

Negotiating Religious Authority and Generative AI In Banten Higher Education

Miftahudin^{1*}, Saepudin², Fauzul Adzim³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Bina Bangsa, Indonesia

Corresponden author:

Email: miftahudin@binabangsa.ac.id

Abstract.

Generative artificial intelligence increasingly mediates university students' access to Islamic knowledge, posing challenges for scholarly legitimacy, evidentiary accuracy, and accountability. This article offers a conceptual framework for negotiating religious authority and verification at universities in Banten, Indonesia. Integrative literature review incorporates scholarly perspectives on Islamic authority, digital religion, algorithmic authority, source credibility, epistemic vigilance, AI literacy, and Islamic educational ethics. Purposefully selected academic writings, policy documents, and institutional data are compared and synthesized with the use of thematic analysis. Synthesis reveals the distinction between acknowledged religious legitimacy and epistemic authority which is achievable through accessibility and fluency without interpretive competency and accountability of scholars. Verification process consists of seven steps involving classification of questions, identification of claims, authentication of evidence, independent comparison, contextual interpretation, consultation, and decision-making closure. This article proposes a multi-dimensional negotiation of religious epistemic authority as a conceptual framework that allows assigning different roles to algorithms, texts, ulama, lecturers, and institutions. Four heuristic orientations exemplify potential scenarios of reliance and verification. Banten is used as the background, but not the empirical field site, of the analysis. Both the conceptual framework and the heuristic orientations have not been tested yet. Contribution of the study is the religiously-grounded approach to verification which will prove useful for the development of Islamic religious education, assessment, university governance, and will allow proposing research directions for future comparative analysis.

Keywords: *algorithmic authority; generative artificial intelligence; hybrid religious authority; Islamic higher education and tabayyun.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Islamic religious knowledge has various sources: ulama, lecturers, pesantren, religious books, fatwa institutions, and religious communities. In addition to these sources, digital environment provides search engines, social media, video services, and conversational AI systems. Digital-religion literature focuses on how digital environment influences the way of accessing and negotiating authority (Campbell, 2007; Christensen, 2021; Lövheim & Campbell, 2017). Generative AI develops this trend by generating synthesized answers and answering follow-up questions. Students can get explanation, translation, and comparison of religious texts in private and colloquial language. These characteristics can facilitate preliminary learning, but generated outputs still need to be judged and supervised by human (Kasneci et al., 2023). When a question concerns worship, family, or any other crucial decisions, the issue becomes linked to the reliability of evidences and interpretation provided in answer.

Islamic religious authority is built on expertise, interpretive competencies, tradition of scholarly transmission, community recognition, and ethical responsibility (de Seife et al., 1998; Melchert & Berkey, 2004; Zaman, 2010). Sanad emphasizes the provenance and recognizability of learning tradition, while adab makes the learner accountable in relation to knowledge and teacher (Al-Attas, 1980; Ridlo, 2026). Lecturers and fatwa institutions can provide discipline-specific expertise, group discussion, and public accountability (Whyte, 2023). Generative AI does not have an independent scholar status. It achieves its influence partly due to accessibility, interactivity, and apparent universality (Gillespie, 2014). However, the social response to computer technology and anthropomorphic features can enhance the impression of conversational interface as trustworthy (Nass & Moon, 2000; Waytz et al., 2014). That is why it is necessary to make a distinction between acknowledged religious legitimacy and practical influence of a generated answer.

Perception of expertise and trustworthiness affect the reception of information, while interface characteristics encourage positive evaluation before evaluation of evidences (Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Sundar, 2008). Algorithmic opacity makes these evaluations difficult because users cannot easily figure out the procedure which produced the answer (Burrell, 2016). Language models can fabricate references, falsely attribute claims, and create unsupported or biased claims (Bender et al., 2021; Ji et al., 2023; Walters &

