sensitivity to context. When AI chatbots are introduced, the core question is not simply whether students can produce better text or faster answers, but whether educational practices maintain epistemic integrity and moral responsibility.

From an Islamic perspective, educational technology is not treated as morally neutral; it must be evaluated by whether it promotes benefit and avoids harm, and by whether it supports virtues such as intellectual honesty and responsibility. JITC scholarship on technology and values provides a framing in which technology is assessed as value-laden, requiring moral evaluation rather than purely instrumental adoption.⁵ Given this context, AI chatbots in Islamic higher education introduce three recurring risks reported in early studies: (i) fabricated or untraceable citations; (ii) overconfident answers without dalil (textual evidence) or methodological transparency; and (iii) integrity violations, including plagiarism and unacknowledged AI assistance. At the same time, early evidence suggests constructive use-cases: structured inquiry, language practice, research skill scaffolding, and reflective dialogue under instructor guidance.⁶

Because the empirical literature is fast-growing and dispersed across education and Islamic studies venues, a scoping review is appropriate to map evidence, clarify use-cases, summarise outcomes and measures, and identify governance themes and research gaps. This study, therefore conducts a systematic scoping review of AI chatbots (ChatGPT/LLMs and non-LLM tutoring-style chatbots) used for teaching, learning, or assessment within higher education Islamic Studies and Islamic Education.

2. REVIEW QUESTIONS

RQ1. How are AI chatbots (including ChatGPT/LLMs and non-LLM tutoring-style chatbots) used in teaching, learning, and assessment within Islamic Studies and Islamic Education in higher education?

RQ2. What outcomes are reported, and how are they measured?

² Ehsan Arzroomchilar and Maryam Olamaiekopaie, "Where Technology Meets Islam: Towards an Islamic Perspective on Technology," *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 12, no. 2 (2022): 14–27, <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.122.02>.

³ Talat Zubair and Amana Raquib, "Islamic Perspective on Social Media Technology, Addiction, and Human Values," *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 10, no. 2 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.102.14>; Nurmunirah Ramli et al., "A Need of Shari'ah Compliant Model of 3D Bioprinting," *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 12, no. 2 (2022): 103–115, <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.122.08>.

⁴ Olaf Zawacki-Richter, Victoria I. Marín, Melissa Bond, and Franziska Gouverneur, "Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education – Where Are the Educators?" *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 16, no. 1 (2019): 1–27, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>.

⁵ Arzroomchilar and Olamaiekopaie, "Where Technology Meets Islam," 14–27.

⁶ Darmu'in et al., "Perceived Barriers to ChatGPT Integration in Islamic Studies Education," *Journal of International Students* 15, no. 11 (2025): 141–164, <https://doi.org/10.32674/h99a4p06>.

RQ3. What assessment, integrity, and epistemic governance issues are reported, and what mitigation strategies are described? RQ4. Where are the major evidence gaps for future research and practice?

3. METHOD

This systematic scoping review followed JBI guidance for scoping reviews and is reported in line with PRISMA-ScR. Search methods are reported following PRISMA-S.⁷

3.1 Eligibility Criteria (PCC)

Population: higher education learners, instructors, or programme stakeholders in universities/tertiary institutions.

Concept: AI chatbots and conversational systems used for teaching/learning/assessment, including ChatGPT/LLMs and non-LLM tutoring/chatbot systems. Context: Islamic Studies disciplines (e.g., Qur'anic Studies, Hadith, Fiqh, Tafsir, Sharia) and Islamic Education/IRE/PAI in higher education (including teacher education when HE).

Evidence types: empirical studies (quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods) and design/evaluation studies. Purely technical NLP/IR studies without an explicit education context were excluded.

Language: English; other languages were eligible if the full text was accessible and extractable.

