

FORMULATING A NORMATIVE TYPOLOGY OF STUDENT GENERATIVE AI USE BEYOND THE BINARY OF ISLAMIC PERMISSIBILITY

Arif Jamaluddin Malik*

UIN Sunan Ampel, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: arif.jamaluddin@uinsa.ac.id

Ahmad Sayyidiman Hamidalloh

UIN Sunan Ampel, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: sayyidiman11@gmail.com

Article Info

Keyword:

Generative Artificial Intelligence,
Islamic law,
Maqāṣid Al-Sharī'ah,
Academic Integrity.

Abstract

The development of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in education presents both opportunities and ethical challenges for learners. On one hand, GenAI can facilitate learning processes, information retrieval, idea development, and the provision of feedback. On the other hand, its use carries the potential for academic dishonesty, intellectual dependency, the dissemination of unverified information, and the shifting of academic responsibility onto technology. This study aims to analyze the ethics of GenAI usage by learners from an Islamic legal perspective and to formulate normative principles to guide its use in academic activities. The research employs a normative-juridical approach utilizing a literature review method. Data sources include Islamic legal texts, literature on maqāṣid al-sharī'ah (objectives of Islamic law), scholarly articles on GenAI and education, and policy documents regarding artificial intelligence usage. A descriptive-analytical approach is used to correlate Islamic legal principles with the characteristics and issues surrounding GenAI use in learning. The findings indicate that GenAI is essentially a *wasilah* (means), the legal status of which is determined by the purpose, method, and impact of its use. Using GenAI as a tool to comprehend material, develop ideas, practice, and obtain feedback is permissible, provided it does not supplant the learner's intellectual responsibility. Conversely, using GenAI to commit fraud, falsify work, conceal AI contributions, or gain unfair academic advantage contravenes the principles of *ṣidq* (truthfulness) and *amānah* (trustworthiness) and may be classified as *ḥarām* (forbidden). The maqāṣid al-sharī'ah perspective—specifically *ḥifẓ al-'aql* (preservation of the intellect) and *ḥifẓ al-dīn* (preservation of religion)—underscores the importance of maintaining intellectual independence and practicing *tabayyun* (verification) regarding AI-generated information. The study

Copyright © 2026 The author(s).

Published by International Journal of Law Dynamics Review. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>).

formulates five ethical principles for learners' use of GenAI: *maslahat* (public interest/benefit), *ṣidq*, *amānah*, *tabayyun*, and *ḥifẓ al-'aql*. Thus, Islamic law is not anti-technology; rather, it provides a normative framework ensuring that GenAI is used to support the best interests of education without compromising human integrity and responsibility.

Page: 83-95

*Corresponding Author.

Received: February 19, 2025; Received in revised form: April 11, 2026; Available online: May 29, 2026.

Introduction

The development of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has brought about significant changes in educational practices. The emergence of applications based on large language models (LLMs)—such as ChatGPT and various other generative platforms—enables learners to obtain explanations, brainstorm ideas, summarize information, translate text, draft outlines, and even generate academic answers in a relatively short time. These changes indicate that GenAI is no longer merely a supporting technology; it has become an integral part of the learning ecosystem, influencing how learners acquire and produce knowledge. A systematic review of 407 publications regarding GenAI in education reveals that research in this field has evolved around themes such as applications, impacts, adoption, user experiences, and the ethical implications and risks associated with GenAI usage. However, the ethical dimension remains a critical issue requiring further conceptual development, particularly within diverse educational and cultural contexts (Yusuf et al., 2024).

On one hand, GenAI offers numerous opportunities for learners. The technology can help explain complex concepts, provide alternative ways to understand material, offer preliminary feedback on writing, assist with brainstorming, and support independent learning. In the context of higher education, studies on assessment transformation indicate that GenAI has the potential to support self-assessment, feedback provision, and more responsible learning, provided its use is integrated into appropriate instructional designs (Lin & Chiu, 2024). The issue of GenAI cannot be reduced to the notion that it is inherently detrimental to the educational process. The more critical questions concern how the technology is utilized, the extent to which learners remain intellectually engaged, and how educational institutions establish acceptable boundaries for its use.