Wilder, 2023). In religious inquiries, this can affect scriptural attribution, representation of legitimate disagreement, and interpretation of the circumstances of the questioner. Therefore, AI literacy must include information on model limitations and ability to assess the quality of generated results (Long & Magerko, 2020; Ng et al., 2021), along with religious literacy concerning textual reliability, interpretive competencies, and consequences of error. Governance guidelines stress the importance of provenance, oversight, and proper usage (Raimondo et al., 2024). Epistemic vigilance describes the process of evaluation of claims and reliability of sources (Sperber, 2010). Authority is seen as context-dependent and expertise-dependent in information literacy, while lateral reading implies comparison with other sources (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2016; Wineburg & McGrew, 2019). Calibrated trust links reliance with the demonstration of competence and cost of errors (Lee & See, 2004). In terms of Islamic educational ethics, *tabayyun* is a process of verification associated with responsibility: Qur'an 49:6 states the necessity of clarification of potentially harmful information, while Qur'an 16:43 says that individuals lacking knowledge should consult experts (Riza, 2021). There are several recent papers dedicated to epistemic authority in AI-mediated learning, digital fatwas, changing role of teachers, and Islamic AI literacy (Mutaqin et al., 2026; Jose et al., 2025; Maulana, 2026; Suaedy et al., 2023; Syamsudduha et al., 2026). These papers provide basis for the comprehensive explanation of the way of negotiating religious answer through algorithms, texts, humans, and institutions.

The theory requires the institutional context of Banten for development. The institution profiles include an Islamic state university along with public and private universities (UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Universitas Bina Bangsa, and Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa). These descriptions do not contain data about students' actions but represent an institutional background. Availability of the Arabic language, scriptural studies, religious experts, PAI lecturers, and online tools may differ depending on educational programs; however, prior religious education and social network transcend the institutional boundaries. The student agency depends on the resources, relations, platform features, and institutional expectations (Stenalt, 2021). Thus, the review does not assume institutional identity as the crucial aspect of verification competence and compares Islamic and general universities in terms of resources and access.

The article offers the concept of hybrid religious epistemic authority negotiation as a tool to analyze the process of attribution of the specific roles to AI, religious texts, ulama, lecturers, and religious organizations by the learners. There are three main research questions of the article: how can one differentiate the recognized Islamic religious authority from algorithmic authority in the unified information space; what are the ways to use *tabayyun*, source credibility, epistemic vigilance, and calibrated trust for verification of the religious answers created by AI; and how can one apply the proposed framework to Islamic and general higher education in Banten? The purposes are to clarify the distinction between the legitimacy and operational authority, construct the staged verification cycle, and identify the dimensions and tentative orientations for future research. The contribution of the work is conceptual and pedagogical: it outlines how the verification connects technological assistance with religious accountability without presumptions about the practices of the students.

II. METHODS

Research Design and Source Selection

The integrative literature review design is used to construct the theoretical framework that is based on several strands of scholarship. The reviews are particularly useful when one needs to compare established and emergent perspectives, reveal conceptual tension, and create new connections instead of evaluating the effectiveness of an intervention (Snyder, 2019; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). The review is conceptual and interpretive. It should not be interpreted as digital ethnography, participant study, exhaustive systematic review, or meta-analysis.

The unit of analysis is the argument, finding, institutional description, or policy recommendation identified in some recognizable publication. The material under review covers such issues as Islamic religious authority, digital religion, generative AI, epistemic vigilance, source credibility, student agency, information verification, Islamic educational ethics, and higher education in Banten. The references have

been identified to answer the above-listed conceptual research questions; interviews, observations, focus groups, AI user diaries, and participant-based platform audits have not been conducted.

Sources have been selected purposely from peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, methodology guides, official UNESCO and NIST guidelines, and public profiles of the relevant universities in Banten. The references included in the preliminary manuscript have been checked against the journal or publisher records, DOI landing pages, and official websites of the organizations. Additional search of literature was carried out by means of the key words such as religious authority, algorithmic authority, generative AI, Islamic AI literacy, epistemic vigilance, lateral reading, tabayyun, and Banten higher education. The foundation sources have been found through selective backward reference tracing.

