



Islamic Educational Ethics on AI in Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Saudi Arabia: Comparative Study Analysis Using Maqasid Enlightened AMANAH Framework

Naved Alam^{*1} , Tania Hossain² , Riaz Ahmad¹ , Naveela Rehman¹

¹ Aligarh Muslim University, India

² Waseda University, Japan

Received : March 21, 2025

Revised : April 28, 2025

Accepted : September 15, 2025

Online : December 31, 2025

Abstract

Research pertaining to artificial intelligence (AI) in education has scrutinized customization, teacher facilitation, data oversight, and human agency, in contrast to Islamic education studies, which highlight faith, moral development, and interpretive diversity. The association between both sectors is poorly delineated: broad AI ethics do not inherently specify their implementation in religious instruction, and the Islamic educational discourse has not established a distinctly operational, comparative model. This qualitative conceptual study seeks to bridge the gap by doing a structured analysis of nine public policy and governance texts: national AI strategies or recommendations from Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Saudi Arabia, as well as UNESCO and OECD guidelines. Documents were selectively chosen for their significance, public traceability, and nation representation, and then comparatively categorized for governance, inclusivity, data security, human agency, and cultural or religious context. The investigation uncovers three patterns: national frameworks set forth extensive AI objectives but rarely articulate safeguards for Islamic education; international directives furnish useful principles yet leave their religious-pedagogical application ambiguous; thus, responsible adoption is contingent upon local institutional interpretation, educator mediation, and accountable data practices. The manuscript suggests AMANAH as a normative paradigm consisting of accountability, masalahah-driven design, trust and privacy, refined hermeneutics, accessibility and equity, and human governance. AMANAH is a theoretical construct resulting from document synthesis; it remains unverified empirically and fails to establish the effects of AI on academic performance.

Keywords: *AI Ethics in Islamic Education, Maqasid Al-Shariah Framework, Comparative Qualitative Study, Educational AI Governance, Adaptive Learning, Human Oversight*

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence and adaptive learning technologies are infiltrating the educational sector via tutoring platforms, automated evaluations, material suggestions, learning analytics, and generative assistants. These programs can assist instructors in recognizing learning requirements and provide supplementary practice, although they also gather sensitive information, influence knowledge accessibility, and may generate results that are challenging to elucidate or validate. UNESCO's policy directives and its recommendations for generative AI highlight the need of human agency, inclusivity, age-appropriate usage, and institutional endorsement, rather than supposing that mere technological proficiency renders an educational tool advantageous (Miao et al., 2021; Miao & Holmes, 2023). Systematic reviews also delineate a domain characterized by varied applications and ongoing inquiries regarding assessment, ethics, and the function of educators (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Beyond these policy texts, scholarship on AI in education has cautioned that claims about personalization are often shaped by technical and commercial

Copyright Holder:

© Alam, Hossain, Ahmad & Rehman. (2025)

Corresponding author's email: navedelt@icloud.com

This Article is Licensed Under:



expectations rather than by evidence of improved learning, and that the field has a longer history whose assumptions and politics merit critical scrutiny (Selwyn, 2019; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). Ethical analyses specific to education likewise stress that the risks of AI are not limited to data misuse but extend to questions of pedagogy, learner autonomy, and the values embedded in system design (Holmes et al., 2022).

These inquiries assume a specific structure within Islamic education. Acquisition of knowledge may encompass Arabic and Qur'anic studies, legal theory, moral contemplation, and the development of spiritual comprehension. A system that provides articulate yet erroneous responses, conceals its references, or asserts a singular interpretation as universally applicable might influence both education and the perceived legitimacy of religious understanding. Islamic ethical reasoning provides pertinent principles such as the safeguarding of human dignity, equity, trustworthiness, communal welfare, and the avoidance of damage. Maqasid al-Shariah offers a goal-oriented framework to evaluate if a practice promotes human and societal welfare, acknowledging that its implementation necessitates contextual scholarly discernment (Auda, 2008). Two domains of academic inquiry converge, yet remain inadequately integrated. Policy frameworks for AI in education address issues of privacy, equity, openness, human agency, and inclusivity. Discussions on Islamic education focus on epistemological authority, ethical objectives, and interpretive legacies. The disparity does not stem from a deficiency of overarching principles; rather, it arises from the absence of a comparative, functional framework for integrating such values into AI-enhanced Islamic education under various policy environments. Current assertions regarding certain AI implementations at Islamic educational institutions are inconsistently recorded. The current document does not include unconfirmed accounts of school pilots as substantiation.

This research tackles the deficiency by conducting a comparative qualitative analysis of publicly accessible AI policy and governance documents from Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Saudi Arabia, in conjunction with worldwide educational and AI ethics frameworks.

It inquires:

1. What ethical and governance priorities are illuminated by the chosen documents?
2. What requirements remain unarticulated when these priorities are implemented in Islamic education?
3. How might reasoning inspired by Maqasid structure a pragmatic ethical framework?