3.2 Information Sources and Search Strategy

We searched Scopus, ERIC (via EBSCOhost), and IEEE Xplore from inception to 28 February 2026. Search strategies combined four concept blocks: (i) Islamic domain terms; (ii) higher education terms; (iii) chatbot/LLM terms; and (iv) teaching/assessment terms. Supplementary searching was conducted due to database access constraints and the rapid emergence of GenAI publications. Google Scholar queries 1–4 were run on 02 March 2026 at 10:00 pm (Dubai time). Because Scholar does not support controlled bulk export, the first 100 results per query were manually captured and screened at the title/snippet level. We also performed backward reference checking of included full texts, Scopus forward citation searching for seed studies, and targeted hand searching.

3.3 Selection Process and Data Charting

Database exports were merged and deduplicated using DOI, where available and otherwise by title and year. Title/abstract screening was conducted against the PCC criteria, followed by full-text assessment. A

structured charting form captured: study setting and country; programme stratum (Islamic Studies vs Islamic Education/IRE); AI system type; study design and sample; educational use-case; outcomes and measures; and governance themes (e.g., verification of evidence and academic integrity). To avoid scope drift, a chatbot development study that combined secondary and tertiary learners was excluded at full text, consistent with the HE-only protocol.

3.4 Synthesis Approach

Given heterogeneity in designs and outcomes, findings were synthesised narratively and mapped to the review questions. Empirical evidence was treated as the core evidence base; narrative review evidence was used for contextualisation rather than to infer effectiveness.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Study Selection

Database searches identified 166 records (Scopus n=30; ERIC via EBSCOhost n=12; IEEE Xplore n=124). After removing duplicates (n=43), 123 unique records were screened by title/abstract. Five studies met the eligibility criteria and were included from database searching. Supplementary searching (Google Scholar queries 1–4, forward/backward citation searching, and targeted hand searching) yielded additional eligible studies. In total, 23 full texts were assessed for eligibility; four were excluded at full text (one inaccessible; two not higher education/not education; one excluded because it combined secondary and tertiary learners, violating the HE-only scope). Nineteen evidence sources were included in the final synthesis (18 empirical studies; 1 higher education narrative review).

4.2 Evidence Map: Countries, Programmes, and Designs

The empirical literature is geographically concentrated: 14 of 18 empirical studies were conducted in Indonesia, with the remaining evidence spanning Saudi Arabia and cross-country settings (Indonesia–Thailand; Indonesia–Malaysia). Islamic Education/IRE/PAI programmes dominate the sample frames, while fewer studies explicitly evaluate Islamic Studies programmes. Study designs are primarily qualitative or survey-based, with limited controlled evaluations; this pattern aligns with early-stage adoption research in higher education. Table 1 summarises the characteristics of the 18 included empirical studies (see Table 1).

⁷ Micah D. J. Peters et al., "Updated Methodological Guidance for the Conduct of Scoping Reviews," *JBI Evidence Synthesis* 18, no. 10 (2020): 2119–2126, <https://doi.org/10.11124/JBIES-20-00167>; Tricco et al., "PRISMA-ScR"; Rethlefsen et al., "PRISMA-S."

Table 1. Included empirical higher education studies on AI chatbots (ChatGPT/LLMs) in Islamic Studies and Islamic Education.