Selection criteria were based on the conceptual relevance, author attribution, citation and publication data, disciplinary reliability, and contribution to at least one of the research questions. In the latter case, old sources were selected if they provided foundational definitions of source credibility, scholarly authority, automation trustworthiness, or ethical basis of Islamic education; while new sources were selected if they provided information on generative AI and dynamics of contemporary Indonesian religious education. The number of sources selected was 43 in total. As a purposive review does not ensure comprehensiveness, search statistics and PRISMA diagram are not included here.

Thematic Synthesis and Conceptual Development

Thematic synthesis was adjusted for the purposes of the conceptual development. The found sources were classified into five main traditions - Islamic scholarly authority, digital and algorithmic authority, epistemic vigilance and credibility, AI and religious literacy, and education/context. Ideas developed in those traditions were compared to identify similarities, contradictions, and conceptually important differences. Some of the particularly interesting oppositions arose around the concepts of legitimacy versus influence, fluency versus evidential responsibility, single source versus cross-source verification, and availability versus responsibility for the decision (Braun & Clarke, 2008; Nowell et al., 2017).

Review moved from description to the development of theory. Established mechanisms of religious and algorithmic authority were separated first. Then epistemic vigilance, lateral reading, calibrated trust, and tabayyun were combined in the staged cycle of verification. Next, the relationships between human, textual, institutional, and algorithmic sources were structured into six dimensions of analysis. Finally, four ideal types of orientations were proposed as heuristics. These orientations are found in the literature; they are not observable phenomena and therefore should not be seen as frequency distribution in the population.

Table 1. Conceptual traditions and their analytical contribution

Tradition	Core concern	Contribution to the framework
Islamic authority	Sanad, competence, adab, scholarly accountability	Distinguishes legitimate interpretation from information access
Digital and algorithmic authority	Mediation, platform logic, opacity, fluency	Explains technologically mediated influence and credibility cues
Epistemic trust and credibility	Source expertise, vigilance, appropriate reliance	Defines evidence-sensitive and risk-calibrated judgment
AI and religious literacy	Model limits, verification, tabayyun, ethics	Supports a practical, religiously grounded verification cycle
Higher-education context	Student agency, curricular access, institutional pathways	Contextualizes the model for PTKI and general universities in Banten

Context and Research Ethics

Region of Banten is used only as the background of the review. The profiles of the region provide information that Islamic state universities coexist alongside the regular universities both public and private. However, there is no information on the religious beliefs of the students nor on the use of AI in the region (UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, n.d.; Universitas Bina Bangsa, 2026; Universitas Sultan Ageng

Tirtayasa, n.d.) . This possible difference is, therefore, left open to be explored in future research, not included in the findings of this study.

As this analysis relies entirely on secondary sources and no data are used in this study, no human participants are involved in this research process and no chat history is collected, the ethics approval number is not required. Integrity of the scholarly work is assured through proper citation, clear distinction between evidence published in the secondary sources and the conclusions made in the paper, non-fabrication, and awareness of the legitimate interpretation diversity in Islam. Future empirical research would need to go through the standard process of recruiting the participants, ensuring their privacy, gaining the necessary authorizations, and respecting their religious beliefs.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Religious Legitimacy and Operational Algorithmic Influence

The first discovery of this review is that there is an overlapping, but not identical, relationship between religious legitimacy and epistemic influence. Ulamas, qualified lecturers, recognized authorities, and the textual tradition can justify their accountability through expertise, way of interpreting the texts, scholarly support, and answerability. The generative AI, however, has quite a different base of immediate epistemic influence convenience, interactivity, fluency, and apparent breadth of knowledge. This makes it possible to distinguish the recognized religious authority from operational epistemic authority cases where the output has epistemic influence not being religiously legitimate at all (Campbell, 2007; Gillespie, 2014; Jose et al., 2025). From this point of view, a change in the source of authority does not require a proclamation of the fact that AI substitutes an ulama. An AI output serves just as a tool for identifying terminology, formulating the question, and accessing the recognized source. If the output makes a decision in the matter without being verified sufficiently, it becomes an operational authority. It is a mechanism proposed by this review and not an empirical description of the behavior of the students in Banten. Its importance consists in revealing the moment when convenience starts playing role in decision-making.