On the other hand, this ease of access gives rise to new challenges regarding academic integrity. While GenAI can serve as a valuable study aid, it can also be used to generate portions—or even the entirety—of academic assignments, which are then claimed as the learner's own work. Research involving 2,555 university students shows that more than half of the respondents had used or considered using GenAI for academic purposes, whereas 70.4% did not support the use of ChatGPT to write entire essays. These findings indicate a distinction between accepting AI as a supportive tool and accepting it as a substitute for students' academic work (Johnston et al., 2024).

This issue is also evident in a study involving 337 university students in Australia. More than one-third of respondents reported using chatbots to assist with assessments, yet some students did not necessarily view such usage as a breach of academic integrity (a study related to the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency; see Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 2024). These findings suggest that the issue of Generative AI (GenAI)

lies not only in technology usage behaviors but also in the ambiguity of normative boundaries regarding what constitutes honest or dishonest conduct. When students use AI to generate ideas, refine grammar, construct arguments, or produce entire answers, each action entails varying levels of human involvement and distinct ethical implications.

This issue is particularly significant because the use of GenAI does not necessarily result in simple shifts in the nature of cheating. Research on secondary school students indicates that overall cheating behavior did not automatically increase following the advent of ChatGPT; instead, there were changes in AI-related forms of cheating and in students' perceptions of acceptable conduct. Most students did not consider using chatbots to generate entire assignments to be justifiable, though they were more accepting of using them to initiate a task or clarify concepts they did not yet understand (Middaugh et al., 2024). These findings demonstrate that the ethical challenges surrounding GenAI exist on a spectrum, rather than representing a simple dichotomy between using and not using AI.

In this context, academic integrity emerges as a central issue. A systematic review of 41 studies on GenAI and academic integrity indicates that while the technology can enhance learning efficiency and engagement, it simultaneously poses risks of academic dishonesty—such as using AI to generate work that does not reflect a learner's actual capabilities (Mousavi et al., 2025). Consequently, the primary challenge for education is not merely detecting whether an assignment was created by AI, but rather establishing norms for responsible AI usage. Approaches focused solely on detection and prohibition risk lagging behind technological advancements, whereas unrestricted acceptance could obscure the meaning of the learning process and academic responsibility.

UNESCO also frames the use of GenAI in education as an issue requiring a human-centric approach. UNESCO guidelines emphasize the necessity of regulation, data protection, AI competency development, pedagogical validation, and the use of GenAI in a manner that considers ethical aspects and human responsibility (UNESCO, 2023). This perspective suggests that the use of GenAI should ideally aim not to replace humans in the educational process, but to augment human capabilities while maintaining user control, critical judgment, and accountability.

This issue takes on a different dimension when situated within the context of Islamic education. From an Islamic perspective, education aims not only to foster cognitive competence but also to cultivate individuals who embody *adab* (proper conduct), honesty, *amānah* (trustworthiness/responsibility), and the ability to apply knowledge for the greater good. Therefore, the use of GenAI by Muslim learners cannot be evaluated solely based on technological efficiency or effectiveness; it must also be examined through the lens of Islamic morality and law. Using AI to aid in understanding material is morally distinct from using it to complete an entire assignment while concealing the technology's contribution. This distinction hinges on principles such as *ṣidq* (honesty), *amānah* (responsibility), and *tabayyun* (verification), as well as the prohibition of *ghishsh*—acts involving deception or fraud. The need to develop an Islamic perspective on the evolution of AI is increasingly relevant, given that generative technology can produce information regarding religious matters.

While AI can provide explanations concerning the Quran, Hadith, *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence), and various Islamic issues, the ability to generate convincing answers is not synonymous with scholarly authority. In the context of Islamic religious education, this issue is critical because erroneous religious information can impact students' understanding and religious practices. Recent research on AI in Quranic education indicates that AI technology holds the potential to support learning; however, teachers remain essential for verifying the accuracy and authenticity of religious information and for upholding the spiritual dimension of the learning process (Alramamneh et al., 2026).

From the perspective of Islamic law, the use of new technology cannot be directly

categorized as halal or haram based solely on its novelty. The object of legal assessment is human action in using the technology along with its goals and consequences. The *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* approach is relevant because it provides a framework for assessing an action based on the objectives of the Shariʿa and the benefits to be realized. In *maqāṣid* thought, the protection of religion (*ḥifẓ al-dīn*), soul (*ḥifẓ al-nafs*), reason (*ḥifẓ al-ʿaql*), offspring (*ḥifẓ al-nasl*), and property (*ḥifẓ al-māl*) is part of the fundamental objectives of the Shariʿa. In the context of GenAI, the *ḥifẓ al-ʿaql* dimension is particularly important because education aims to develop thinking abilities, while excessive use of AI has the potential to replace students' intellectual activities. On the other hand, *ḥifẓ al-dīn* becomes relevant when GenAI is used to obtain and produce religious knowledge that requires source verification.