Study (DOI)	Country/Setting	Programme Stratum	AI Type	Design & Sample	Use-case	Key findings / governance themes
Alsulami et al., 2024 (Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences) (10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00479)	Saudi Arabia; Islamic University of Madinah (College of Quran and Islamic Studies)	Islamic Studies	AI tutoring/ITS (Qur'an/Hadith reader)	Quantitative survey; n=258	AI-assisted Qur'an/Hadith learning support	Satisfaction explained by TAM + ISSM dimensions (information/system/service quality).
Supriyadi et al., 2025 (IRJMS) (10.47857/irjms.2025.v06i03.05084)	Indonesia; multi-university Islamic Education context	Islamic Education/IRE	AI-assisted chatbot interaction (tool NR)	Design-based research; students + lecturers (multi-site)	Inquiry learning integrating AI-assisted chatbot interaction	Reports learning gains in religious literacy and tolerance-oriented outcomes; stresses guided interaction.
Zubaidi et al., 2025 (IJAL) (10.17509/ijal.v15i1.75378)	Indonesia; Islamic Education department	Islamic Education/IRE	LLM chatbot (ChatGPT)	R&D (Borg & Gall); trial n=40	Arabic writing support (human-AI collaboration framework)	Improves drafting and feedback cycles; requires human verification and referencing routines.
Darmu'in et al., 2025 (Journal of International Students) (10.32674/h99a4p06)	Indonesia (UIN context); Malaysian international students	Islamic Studies	LLM chatbot (ChatGPT)	Qualitative narrative inquiry	Student use and perceptions of ChatGPT in Islamic Studies	Governance barriers: authority/sanad concerns, dalil verification issues, and hallucination risks.
Harimurti et al., 2025 (Profetika) (10.23917/profetika.v26i02.10763)	Indonesia; Islamic HE course context	Islamic Studies (course-based)	LLM chatbot (ChatGPT)	Classroom implementation (empirical)	Understanding SDGs via Islamic HE learning	Highlights structured prompting and reflection; stresses lecturer oversight.
Mainuddin et al., 2025 (Al-Hayat) (10.35723/ajie.v9i3.234)	Indonesia; Islamic higher education (PTI)	Islamic Studies courses	AI tools incl. ChatGPT (student use)	Qualitative case study; interviews n=11	Student use for academic and learning support	Benefits: efficiency, wider access; limits: spiritual depth and ethics concerns; calls for guidance.
Sholeh et al., 2024 (Al-Ishlah) (10.35445/alishlah.v16i2.5409)	Indonesia; doctoral students (UIN Sunan Ampel)	Islamic Education/teacher education (HE)	AI chatbots (incl. ChatGPT)	Perspective study (doctoral student perspective)	Ethical and pedagogical implications in HE	Emphasises ethics, academic integrity, and responsible integration in HE.
Salim & Habibi, 2025 (Islamika) (10.36088/islamika.v7i4.5915)	Indonesia; Islamic Religious Education in HE	Islamic Education/IRE	LLM chatbot (ChatGPT)	Empirical learning model study	Critical thinking + moral reasoning learning design	Reports improvement claims; emphasises lecturer moderation and reflective dialogue.
Intan et al., 2025 (el-Tarbawi) (10.20885/tarbawi.vol18.iss2.art5)	Indonesia; PAI students (HE)	Islamic Education/IRE	GenAI tools such as ChatGPT	Quantitative survey; n=61 (PIECES framework)	AI-assisted learning experience and satisfaction	Captures perceived effectiveness and satisfaction dimensions; recommends ethical guidance.
Agustin et al., 2024 (Tribakti) (10.33367/tribakti.v35i2.5391)	Indonesia; State Islamic University (UIN Sunan Ampel)	Islamic Education/IRE	LLM chatbot (ChatGPT)	Empirical study	Digital literacy and research skills support	Finds perceived improvements in research skills; stresses responsible use.
Nisa & Sulaiman, 2025 (SiLeT) (10.46627/silet.v6i1.4924)	Indonesia/Malaysia; teacher professional education (PPG) in HE	Islamic Education (HE teacher education)	LLM chatbot (ChatGPT)	Survey; n=84 teachers (UEQ scales)	User experience of ChatGPT-based AI in Islamic education learning	Highlights usability factors and need for institutional guidance in HE teacher education.
Rahmawati & Inayati, 2024 (Iseedu) (10.23917/iseedu.v8i2.900)	Indonesia; Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta	Islamic Education/IRE	AI assistant (Perplexity)	Qualitative phenomenology	Digital literacy support for IRE students	AI supports information search; raises accuracy and ethics considerations.
Kurnaesih et al., 2025 (Ta'dibuna) (10.32832/tadibuna.v14i6.21188)	Indonesia; STIT Al-Khairiyah Cilegon	Islamic Education/IRE	AI tools incl. ChatGPT	Qualitative; n=85 students	Ethics of AI use in learning	Themes: privacy, plagiarism avoidance, responsibility; calls for policy and literacy.
Rahman & Afandi, 2024 (J-PAI) (10.18860/jpai.v11i1.27932)	Indonesia; UINSI Samarinda	Islamic Education/IRE	AI tools (incl. ChatGPT)	Phenomenological study	Ethical perceptions of AI use	Emphasises academic integrity and ethical boundaries in PAI learning.
Mulya et al., 2025 (JIE) (10.52615/jie.v10i1.554)	Indonesia; Islamic Education programme (HE)	Islamic Education/IRE	LLM chatbot (ChatGPT)	Descriptive empirical study	ChatGPT use in IRE learning process	Documents integration patterns; recommends guidance for valid sourcing.
Syukur et al., 2024 (Nazhruna) (10.31538/nzh.v7i3.13)	Indonesia and Thailand; Islamic HE institutions	Islamic Education/HE governance	GenAI tools incl. ChatGPT	Qualitative; interviews + observation (lecturers and students)	Comparative adoption and governance responses	Highlights institutional differences and need for policy alignment.
Nasikhin et al., 2025 (Eduprof) (10.47453/eduprof.v7i2.356)	Indonesia; Bachelor IRE programme (UIN Walisongo)	Islamic Education/IRE	GenAI platforms incl. ChatGPT, Gemini, Qwen	Qualitative case study	Student strategies and challenges for pedagogical development	Students use AI for module preparation; concerns on validity and religious contextualisation.
Indasari, 2026 (At-Tadzkir) (10.59373/attadzkir.v5i1.241)	Indonesia; Islamic HE (pre-service teachers)	Teacher education (HE)	AI apps incl. ChatGPT	Acceptance modelling study	Acceptance of AI among pre-service teachers	Reports determinants of acceptance; recommends training and policy.