It is evident from this review that the authority is not something stable, like a ladder with immobile positions for each source. The relevance of the source is relative to the nature of the question asked. Translation request, disputed hadith, commercial contract, and a family law problem require different types of expertise and accountability. In the same way, information literacy scholarship views authority as a socially constructed concept dependent on information needs (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2016) . Contextuality does not equate all the sources; it shows the necessity of proper usage of the source depending both on its purpose and the possible consequences of an error.

The same perspective makes it possible to rethink the role of lecturers. There is no point in competing with AI in terms of speed. The role of lecturers is completely different it includes revealing assumptions behind interpretation, assessing the validity of the evidence, supporting ethical reasoning, and showing the applicability of the standards of the discipline. Recent research on Indonesian universities points out the shift from instructional authority in one direction to the interpretive or curatorial authority (Mutaqin et al., 2026). According to the perspective outlined by this review, the human authority is not threatened but defined as the place of human accountability in those instances when algorithmic assistance requires human evaluation.

Credibility Cues and Calibrated Trust

The second important finding is the difference between the cues which are characteristic for interface credibility and those necessary for evidence-based reliability. The speed of response, structure of information, politeness, apparent objectivity, and confident formulations can all make an answer seem credible. However, none of these attributes guarantees that the cited source really exists, that the Qur'anic verse is quoted correctly, that the hadith is authentic, or even that the legal conclusion is correct. Source-credibility research and the MAIN model explain the reason why people perceive these cues as the attributes of expertise, while hallucination research shows that fluent language can hide factual fabrication (Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Ji et al., 2023; Sundar, 2008).

When it comes to religious questions, five risks are identified in the literature: fictional or unverifiable citations, incorrect quotation and attribution, the flattening of ikhtilaf, ignoring the context of the questioner's

situation, and excessive confidence in controversial issues. They are theoretical risks, inferred from the known weaknesses of language models and the specificity of Islamic interpretation; they are not the frequencies observed at any Banten campus.

In the described situation, neither blind trust nor complete rejection is the right choice, but rather the verification that has to become increasingly thorough due to uncertainty and potential consequences (Raimondo et al., 2024; Walters & Wilder, 2023).

Calibrated trust provides an operational way of defining proportionality. Actions with low risk can be, for example, clarification of vocabulary and search terms formulation. Moderate risk means that it is necessary to have the independent verification of the quotes and official statements. High-risk cases concern delicate questions about worship, family matters, duties, health decisions related to religion, public claims, etc. This tool is used solely for decision making and cannot be regarded as a scale of classification of legality. The required threshold varies depending on the topic, the level of uncertainty, qualifications of the user, and risks (Lee & See, 2004).

Verification Cycle Based on Tabayyun

The third finding concerns the seven-stages verification cycle that turns tabayyun into a series of practical steps for learning and decision-making. First of all, the user classifies the question in terms of the domain, uncertainty, and potential consequences. The second stage is to understand the claim of AI, the origin of the quotes, the assumptions behind it, and uncertainties. On the third stage, the accuracy of the wording and translation of the Quran, attribution of hadiths, and academic references are checked. On the fourth stage, the user leaves the AI interface and compares the claim with independent sources, either scholarly, official, or institutional, and does not rely on the repetition of AI answers (Sperber, 2010; Wineburg & McGrew, 2019).

On the fifth stage, the claim is interpreted based on relevant ikhtilaf, differences between various schools of law, the historical background, and the situation of the person asking the question. The sixth stage is to consult a qualified lecturer, scholar, or official religious organization in case of significant, controversial, or difficult issue. The seventh stage is the decision of closure: to accept, revise, postpone, or reject the answer. The sequence of the actions is non-linear: in case of false citation, the user should go back to source tracing, and consultation with the scholar can change the question rather than answer it.

Each stage of the cycle contains the knowledge of one of the intellectual traditions without mixing them together. Epistemic vigilance focuses on the claim and its reliability; lateral reading allows the verification to move outside the initial interface; calibrated trust links the depth of the verification with the risk level; adab provides ethical positioning of the learner in the knowledge acquisition process; and tabayyun links verification with responsibility and avoidance of harm (Al-Attas, 1980; Ridlo, 2026; Riza, 2021). Therefore, these concepts transform verification into the teachable action, not an abstract principle of caution.