The *maqāṣid* framework also allows Islamic law to respond to technological developments in a more contextual manner. Auda (2008) developed a systems approach in *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* by emphasizing interconnectedness between parts, openness to changes in context, multidimensionality, and goal orientation. This approach provides space to read contemporary problems holistically so that an action is not only judged by its outward form, but also based on the goals and consequences that accompany it. In the context of AI, this approach allows a distinction between the use of technology that produces benefits and the use of technology that produces benefits.

The study of AI ethics from an Islamic perspective has also developed. Elmahjub (2023) shows that AI ethics can be developed through a combination of the principles of moral obligation and considerations of benefit, while *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* can serve as an important reference for building an AI ethical framework that is more responsive to the context of Muslim society. Within this framework, the protection of religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property is viewed not merely as a legal objective but also as a parameter for evaluating the ethical consequences of a technology.

More specific research regarding the relationship between AI and *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* has also been conducted by Hakim and Shamsuddin (2025). Their study specifically examined the use of ChatGPT by Muslim students at the International Islamic University Malaysia, involving a survey of 83 students as well as interviews with Islamic scholars and AI experts. The study demonstrates that the use of ChatGPT can be analyzed through the principles of *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* and the ethical issues surrounding AI usage within a Muslim context. These findings are significant for the present study, as they indicate that the discussion of AI from an Islamic legal perspective is no longer an entirely unexplored area.

Nevertheless, the study also reveals room for further development. While the study by Hakim and Shamsuddin focuses on the general use of ChatGPT by Muslim students, the present research addresses the ethics of Generative AI usage by learners within an academic context, paying particular attention to academic integrity and the normative boundaries of AI application. This distinction is crucial because the legal issue lies not merely in whether AI is permissible, but in the specific actions learners take when utilizing it. Using AI to brainstorm ideas, seek explanations, edit language, or generate drafts involves different ethical implications—and entails different legal consequences—than submitting an entire AI-generated assignment as one's own work.

A research gap is also evident in the evolving literature on GenAI within Islamic education. Recent studies have begun to explore GenAI integration in Islamic Religious Education, digital ethics, character building, and AI literacy grounded in Islamic values. Research on GenAI integration in Islamic education, for instance, emphasizes the importance of AI literacy, human competence, and ethical governance in technology use (Mukaffan & Siswanto, 2025). Other studies on Islamic character education indicate that while GenAI can support values-based learning, it requires ethical oversight to ensure its use remains consistent with values such as honesty, responsibility, and Islamic character.

Recent scholarship has also begun to propose the *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* framework for AI ethics more broadly. Prabowo et al. (2026), for example, demonstrate that contemporary discourse on AI ethics remains heavily influenced by Western ethical paradigms; they propose *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* as an evaluative framework capable of incorporating Islamic moral, social, and spiritual dimensions. Habib (2025) further develops the discussion on AI ethics based on *maqāṣid*, establishing the protection of religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property as parameters for evaluation.

However, these research developments have not yet fully addressed the more granular issues regarding how learners ought to use GenAI in academic activities and how such ethical boundaries can be formulated within an Islamic legal framework. In other words, there is a gap between macro-level studies on AI ethics and educational studies regarding academic integrity. This gap needs to be filled with an analysis that links the concrete behavior of learners with Islamic legal principles. This is where the present study is situated.

This research proceeds from the assumption that Generative AI (GenAI), as a technology in itself, does not automatically possess a specific legal status; rather, its ethical and legal standing depends on the purpose, method, and extent of user engagement, as well as the consequences of its use. Based on this premise, using GenAI for brainstorming, seeking conceptual explanations, correcting language, or exploring problem-solving alternatives may carry a different legal character than using it to generate entire assignments, cheat on exams, fabricate work, or disseminate unverified religious information. Consequently, a typology is required to distinguish between GenAI applications based on their respective levels of *maṣlaḥah* (public interest/benefit) and *mafsadah* (harm/corruption).