4.3 Included Secondary Evidence

One higher education narrative review met the inclusion criteria and is used for contextualisation (see Table 2).

Table 2. Included higher education narrative review evidence.

Citation	Publication type/venue	HE context focus	Method	Key contributions (contextual)
Setiyo, Hadiati, & Setianingrum, 2025 (KnE Social Sciences) (10.18502/kss.v10i14.19069)	Conference proceedings article (narrative review)	Islamic studies and communication in higher education	Narrative review / library research	Synthesises opportunities and risks of AI and digital media in HE Islamic studies; informs discussion and implications.

4.4 Full-Text Exclusions

Table 3 lists full-text items assessed and excluded, with reasons aligned to the HE-only PCC criteria (see Table 3).

Table 3. Full-text exclusions and reasons.

Record	Reason for exclusion	Source	Notes
Exploring the Impact of ChatGPT on Non-native Arabic Writing Skills in Higher Education Contexts (Springer chapter; DOI: 10.1007/978-3-032-01348-4_12)	Full text not accessible for eligibility confirmation	Scopus	HE context uncertain; excluded to avoid assumptions.
Suhendi et al., 2024. The emergence of ChatGPT: opportunities and challenges in PAI learning	Not higher education	Backward reference checking	Full text retrieved; excluded as non-HE.
Faizin et al., 2025. Considering religious moderation in Islamic law through AI ChatGPT and Bahsul Masail	Not education/teaching context	Backward reference checking	Full text retrieved; excluded (Islamic law/politics focus).
Prayoga et al., 2025. NURRA Chatbot for Islamic Education among Generation Z (10.30983/educative.v10i1.10365)	Mixed secondary and tertiary learners; violates HE-only scope	Google Scholar	Excluded per protocol (HE-only).