Table 2. Seven stage tabayyun oriented verification cycle

Stage	Verification action	Guiding question	Expected decision contribution
1	Classify the question	What is the issue, uncertainty, and potential harm?	Risk-sensitive verification threshold
2	Identify the generated claim	What does the answer assert, cite, and leave uncertain?	Transparent claim and provenance check
3	Authenticate religious evidence	Are the verse, hadith, quotation, and source accurate?	Textual and bibliographic reliability
4	Read laterally	Do independent, credible sources support or challenge it?	Cross source corroboration
5	Contextualize interpretation	Are ikhtilaf, madhhab, and the questioner's context addressed?	Interpretive proportionality

6	Consult qualified authority	Is a lecturer, ulama, or institution needed?	Human and institutional accountability
7	Close the decision responsibly	Should the answer be accepted, revised, deferred, or rejected?	Documented and justified judgment

Contextual Applicability in Banten Higher Education

Concerning the case of Banten, the proposed framework will cover educational institutions, which differ in the curricula and connection with Islamic educational tradition. The profile of the UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten describes the long-standing tradition of Islamic educational activities in this university, while Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa and Universitas Bina Bangsa demonstrate the co-existence of general public and private universities in one province (UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, n.d.; Universitas Bina Bangsa, 2026; Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, n.d.). These documents are only used for the contextualization, but cannot serve as evidence for claims on how some students verify the religious information.

Dependent on the field of studies that students pursue at university, the Islamic higher education gives more access to scriptural interpretation, hadith, jurisprudence, Arabic and religious specialists in contrast to general universities, where students have more interdisciplinary opportunities and PAI is placed in such areas as education, business, social sciences or technologies. Nevertheless, the students of both types of education can have the background in pesantren, religious organizations, computer literacy or connections with local ulama. Thus, the comparison should concentrate on institutional resources and access, rather than making any assumptions about difference inherent to the students of PTKI and general universities.

Application of the framework for Banten requires answering the first question on whether students have access to the authoritative information about the Qur'an and hadith, PAI lecturers, institutional fatwas, legitimacy of disagreement and advice on the boundaries of AI usage. Thus, the main question is on how an educational institution may help its students to get from the algorithmic information to verified information. Differences between PTKI students and general-university students depending on the area of their study, religious background, organizational activity, language skills, gender-specific access, social media contacts and personal connections need to be discovered empirically.

Table 3. Potential institutional resources in Banten

Analytical aspect	Islamic higher education (PTKI)	General higher education
Curricular resources	Possible access to Islamic studies, Arabic, tafsir, hadith, or fiqh	PAI combined with education, business, social science, STEM, or other programs
Human consultation	Religious studies lecturers, ulama, pesantren linked networks	PAI lecturers, campus religious groups, local ulama, community networks
Verification resources	Primary texts, interpretive literature, specialist guidance	Official religious portals, accessible translations, library guidance
Potential strength	Disciplinary support for textual and interpretive verification	Interdisciplinary problem framing and broader digital contexts
Potential challenge	Overconfidence or assuming institutional identity guarantees accuracy	Unequal access to primary text or specialist consultation
Analytical caution	Resources vary by program and individual background	Religious competence may be strong regardless of institutional label

Hybrid Religious Epistemic Authority Negotiation

The most significant conceptual contribution in the reviewed literature is the concept of hybrid religious epistemic authority negotiation. It refers to the context-specific process in which the learner uses, compares and assigns epistemically different roles to algorithmic, textual, human and institutional sources and accepts, revises, postpones or rejects religious claim. Hybrid here means interaction between sources, rather than the equality of their legitimization. AI gives access to information and its algorithmic synthesis,

the text provides evidences, institutional positions are formulated in fatwas, while ulama and lecturers give interpretations and accountabilities.