From the perspective of *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* (the higher objectives of Islamic law), such a typology can be developed based on several principles. First, *ḥifẓ al-'aql* (preservation of the intellect), ensuring that GenAI does not undermine the learner's intellectual function. Second, *ḥifẓ al-dīn* (preservation of religion), particularly when AI is used to generate or explain religious knowledge that requires verification against authoritative sources. Third, the principles of *ṣidq* (truthfulness) and *amānah* (trustworthiness), which require learners not to pass off AI-generated work as their own when academic regulations mandate transparency regarding its use. Fourth, the principle of *tabayyun* (verification/clarification), requiring users to verify information generated by AI. Fifth, the principles of *maṣlaḥah* and the prevention of *mafsadah*, guiding the use of technology to ensure that educational benefits outweigh potential harms.

Based on this framework, the study's novelty lies in its formulation of an ethics of GenAI usage for learners, achieved by integrating principles of academic integrity with *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*. Rather than merely questioning whether GenAI usage is permissible in Islam, this research seeks to establish a normative classification based on usage patterns. This research aims to establish an understanding that the use of Generative AI (GenAI) exists along a spectrum: ranging from a justifiable learning aid to a technology requiring regulation when it begins to diminish intellectual independence, and finally to a means of cheating that contravenes principles of honesty and trustworthiness. This perspective differs from approaches that view AI in binary terms—as either permissible (*halal*) or forbidden (*haram*).

Research Method

This study is a normative legal study characterized as library research. A normative legal approach is employed because the study focuses on examining Islamic legal norms, principles, concepts, and arguments regarding the ethics of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) usage by students. In normative research, library materials serve not merely as sources of information but as legal materials analyzed to derive arguments and normative formulations concerning specific legal issues (Rohman et al., 2024). This approach is relevant to contemporary Islamic

legal research because technological advancements give rise to new issues that lack explicit provisions in textual sources; thus, a legal interpretation is required that bridges norms with the context of social and technological change.

This study employs both a conceptual approach and a *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* approach. The conceptual approach is used to examine and clarify the concepts of Generative AI, technology usage ethics, academic integrity, and the principle of user responsibility in educational activities. The *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* approach serves as the primary analytical framework for assessing the objectives, benefits, risks, and consequences of GenAI usage in relation to the goals of Islamic law. Utilizing *maqāṣid* as an approach in Islamic legal research is relevant for analyzing contemporary issues that evolve with the times and lack specific textual rulings (Fajri, 2022). The *maqāṣid* approach also enables a more contextual legal analysis while maintaining a connection to the fundamental objectives of Sharia.

Data collection involved documentary study and systematic literature searches across relevant academic databases and scholarly sources. The identified literature was then screened for alignment with the research focus. Selected materials were classified into five main themes: (1) characteristics and forms of GenAI usage by learners; (2) academic ethics and integrity; (3) ethical principles in Islamic law; (4) *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah*; and (5) the benefits (*maslahat*) and harms (*mafsadat*) associated with GenAI usage. This thematic categorization ensured that the analysis went beyond merely describing technological developments, enabling the establishment of an argumentative link between GenAI usage practices and Islamic legal principles.

Results and discussions

Generative AI as a Learning Tool and Ethical Issue

A review of the literature indicates that Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) possesses an ambivalent nature within education. GenAI can serve as a tool that helps learners obtain explanations, develop ideas, edit content, translate text, and receive feedback. At the same time, the technology is capable of producing academic outputs that substantially replace the learners' own intellectual work. A systematic review of 407 publications regarding GenAI in education reveals that research on the technology has evolved around themes such as applications, impacts, adoption, user experiences, and ethical implications and risks. Consequently, the central issue is no longer whether GenAI is present in education, but rather how the technology is positioned within the relationship between humans, knowledge, and the learning process (Yusuf et al., 2024).

In the context of learners, the use of GenAI can be distinguished based on the level of engagement with the academic process. At the first level, GenAI is used as an aid—for instance, to explore alternative ideas, explain concepts that are not yet understood, translate terms, or correct linguistic errors. At the second level, GenAI serves as a learning companion—such as by facilitating Q&A simulations, providing feedback on drafts, or helping learners develop arguments. At the third level, GenAI acts as a substitute for intellectual activity; this occurs when a significant portion or the entirety of an academic assignment is generated by AI and subsequently submitted as the learner's own work. This final level represents the most problematic area, as the technology no longer supports the learning process but instead takes over activities that ought to serve as a means for developing learner competence.