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Use-Cases of AI Chatbots in Islamic Higher Education

The reviewed studies indicate AI chatbots are used across three pedagogical layers. First, “micro-support” tasks where ChatGPT assists with drafting, translation, or writing feedback. Arabic writing studies operationalise this as a human-AI collaboration model that emphasises iterative drafting and instructor review. Second, “academic skill scaffolding,” where chatbots are used for literature search, outlining, and digital literacy support (including non-LLM assistants such as Perplexity). Third, “course-integrated learning designs,” where chatbot interaction is embedded in inquiry learning models for religious literacy, tolerance education, or contextualised topic learning (e.g., SDGs within Islamic HE curricula).⁸

5.2 Outcomes and Measurement

Outcome reporting is uneven. Several studies operationalise outcomes through acceptance and satisfaction constructs (e.g., TAM-aligned measures

and service/system quality). Others use qualitative frameworks to describe user experience and perceived learning support. Only a small subset reports learning-gain metrics as part of design-based implementations. For scoping purposes, these outcome families are useful for mapping the field, but they are not interchangeable: satisfaction does not equate to learning, and perceived usefulness does not necessarily indicate epistemic validity of outputs. Future studies would benefit from reporting standards that separate (i) learning outcomes, (ii) epistemic validity checks, and (iii) integrity outcomes.

5.3 Epistemic Governance, Integrity, and the “Authority Problem”

A primary theme in these studies is the repeated emphasis on epistemic governance. In Islamic disciplines, students must verify claims with dalil (textual evidence) and treat interpretive reasoning as accountable to recognised scholarly methods. When AI chatbots provide unreferenced or fabricated claims, they create a category error: probabilistic text generation is misread as religious authority. Qualitative evidence reports concern that ChatGPT

⁸ Zubaidi et al., “Enhancing Arabic Writing Skills,” 87–101; Rahmawati and Inayati, “Utilization of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Perplexity,” 205–214; Supriyadi et al., “Enhancing Religious Literacy,” 310–324.

answers may omit sanad (chain of authority), conflate viewpoints, or generate plausible but incorrect religious rulings. These issues are not resolved by generic “use responsibly” statements; they require explicit educational design choices.⁹

A practical way to operationalise epistemic governance is to shift from “answer-seeking” prompts to “evidence-seeking” prompts. For example, students can be required to ask the chatbot to list potential evidences and then to verify each item in a trusted corpus or in course-approved references. Instructors can also require students to label each chatbot output as: (a) directly evidenced (with cited primary text and scholarly commentary), (b) plausible but unverified, or (c) incorrect/unsupported. This converts chatbot use into a structured critical-reading and source-tracing exercise rather than passive consumption.

Finally, the governance problem is also institutional: policies should clarify what counts as acceptable AI assistance, what must be disclosed, and how student data is protected. In Islamic higher education, policy should also specify the status of AI chatbots as non-authoritative tools and encourage alignment with recognised scholarly sources. Several included studies implicitly move in this direction by emphasising instructor mediation, reflective dialogue, and ethical boundaries. However, few studies report the prompt protocols, model versions, or verification workflows in sufficient detail to enable reproducibility. Future research should report these elements explicitly and evaluate whether such governance designs reduce hallucination uptake and improve students’ evidentiary reasoning.

Across studies, suggested mitigations converge on: (i) instructor-mediated prompting and constrained tasks; (ii) explicit evidence-checking routines (students must trace outputs to primary texts and recognised scholarship); (iii) assessment designs that reward transparent sourcing and process evidence; and (iv) institution-level guidance on acceptable use, privacy, and disclosure. In ethical perception studies, students frequently request clearer boundaries and training rather than blanket prohibition.

5.4 Evidence Gaps and Research Priorities

Four gaps are salient. First, geographical concentration limits generalisability across diverse Islamic higher education systems. Second, many

studies remain exploratory; more rigorous comparative designs are needed to evaluate whether AI chatbot integration improves learning beyond perceived utility. Third, few studies test governance-focused interventions (e.g., structured dalil verification rubrics or source-trace assessments) as outcomes in their own right. Fourth, reporting of AI system details (model version, prompting protocol, and disclosure requirements) is inconsistent, limiting reproducibility.