Six dimensions should be taken into account to render the model more concrete. Firstly, the source configuration means the list of the actors and the material sources that the student uses. Secondly, the functional distribution reflects the role of each source. Thirdly, the verification movement takes place along the pathway of the inquiry. Fourthly, the contextual calibration reflects the level of the criticality in light of the interpretation risk. Fifthly, the accountability anchoring means the actors/institutions that are capable of defending the result of the interpretation. Finally, the decision closure means whether the user accepts, modifies, suspends, or rejects the answer.

There are four orientations which illustrate how the process could vary. The algorithmic deference means the full acceptance of the generated answer. The convenience-oriented cross-checking includes only a minimal amount of confirmation due to access to digital sources. The integrative verification reflects the combination of AI assistance, text checking, and human competence. The human authority primacy means the limited use of AI as the initial assistance or refusal of AI at all when dealing with sensitive religious questions. These are the Weberian-type ideal types, analytical categories, which can facilitate comparison but not empirically observable types, counts, or claims about any institution.

Table 4. Provisional analytical orientations for future empirical examination

Ideal-typical orientation	AI reliance	Verification pattern	Accountability anchor
Algorithmic deference	High	Generated answer ends inquiry with little checking	Primarily the AI output
Convenience-oriented cross-checking	Moderate to high	Quick comparison through accessible digital sources	Familiar websites or platform consensus
Integrative verification	Conditional	Scriptural checks, lateral reading, and qualified consultation	Validated texts plus qualified human interpretation
Human-authority primacy	Low or restricted	AI limited to orientation or excluded from sensitive topics	Ulama, lecturer, or recognized institution

Hybrid religious epistemic authority negotiation serves to advance digital-religion research in the sense that it focuses on collaboration, competition, and correction among mediated sources within one inquiry. In the existing literature, there is an analysis of how digital spaces alter the visibility and flow of religious authority (Campbell, 2007; Maulana, 2026). What the framework offered in this paper adds is the following: who starts the inquiry, who checks the evidence, who explains the conflict, who interprets the context, and who is accountable once the inquiry ends? In accordance with the framework proposed, the relation between the old and the new religious sources does not have to be oppositional but functionally differentiated.

Seven propositions may be put forward according to the proposed framework. P1: The more fluent the answer generated by the AI is, the higher chances it has to gain operational influence unless the user checks it on purpose. P2: The human and institutional religious authority does not coincide with the computational power analytically. P3: Verification is stronger when scriptural authentication, cross-source comparison, and consultation with competent individuals take place. P4: Levels of trust have to be adjusted to the sensitivity and significance of the religious question. P5: Affordances provided by institutions do not define behavior alone but interact with the previous religious education and digital competence of users. P6: Accountability is better when decisions are anchored with consequences in the context of human or institutional authority. P7: The documentation of uncertainties and reasons for the decision closure contribute to the religious-AI literacy.

Proposed statements are testable in an empirical sense, but the present article does not assert that these statements have already been verified in Banten. The theoretical contribution of the framework lies in the connection between epistemic vigilance, contextual credibility, Islamic transmission ethics, and calibrated trust in one conceptual model (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2016; Lee & See, 2004;

Sperber, 2010). The six dimensions and four ideal types can be used in the future to design comparative interviews, digital ethnography, platform audit, survey, or educational intervention after gathering the empirical data.

Implications for Religious Education and University Governance

The practical implication of this framework lies in the necessity to complement recommendations to use AI carefully with the training in religious-AI literacy. In addition to promoting careful AI usage in PAI courses, students can be prompted to differentiate explanations and evidence generated by AI, find the origin of citation, check the references to Qur'an and hadith, compare scholarly interpretations, find the appropriate religious institution, and know when the human consultation is needed. It is in line with the emphasis of UNESCO on human-centric capability and recent research building Islamic AI literacy through evaluation, ethics, and knowledge practices (Syamsudduha et al., 2026). The criteria for the assessment should include consideration of the way how a learner finds an answer. The rubric should include the criteria for the accuracy of questioning, transparency of AI usage, the authenticity of scriptural references, independence and credibility of cross-sources, the acknowledgment of ikhtilaf, proportionality of human consultation, and reasons for the closure of a question.