Lin and Chiu (2024), through a scoping review of 32 empirical studies, demonstrate that GenAI offers opportunities—such as rapid, diverse feedback that supports self-assessment—while simultaneously raising concerns regarding academic integrity. They emphasize the need to transform assessment methods so that learning continues to foster self-regulated learning, responsible learning, and learner integrity. These findings indicate that the educational value of GenAI cannot be determined solely by its technological capabilities; rather, its value depends on whether the technology reinforces or undermines learning objectives. Thus, the use of

GenAI must be understood as an ethical issue regarding the use of tools, rather than merely a technological one. The same technology can yield different consequences when employed for different purposes. AI used to assist learners in understanding material differs in nature from AI used to generate entire assignments while concealing its use. This distinction in purpose serves as a crucial basis for ethical and Islamic legal assessment.

In Islamic law, technology is fundamentally a *wasilah* (means). Consequently, the legal assessment of technology cannot be separated from the purpose and manner of its use. This principle allows for a distinction between means that generate *maslahat* (public interest or benefit) and those that lead to *mafsadat* (harm or corruption). These findings align with research by Hakim and Shamsuddin (2024), which examined the use of ChatGPT by Muslim students at the International Islamic University Malaysia. That study involved 83 students and interviews with Islamic scholars and AI experts. The results showed that 93.8% of respondents viewed the use of ChatGPT as permissible; however, the researchers emphasized that this permissibility is context-dependent—meaning it relies on the purpose and impact of its use. They also highlighted the importance of critical thinking, understanding AI's limitations, and maintaining human judgment when using the technology. These findings establish that the legal status of Generative AI (GenAI) usage cannot be absolutely categorized as simply *halal* (permissible) or *haram* (forbidden). In principle, using AI to obtain explanations, assist the learning process, or improve the quality of learning is acceptable, provided it does not involve prohibited elements. Conversely, when AI is used for cheating, fraud, manipulation, or to cause harm, its legal status shifts according to the nature of the act itself.

In this context, the *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence) maxim *al-umūr bi maqāṣidihā*—which holds that an action is judged based on its intent or purpose—serves as a starting point for distinguishing between different uses of AI. However, purpose alone is insufficient; the manner of use and the consequences must also be taken into account. Thus, the legal analysis of GenAI in this study employs three dimensions: purpose (*qaṣd*), means/method (*wasilah*), and consequences (*ma'āl*). Based on these three dimensions, GenAI usage can be classified into several categories. First, usage intended to assist in understanding material, generating ideas, or obtaining feedback may be deemed *mubāḥ* (permissible), provided it does not violate academic regulations and maintains the learner's intellectual engagement. Secondly, usage that demonstrably enhances the quality of learning and yields significant benefits may be deemed *mandūb* (commendable) if there is a compelling public interest (*maslahah*). Thirdly, usage that fosters dependency and impairs cognitive abilities may become *makrūh* (disliked/discouraged) when negative impacts begin to predominate. Fourthly, the use of AI to commit fraud, fabricate work, deceive evaluators, or gain academic advantage through dishonest means may fall into the *harām* (forbidden) category, as it involves elements of deception and a violation of academic integrity. Thus, this study does not conclude that "Generative AI is *halal* (permissible) *per se*"; rather, it posits that the ruling on the use of Generative AI depends on the nature of the specific act of usage. This distinction is crucial because the actual subject of the legal ruling is human action, not the algorithm as a technology.

Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah Analysis of Generative AI Usage

Maqāṣid al-sharī'ah provides a comprehensive framework for explaining why certain uses of GenAI are acceptable while others require restriction. Habib (2025) demonstrates that *maqāṣid* can be utilized to construct an AI ethics framework that considers the protection of religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property. In the context of technology, this approach allows AI-related issues to be analyzed not only in terms of technical benefits but also regarding their moral and social consequences.

a. *Ḥifẓ al-'Aql*: Protection of the Intellect and Intellectual Autonomy

The dimension most directly related to education is *ḥifẓ al-'aql*. In the context of learning, protecting the intellect entails more than merely preventing physical harm to cognitive abilities; substantively, it signifies preserving and developing human capacities for understanding, reasoning, evaluating, and decision-making. GenAI presents a paradox regarding this objective. When used as a learning assistant, AI can help learners explore various explanations and expand the range of problem-solving possibilities. However, if the entire thinking process is offloaded to AI, learners risk losing the opportunity to develop their intellectual capabilities.