5.5 Implications for Teaching, Assessment, and Policy

The mapped evidence supports three practice implications. First, AI chatbots should be positioned as scaffolds for inquiry and drafting, not as authorities, with verification routines embedded into tasks. Second, assessment should emphasise process and source-trace requirements to reduce incentives for unacknowledged AI assistance. Third, programmes should develop policies and training aligned to Islamic epistemic integrity and academic integrity, including privacy guidance for third-party AI tools.¹⁰

5.6 Limitations of This Review

This review has limitations. Database access constraints prevented searching of several humanities-focused and Islamic studies indices. Google Scholar supplementation relied on manual capture of the first 100 results per query; while transparent and documented, it may miss relevant records beyond the captured range. Included studies vary widely in quality and reporting of AI system details, which limits comparative synthesis.

6. CONCLUSION

This systematic scoping review maps a growing body of evidence-based higher education on AI chatbots (ChatGPT/LLMs and non-LLM tutoring-style systems) in Islamic Studies and Islamic Education. Evidence shows expanding use for Arabic writing support, research and digital literacy, and course-integrated learning designs. At the same time, governance and integrity concerns, especially sanad/dalil traceability, hallucination risk, plagiarism, and privacy, are consistently reported. Responsible integration requires instructor-mediated design, explicit evidence-checking requirements, and assessment practices that reward transparent sourcing and reflective reasoning.

⁹ Darmu'in et al., “Perceived Barriers to ChatGPT Integration,” 141–164; Nasikhin et al., “Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Education: Student Strategies and Challenges in Pedagogical Development,” *Eduprof: Islamic Education Journal* 7, no. 2 (2025): 466–487, <https://doi.org/10.47453/eduprof.v7i2.356>.

¹⁰ Reda Ibrahim Ibrahim Elsayed Abdelgalil, “The Philosophy of Creativity, Innovation, and Technology from an Islāmic Perspective,” *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 13, no. 1 (2023): 218–244, <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.131.16>.

7. LIMITATIONS

Beyond the limitations described above, the evidence base remains concentrated in particular national contexts and is dominated by short-term evaluations. Broader multi-country studies and longer-term learning assessments are needed.

8. IMPLICATIONS

For instructors, the central implication is to align AI chatbot use with transparent evidence

practices and to teach verification as a core academic skill. For programme leaders, the implication is to establish clear policy on acceptable AI use, privacy, and academic integrity, supported by staff development. For researchers, priority areas include evaluative designs that compare AI-supported and non-AI learning, validated measures of religious literacy outcomes, and governance frameworks grounded in Islamic epistemic norms.

Acknowledgement None.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement: The search logs, screening logs, and data-charting materials supporting this scoping review are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Use of Generative AI: During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used OpenAI's ChatGPT (accessed March 2026) to support language editing, structural re-formatting to the Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilisation (JITC) requirements (Chicago Notes and Bibliography), and clarity improvements. No generative AI tool was used to create or alter research data. All extracted study details, screening decisions, and the final interpretations were verified by the authors, who take full responsibility for the content. This disclosure aligns with UMT Journals' requirement for transparency regarding AI tool involvement and with COPE-aligned publishing ethics guidance.¹¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdelgalil, Reda Ibrahim Ibrahim Elsayed. "The Philosophy of Creativity, Innovation, and Technology from an Islāmic Perspective." *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 13, no. 1 (2023): 218–244. <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.131.16>.
- Agustin, Fia Ayu Putri, Oktaviana Wulandari, and Evi Fatimatur Rusydiyah. "Enhancing Digital Literacy through Chat GPT: The Impact on Islamic Education Research Skills among Students at State Islamic University." *Tribakti: Jurnal Pemikiran Keislaman* 35, no. 2 (2024): 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.33367/tribakti.v35i2.5391>.
- Alsulami, Sami Ghazzai, Abdulrahman Awdah Albeladi, Shouket Ahmad Kouchay, Abdullah Ali Altammam, Mohammed Yousef Afifi, Reem Thabet Muhammad Al-Qahtani, and colleagues. "Integration of TAM and ISSM into Student Satisfaction with AI Learning Intervention: Empirical Evidence from Islamic Studies." *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences* 22, no. 2 (2024): 6356–6366. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00479>.
- Arzroomchilar, Ehsan, and Maryam Olamaiekopaie. "Where Technology Meets Islam: Towards an Islamic Perspective on Technology." *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 12, no. 2 (2022): 14–27. <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.122.02>.
- Darmu'in, Nasikhin, Darnoto, M. A. Maarif, A. Sofanudin, and J. T. Haryanto. "Perceived Barriers to ChatGPT Integration in Islamic Studies Education: Insights from Malaysian International Students in Indonesia." *Journal of International Students* 15, no. 11 (2025): 141–164. <https://doi.org/10.32674/h99a4p06>.
- Harimurti, Shubhi Mahmashony, Muhammad Sulaiman, Irfan Hilmi, and Dwi Santosa Pambudi. "Integrating ChatGPT in Islamic Higher Education: Enhancing Students' Understanding of the Sustainable Development Goals." *Profetika: Jurnal Studi Islam* 26, no. 2 (2025): 579–596. <https://doi.org/10.23917/profetika.v26i02.10763>.
- Indasari, Nur Laili. "Modelling Acceptance of Artificial Intelligence Technology among Pre-service Teachers in Islamic Higher Education." *At-Tadzkir: Islamic Education Journal* 5, no. 1 (2026): 22–39. <https://doi.org/10.59373/attadzkir.v5i1.241>.