At the institutional level, the framework can be integrated into guidance on academic integrity at the universities of Banten, expected learning outcomes in PAI, staff development, library instruction, and responsible AI policy. Libraries can help in this effort by selecting and organizing the recognized religious databases and source evaluation guidelines; lecturers can offer explicit options for consultation; program managers can introduce risk-conscious requirements for disclosure when AI is used; and university governance can manage issues of privacy, accessibility, fairness, changes in platforms, and interdisciplinarity (Raimondo et al., 2024). The form of these policies and programs should correspond to the capacity of every institution.

Limitations and Future Research

However, several restrictions should be mentioned. The corpus was purposefully chosen and does not represent all the publications, theology schools, platforms, languages, and regions in Indonesia. Profiles of institutions are a great source of contextual information, but they do not include any information on students' behavior. Typology and propositions were not verified, and constantly changing AI systems may change the way the verification takes place. For that reason, future research should compare several Banten institutions, engage students of different religious and academic background, carry out interviews according to the informed consent, include writing tasks verified by lecturers, disclose prompts and versions of model, and study changes over time. This research is necessary for verifying, refining, or rejecting the proposed model instead of claiming that it already represents the reality.

IV. CONCLUSION

This integrative literature review distinguishes the recognized religious legitimacy of Islam from the operational epistemic authority that generative AI can gain because of its accessibility, fluency, and continuous usage. The verification cycle proposed here combines tabayyun with claim identification, source authentication, independent comparison, context of interpretation, qualified consultation, and responsible decision closure. Hybrid religious epistemic authority negotiation demonstrates how learners allocate functions between algorithms, texts, ulama, lecturers, and institutions unequally in the way of source configuration, function allocation, verification movement, contextual calibration, accountability anchoring, and decision closure. Orientations that learners get as a result allow for comparison of reliance and verification in Islamic and general higher education in Banten. This framework is useful both for learning and assessment of religious education in Islamic higher education institutions and university governance as a tool helping to make checking evidence, uncertainty, and human accountability visible. However, the contribution of this framework is only conceptual. Purposeful source selection and institutional profiles do not prove the behavior of students, and the relations proposed here have not been verified empirically yet. Comparative and longitudinal research is necessary for analyzing whether the proposed verification cycle,

dimensions of analysis, and orientations describe the practices of students and how they change with their educational experience and development of generative AI.

REFERENCE

- [1] Ade Zaenul Mutaqin, Muslihudin, Mukhsin, Apin, & Abdul Hamid. (2026). From Authority to Facilitator: A Grounded Theory Analysis of AI-Mediated Shifts in Islamic Religious Education Pedagogy. *EDUKASI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama Dan Keagamaan*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.32729/edukasi.v24i1.2455>
- [2] Association of College and Research Libraries. (2016). Framework for information literacy for higher education. American Library Association.
- [3] Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? FAccT 2021 - Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- [4] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2008). Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology. Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 3(2).
- [5] Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine ‘thinks’: Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data and Society*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512>
- [6] Campbell, H. (2007). Who’s got the power? Religious authority and the Internet. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00362.x>
- [7] Christensen, H. R. (2021). Hashtag Islam: How Cyber-Islamic Environments Are Transforming Religious Authority, by Gary Bunt. *Comparative Islamic Studies*, 14(1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1558/cis.20054>
- [8] de Seife, R. J. A., Masud, M. K., Messick, B., & Powers, D. S. (1998). Islamic Legal Interpretation: Muftis and Their Fatwas. *The American Journal of Legal History*, 42(1). <https://doi.org/10.2307/846021>
- [9] Muhammad NaquibAl-Attas, S. (1980). The Concept of Education in Islam: A Framework for an Islamic Philosophy of Education. In *The First World Conference on Muslim Education*.
- [10] Gillespie, T. (2014). The Relevance of Algorithms. In *Media Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262525374.003.0009>
- [11] Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.1086/266350>
- [12] Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y. J., Madotto, A., & Fung, P. (2023). Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. In *ACM Computing Surveys* (Vol. 55, Number 12). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730>
- [13] Jose, B., Cleetus, A., Joseph, B., Joseph, L., Jose, B., & John, A. K. (2025). Epistemic authority and generative AI in learning spaces: rethinking knowledge in the algorithmic age. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 10). <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1647687>
- [14] 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. In *Learning and Individual Differences* (Vol. 103). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- [15] Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. In *Human Factors* (Vol. 46, Number 1). https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392
- [16] 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. Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems.
- [17] Lövhelm, M., & Campbell, H. A. (2017). Considering critical methods and theoretical lenses in digital religion studies. In *New Media and Society* (Vol. 19, Number 1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816649911>
- [18] Maulana, M. L. , H. S. , N. A. Y. , A. S. , & F. F. U. (2026). Kyai, platform logic, and digital fatwas: Reconfiguring Islamic legal authority in Indonesia. *Jurnal Indo-Islamika*, 16(1), 124–145.
- [19] Melchert, C., & Berkey, J. P. (2004). The Formation of Islam: Religion and Society in the Near East, 600–1800. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 124(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/4132255>