Therefore, the use of GenAI that aligns with *ḥifẓ al-'aql* is not one that maximizes the volume of work AI can complete, but rather one that maximizes human learning. Learners must still engage in the processes of understanding, verifying, comparing, critiquing, and drawing conclusions. AI serves as a *wasīlah* (means), while the human remains the primary epistemic subject. This finding aligns with UNESCO (2023) recommendations, which position a human-centric approach as a crucial principle for utilizing GenAI in education and research. AI usage should support human capacity rather than eliminate the human role in the educational process.

b. *Ḥifẓ al-Dīn*: Preserving Religious Knowledge and Understanding

The dimension of *ḥifẓ al-dīn* (preservation of religion) becomes increasingly significant when Generative AI (GenAI) is utilized in Islamic religious education. GenAI systems can generate answers regarding the Qur'an, Hadith, *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence), Islamic history, and various religious issues. However, the ability to produce seemingly convincing answers does not elevate AI to the status of a religious authority. This issue necessitates the principle of *tabayyun*—the practice of verification before accepting and disseminating information. In this context, learners should not uncritically accept AI-generated answers concerning religious matters. Such answers must be cross-referenced with the Qur'an, Hadith, credible scholarly texts or literature, and the opinions of authoritative religious scholars or sources. This principle is crucial because errors made by AI in generating religious information can have more serious consequences than errors in general information. If erroneous information is accepted as religious knowledge, it can adversely affect a learner's religious understanding and practice. Thus, the use of GenAI for religious learning can be considered beneficial if it serves as a tool for initial exploration, provided it is accompanied by human verification and consultation with authoritative sources. Within the framework of *ḥifẓ al-dīn*, AI cannot replace the scholarly authority of teachers, religious scholars, or primary Islamic sources.

c. *Ṣidq* and *Amānah*: Foundations of Academic Ethics

The principles of *ṣidq* (truthfulness) and *amānah* (trustworthiness) introduce a vital moral dimension to the use of GenAI. Academic honesty requires learners to avoid misrepresenting the processes and outcomes of their work. If an assignment is generated entirely by AI but claimed as the learner's own work, a discrepancy arises between reality and its academic representation. In this context, a learner's moral obligation does not entail rejecting all AI assistance. What matters most is honesty regarding the extent of AI involvement. If academic regulations mandate the disclosure of AI usage, learners are obliged to make such disclosures. Conversely, if AI is used solely to check grammar or suggest alternative ideas, its contribution differs from AI that generates the core substance of an assignment. Consequently, educational policies regarding GenAI should address not only prohibitions but also transparency in AI usage. This principle aligns with the need for GenAI governance that prioritizes human responsibility and integrity as essential components of technology use.

AI generates → human verifies → authoritative source confirms → student concludes.

This sequence positions AI as an initial source of information rather than a final authority. Through this approach, students retain epistemic responsibility for the knowledge they use. This principle also reinforces the objective of *ḥifẓ al-'aql* (the protection of intellect) within the framework of *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*. Verification is not merely a technical procedure

for identifying errors in AI-generated responses; rather, it constitutes an intellectual activity that strengthens students' critical thinking abilities. Based on the synthesis of academic integrity principles and *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*, this study develops the following normative typology of GenAI use:

Form of Use	Character	Ethical-Legal Assessment
Searching for ideas/topics	AI as a source of initial ideas	<i>Mubāḥ</i> (permissible)
Requesting conceptual explanations	AI as a learning assistant	<i>Mubāḥ</i> (permissible)
Language correction/translation	Technical assistance	<i>Mubāḥ</i> (permissible)
Question-and-answer simulation	Supporting learning practice	<i>Mubāḥ/mandūb</i> (permissible/recommended)
Developing a draft with critical revision	AI provides assistance while human input remains dominant	<i>Mubāḥ</i> (permissible)
Generating most of an assignment without verification	Intellectual dependence	<i>Makrūḥ</i> /problematic (discouraged/problematic)
Generating an entire assignment and claiming it as one's own work	Academic misrepresentation	<i>Ḥarām</i> (prohibited)
Using AI to cheat in examinations/assessments	Deliberate academic misconduct	<i>Ḥarām</i> (prohibited)
Using AI to generate religious information without verification	Risk of religious misinformation	Ethically unjustifiable; may become <i>ḥarām</i> if it causes misguidance or harm

Table 1. Normative Typology of Generative AI Use from an Islamic Legal and Ethical Perspective

This typology demonstrates that the ethical boundary of GenAI lies in the shift of its function from an “assistive tool” to a “substitute for human academic responsibility.” As long as humans remain in control of the intellectual process, the use of AI can still be directed toward *maṣlaḥah* (benefit). Conversely, when AI is used to avoid learning obligations, deceive evaluators, or falsely represent students' actual competencies, such use loses its ethical and legal legitimacy.