¹¹ UMT Journals, "General Policies," section on plagiarism policy and AI disclosure requirement; see also UMT Journals' editorial guidance on AI tools and transparency. <https://journals.umt.edu.pk/index.php/index/general-policies>; Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) position on AI-assisted manuscript preparation is widely summarised: AI tools cannot be authors and use must be disclosed; authors remain responsible. See MDPI, "Updated Guidelines on Artificial Intelligence and Authorship" (20 April 2023), which explicitly references COPE's position statement: <https://www.mdpi.com/about/announcements/5687>.

- Intan Permata Sari, Nabila, Muhammad Thohir, and M. Gian Fithoni Al Fath. "Between Humans and Religious Values (Collaboration in AI-Based Islamic Religious Education Learning)." *el-Tarbawi* 18, no. 2 (2025): 257–281. <https://doi.org/10.20885/tarbawi.vol18.iss2.art5>.
- Kurnaesih, U., F. Faizudin, S. Sayuti, A. Munji, and A. I. Romadan. "Ethics of Using Artificial Intelligence in Learning: Perception of College Students in the Islamic Education Study Program." *Ta'dibuna Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 14, no. 6 (2025): 740–766. <https://doi.org/10.32832/tadibuna.v14i6.21188>.
- Mainuddin, Hermawansyah, Muhammad Irfan, Junaidin, and Muh. Zulkifli. "Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Studies Courses: Opportunities and Limitations in Islamic Higher Education from Student Perspectives." *Al-Hayat: Journal of Islamic Education* 9, no. 3 (2025): 613–627. <https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v9i3.234>.
- Mulya, Berlian Dwi Puji, Nasikhin, Fihris, and colleagues. "Islamic Religious Education Learning Process through the Utilization of ChatGPT." *Journal of Islamic Education* 10, no. 1 (2025): 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.52615/jie.v10i1.554>.
- Nasikhin, Fatah Syukur, Mahfud Junaedi, Mohammad Ridwan, and Zainudin Hassan. "Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Education: Student Strategies and Challenges in Pedagogical Development." *Eduprof: Islamic Education Journal* 7, no. 2 (2025): 466–487. <https://doi.org/10.47453/eduprof.v7i2.356>.
- Nisa, W., and M. Sulaiman. "User Experience Analysis: ChatGPT-Based AI in Islamic Religious Education Learning." *Studies in Learning and Teaching* 6, no. 1 (2025): 186–196. <https://doi.org/10.46627/silet.v6i1.4924>.
- Peters, Micah D. J., Casey Marnie, Andrea C. Tricco, Danielle Pollock, Zachary Munn, Lyndsay Alexander, Patricia McInerney, Christina M. Godfrey, and Hanan Khalil. "Updated Methodological Guidance for the Conduct of Scoping Reviews." *JBI Evidence Synthesis* 18, no. 10 (2020): 2119–2126. <https://doi.org/10.11124/JBIES-20-00167>.
- Rahman, Muhammad Rezza Nur, and Nur Kholik Afandi. "Islamic Education Students' Perceptions: A Phenomenological Study on the Ethical of Using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Learning." *J-PAI: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam* 11, no. 1 (2024): 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jpai.v11i1.27932>.
- Rahmawati, Sufiyah, and Nurul Latifatul Inayati. "Utilization of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Perplexity as a Digital Literacy Tool for Islamic Religious Education Students." *Iseedu Journal of Islamic Education Thoughts and Practices* 8, no. 2 (2024): 205–214. <https://doi.org/10.23917/iseedu.v8i2.900>.