- [20] Nass, C., & Moon, Y. (2000). Machines and mindlessness: Social responses to computers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00153>
- [21] 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041>
- [22] Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- [23] Raimondo, G. M., Locascio, L. E., Autio, C., Dunietz, J., Hall, P., Jain, S., Roberts, K., Schwartz, R., Stanley, M., & Tabassi, E. (2024). NIST AI 600-1 Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile. NIST Trustworthy and Responsible AI .
- [24] Ridlo, A. , S. D. , & A. F. M. Z. (2026). Adab as an operational pedagogical principle: Intercultural alignment in Arabic language teaching at a tahfiz pesantren in West Java, Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 26(1).
- [25] Riza, M. (2021). Information Literacy As An Implementation Of Tabayun Concept In Islam. *Tik Ilmieu : Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan Dan Informasi*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.29240/tik.v5i2.2866>
- [26] Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- [27] Sperber, D. , C. F. , H. C. , M. O. , M. H. , O. G. , & W. D. (2010). Epistemic vigilance. *Mind & Language*. *Mind & Language*.
- [28] Stenalt, M. H. (2021). Digital student agency: Approaching agency in digital contexts from a critical perspective. *Frontline Learning Research*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v9i3.697>
- [29] Suaedy, A., Alnizar, F., Ardiantoro, J., & Siroj, S. A. (2023). Language, Authority, and Digital Media: The Impact on the Legitimacy of Fatwas. *Ahkam: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.15408/ajis.v23i1.28875>
- [30] Sundar, S. S. (2008). The MAIN model: A heuristic approach to understanding technology effects on credibility. *Digital Media, Youth, and Credibility*. <https://doi.org/10.1162/dmal.9780262562324.073>
- [31] Syamsudduha, Suwandi, & Tabrani, Z. A. (2026). Islamic Ai Literacy As Responsible Knowledge Practice: Development And Validation Of Ails-Ilius In Indonesian Islamic Higher Education. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v12i1.54254>
- [32] UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. (n.d.). Profil UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. <https://Ppid.Uinbanten.ac.id/Profil-Uin-Smh-Banten/>.
- [33] Universitas Bina Bangsa. (2026). Universitas Bina Bangsa: Membangun generasi unggul. <https://Binabangsa.ac.id/>.
- [34] Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa. (n.d.). Tentang Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa. <https://Untirta.ac.id/Tentang/>.
- [35] Walters, W. H., & Wilder, E. I. (2023). Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-41032-5>
- [36] Waytz, A., Heafner, J., & Epley, N. (2014). The mind in the machine: Anthropomorphism increases trust in an autonomous vehicle. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.01.005>
- [37] Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *In Journal of Advanced Nursing* (Vol. 52, Number 5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x>
- [38] Whyte, S. (2023). Are Fatwas Dispensable? Examining the Contemporary Relevance and Authority of Fatwas in Australia. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, 11(2–3). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojlr/rwac015>
- [39] Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2019). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. *Teachers College Record*, 121(11). <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912101102>
- [40] Zaman, M. Q. (2010). The ulama in contemporary islam: Custodians of change. In *The Ulama in Contemporary Islam: Custodians of Change*. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.40-5188>.