In the context of this study, academic integrity should not be understood merely as an institutional administrative rule. Integrity constitutes a form of educational *maṣlaḥah* (public interest or beneficial outcome) because the educational process aims not only to produce academic outputs but also to shape the capabilities, character, and sense of responsibility of learners.

If a learner uses AI to complete an assignment without understanding the material, they gain a short-term advantage in terms of time efficiency. However, in the long run, this entails *mafsadah* (harm or detriment)—specifically, diminished competence, technological dependency, and a discrepancy between academic grades and actual ability. Thus, a short-term benefit is not always synonymous with *maṣlaḥah* from the perspective of *maqāṣid* (higher objectives).

This is where the concepts of *maṣlaḥah* and *mafsadah* become crucial. Legal assessment cannot rely solely on the question “Does AI help?”; it must expand to ask, “Helps achieve what

goal, and with what consequences?” AI that assists learners in understanding material offers pedagogical *maṣlaḥah*. Conversely, AI that enables learners to achieve high grades without studying may yield short-term instrumental benefits but results in long-term educational *mafsadah*.

Therefore, the following principle can be formulated: The greater GenAI’s contribution to the human learning process, the stronger the legitimacy of its use; conversely, the more GenAI replaces human intellectual processes and fosters academic dishonesty, the stronger the grounds for restricting or prohibiting it. This principle aligns with the findings of Lin and Chiu (2024), who argue that the educational response to GenAI should focus on responsible learning and integrity rather than merely banning the technology.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) by students cannot be categorically classified as either permissible or prohibited in Islamic law. Its ethical and legal status depends on the purpose, manner, degree of human involvement, and consequences of its use. As a technological *wasilah* (means), GenAI is not inherently prohibited; rather, its legal status follows the nature and consequences of the human action in which it is employed. The use of GenAI to support learning, such as exploring ideas, understanding concepts, practicing, translating, or receiving feedback, is generally permissible as long as it does not violate academic regulations or replace the student’s intellectual responsibility. Conversely, using GenAI to cheat, misrepresent AI-generated work as one’s own, deceive evaluators, or circumvent academic obligations constitutes a violation of the principles of *ṣidq* (honesty) and *amānah* (trustworthiness) and may therefore be considered *ḥarām*. The analysis through the framework of *maqāṣid al-sharī’ah* further demonstrates that *ḥifẓ al-’aql* (protection of intellect) is particularly relevant to the educational use of GenAI. Technology should strengthen rather than replace students’ intellectual capacities, including their ability to understand, analyze, evaluate, and formulate conclusions independently. In addition, *ḥifẓ al-dīn* (protection of religion) becomes important when GenAI is used to obtain religious information. AI-generated religious information should therefore be subjected to *tabayyun*, namely careful verification against authoritative and reliable sources.

Declaration of AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

In preparing this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI), Consensus, and Perplexity as AI-assisted tools during the research and writing process. These tools were used primarily to assist with brainstorming and organizing ideas, identifying relevant scholarly literature, improving language and sentence structure, translating text, and supporting the preliminary exploration of academic sources. The use of these tools did not replace the authors’ intellectual contribution or scholarly judgment. All information, references, arguments, and AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed and independently verified by the authors against the original and authoritative sources before being incorporated into the manuscript. The authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, academic integrity, interpretation of sources, and overall content of this article. Any errors, omissions, or inaccuracies that may remain in the manuscript are solely the responsibility of the authors. ChatGPT, Consensus, and Perplexity were used solely as assistive technologies and were not involved in authorship, decision-making, or the final interpretation of the research findings. The final manuscript represents the authors’ own scholarly analysis, judgment, and responsibility.

CRedit Authorship Contribution Statement

Authorship contributions are reported following the CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) system. Each author’s specific role in the research and writing process should be

identified clearly.