- Rethlefsen, Michele L., Shona Kirtley, Siw Waffenschmidt, Ana Patricia Ayala, David Moher, Matthew J. Page, and Jonathan B. Koffel. "PRISMA-S: an Extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews." *Systematic Reviews* 10 (2021): 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01542-z>.
- Salim, M. A., and F. Habibi. "AI ChatGPT-Based Islamic Religious Education to Enhance Students' Critical Thinking and Moral Reasoning." *Islamika: Jurnal Keislaman dan Ilmu Pendidikan* 7, no. 4 (2025): 716–729. <https://doi.org/10.36088/islamika.v7i4.5915>.
- Setiyo, A., E. Hadiati, and D. A. Setianingrum. "AI and Digital Media: Enhancing Islamic Studies Courses through Cognitive and Affective Engagement." *KnE Social Sciences* 10, no. 14 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v10i14.19069>.
- Sholeh, Mohammad, Evi Fatimatur Rusydiyah, and M. Yunus Abu Bakar. "Integration of AI Chatbots in Islamic Religious Education: Potential and Challenges from a Doctoral Student Perspective." *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan* 16, no. 2 (2024): 2105–2121. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v16i2.5409>.
- Supriyadi, Tedi, J. Julia, Nan Rahminawati, Jabbor Eshbekovich Usarov, Kodirova Feruzakhon Usmanovna, Ravshanov Jamshid Fayzullayevich, and colleagues. "Enhancing Religious Literacy for the Promotion of Tolerance: A Design-Based Approach to Developing an Islamic Education Model in Higher Education." *International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Scope* 6, no. 3 (2025): 310–324. <https://doi.org/10.47857/irjms.2025.v06i03.05084>.
- Syukur, Fatah, Ahmad Maghfur, Uswatun Marhamah, and Phaosan Jehwae. "Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Higher Education: Comparative Responses between Indonesia and Thailand." *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 7, no. 3 (2024): 531–553. <https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v7i3.13>.
- Tricco, Andrea C., Erin Lillie, Wasifa Zarin, Kristin K. O'Brien, Heather Colquhoun, Danielle Levac, David Moher, Micah D. J. Peters, Tanya Horsley, and Sharon E. Straus. "PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 169, no. 7 (2018): 467–473.

- Zawacki-Richter, Olaf, Victoria I. Marín, Melissa Bond, and Franziska Gouverneur. "Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education—Where Are the Educators?" *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 16, no. 1 (2019): 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>.
- Zubaidi, Ahmad, Abdul Munip, Sembodo Ardi Widodo, and Taha Zerrouki. "Enhancing Arabic Writing Skills Using Chat GPT-Based AI Learning Models: A Tridimensional Human-AI Collaboration Framework." *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15, no. 1 (2025): 87-101. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v15i1.75378>.
- Zubair, Talat, and Amana Raquib. "Islamic Perspective on Social Media Technology, Addiction, and Human Values." *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 10, no. 2 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.102.14>.
- Ramli, Nurmunirah, Mohammad Naqib Hamdan, Mohd Anuar Ramli, Saiful Izwan Abd Razak, Hussein 'Azeemi Abdullah Thaidi, Mohd Farhan Md Ariffin, and Norhidayu Muhamad Zain. "A Need of Sharī'ah Compliant Model of 3D Bioprinting." *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 12, no. 2 (2022): 103-115. <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.122.08>.