- a. Arif Jamaluddin Malik: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis
- b. Ahmad Sayyidiman Hamidalloh: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Writing Original Draft, and Writing Review & Editing.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the research, analysis, interpretation, or publication of this article. The authors also declare that there are no institutional, professional, or other conflicts of interest that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the study.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all parties who contributed to the completion of this research and manuscript. Special appreciation is extended to the colleagues who provided valuable insights, constructive feedback, and scholarly guidance throughout the research and writing process. The authors also acknowledge the support of the institution and academic community that facilitated access to relevant literature and resources. Finally, the authors are grateful to all individuals whose intellectual and academic contributions, directly or indirectly, supported the completion of this study.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. As this research employs a normative juridical approach and library research method, the primary materials consist of publicly accessible legal texts, Islamic legal sources, scholarly publications, and relevant policy documents. No personally identifiable or confidential participant data were collected or used in this study.

Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The research and preparation of this manuscript were conducted independently by the authors without external financial support.

Ethical Approval Statement

This study did not require ethical approval from an institutional review board or research ethics committee because it employed a normative juridical and library research approach. The study did not involve human participants, personal data, interviews, surveys, experiments, or interventions. The analysis was based exclusively on publicly available legal sources, Islamic legal literature, scholarly publications, and relevant policy documents. All sources were appropriately acknowledged and cited in accordance with academic integrity standards.

Bibliography

- Akmal, N. A., Rasyad, Salasiyah, C. I., Yunus, F. M., & Syahabuddin, K. (2026). Artificial intelligence in Islamic fatwa: A Maqasid al-Shariah and Hadith perspective. *Jurnal Ilmiah Al-Mu'ashirah: Media Kajian Al-Qur'an dan Al-Hadits Multi Perspektif*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.22373/jim.v23i1.33789>
- Alamsyah, M. F., Yayuli, & Remanda, A. (2025). Ethics of the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the paradigm of Islamic law. *Solo International Collaboration and Publication of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.61455/sicopus.v4i01.393>

- Al Kubaisi, A. A. S. H. (2024). Ethics of artificial intelligence: A purposeful and foundational study in light of the Sunnah of Prophet Muhammad. *Religions*, 15(11), 1300. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15111300>
- Aboalshamat, K. T. (2024). ChatGPT unveiled: Understanding perceptions of academic integrity in higher education—A qualitative approach. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23, 1171–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09543-6>
- Auda, J. (2008). *Maqasid al-Shariah as philosophy of Islamic law: A systems approach*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2024). ChatGPT in higher education: A systematic literature review and research challenges. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 125, 102411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102411>
- Bhullar, P. S., Joshi, M., & Chugh, R. (2024). ChatGPT in higher education: A synthesis of the literature and a future research agenda. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 21501–21522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12723-x>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- 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*, 219, 105224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105224>
- Elmahjub, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI) in Islamic ethics: Towards pluralist ethical benchmarking for AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, 36, Article 73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-023-00668-x>
- Habib, Z. (2025). Ethics of artificial intelligence in Maqāṣid al-Sharī‘a’s perspective. *KARSA Journal of Social and Islamic Culture*, 33(1), 105–134. <https://doi.org/10.19105/karsa.v33i1.19617>
- International Islamic Fiqh Academy. (2025). *Artificial intelligence: Its rulings, guidelines, and ethics (Resolution No. 258 [3/26])*. International Islamic Fiqh Academy. <https://iifa-ai.fi/en/56035.html>
- Johnston, H., Wells, R. F., Shanks, E. M., Boey, T., & Parsons, B. A. (2024). Student perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence technologies in higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 20, Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00149-4>
- Kannike, U. M. M., & Fahm, A. O. (2025). Exploring the ethical governance of artificial intelligence from an Islamic ethical perspective. *Jurnal Fiqh*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.22452/fiqh.vol22no1.5>
- Ogunleye, B., Zakariyyah, K. I., Ajao, O., Olayinka, O., & Sharma, H. (2024). A systematic review of generative AI for teaching and learning practice. *Education Sciences*, 14(6), 636. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060636>
- Strzelecki, A. (2024). Understanding the diffusion of AI-generative (ChatGPT) in higher education: Does students’ integrity matter? *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 14, 100402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2024.100402>
- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10, Article 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>
- Xia, Q., Weng, X., Ouyang, F., Lin, T. J., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). A scoping review on how generative artificial intelligence transforms assessment in higher education. *International*

Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21, Article 40.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00468-z>

Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., Román-González, M., & Noor, N. M. (2024). Generative AI in education and research: A systematic mapping review. *Review of Education*, 12(2), e3489.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3489>