The submission presents a suggested AMANAH framework for institutional evaluation and forthcoming empirical research. The examination is theoretical and reliant on documentation; it does not purport to reflect the perspectives of educators, learners, decision-makers, or theological experts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Artificial Intelligence and personalized learning in academia:

Artificial Intelligence in education encompasses various technologies and functions, hence assertions regarding its advantages must be linked to the specific system and educational objectives being examined. Adaptive learning generally employs student data to modify the order, speed, complexity, or format of educational tasks. Artificial intelligence can assist with feedback, resource suggestions, or instructional planning; however, an examination of higher education studies revealed that a significant portion of the literature emphasizes technical implementations and institutional services, while neglecting the pedagogical responsibilities of educators and the situational context (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). UNESCO likewise warns that AI can enhance education while simultaneously presenting challenges related to equity, privacy, accessibility, and human autonomy (Miao et al., 2021). These results endorse conditional assertions instead of universal ones: adaptive instruments can be beneficial, although results are contingent upon

design, execution, and assessment.

Ethics of artificial intelligence and Islamic pedagogy

Global AI regulatory frameworks align on tenets including human rights, transparency, resilience, accountability, and inclusivity. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence associates AI governance with principles of dignity, diversity, equity, and human supervision (UNESCO, 2021a). Its recommendations for education and research advocate for institutional validation and protections tailored to the age and context of learners (Miao & Holmes, 2023). The OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence highlights the importance of inclusive growth, human-centric values, transparency, resilience, and accountability (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2019). These tools establish a robust foundation; nonetheless, they fail to resolve issues regarding the authority of religious sources, conflicts among interpretive traditions, or the demarcation between educational support and religious adjudication.

Maqasid-informed analysis provides a framework to inquire about the purpose of an AI-assisted activity and its beneficiaries. Auda (2008) articulates maqasid as a systematic interpretation of the objectives and societal benefits of Islamic jurisprudence. When applied to educational technology, this methodology can inform inquiries on the safeguarding of intellectual property and dignity, the dependability of disseminated information, equitable access, and the implications of gathering learner data. It does not generate a solitary automated decision nor supplant expert analysis. It provides a prescriptive framework for human contemplation regarding system architecture and administration.

Analysis-based inclusion

The research employs three supplementary perspectives. Maqasid al-Shariah offers a normative framework: evaluate intended advantages, possible detriments, dignity, and equity. The AI principles established by UNESCO and OECD delineate governance standards: accountability, transparency, data privacy, inclusivity, and human agency. The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge framework identifies accountability in teaching methods by highlighting the connections between technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Collectively, these lenses shape a coding framework for the document examination and the ensuing AMANAH proposal. They are regarded as distinct theories: maqasid establishes the ethical objective, AI governance implements it through systemic protections, and TPACK emphasizes the educational choices retained by educators and institutions. TPACK builds on Shulman's (1986) notion of pedagogical content knowledge, which holds that effective teaching requires an understanding of how particular subject matter can be made comprehensible to learners. By adding technological knowledge to this model, TPACK highlights that decisions about a tool cannot be separated from decisions about content and teaching method (Koehler & Mishra, 2009). In Islamic education, the content domain includes not only factual information but also interpretive methods and ethical formation, which makes the educator's integrative judgment especially important.

METHODOLOGY

Research design and scope

This research employs a qualitative comparative document analysis alongside a conceptual framework creation approach. Records constitute the information. This paper does not involve interviews, surveys, observations, participant quotations, or actual case studies at the school level. Document analysis is suitable for investigating how policy documents articulate priorities, responsibilities, and risks, necessitating consideration of authorship, intent, audience, and context (Bowen, 2009). Policy documents are particularly suitable for this kind of analysis because they are

relatively stable, publicly accessible, and produced independently of the research, which reduces the risk of researcher influence on the data (Bowen, 2009). However, policy scholarship also cautions that policy texts are the outcome of negotiation and compromise and are interpreted, contested, and reworked as they move into institutional practice (Ball, 1993). Treating the documents as statements of intent, rather than as descriptions of practice, is therefore a deliberate analytical choice of this study.

The analysis is confined to four country settings selected from the initial study parameters: Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Saudi Arabia. They offer diversity in religious-demographic settings and in the structuring of national AI aspirations. Thailand exemplifies a scenario where Muslims constitute a national minority; conversely, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Saudi Arabia possess mostly Muslim demographics. The comparison is not intended to prioritize countries or deduce national practices from a strategic statement. It analyzes the content of the chosen policy documents and identifies what they articulate and what remains ambiguous regarding Islamic education. These settings also differ in how Islamic education is organized. Indonesia hosts an extensive network of pesantren and madrasah that operate alongside, and partly within, the national education system (Hefner & Zaman, 2007). In southern Thailand, Islamic schooling has developed within a Muslim-majority region of a Buddhist-majority state, where questions of language, identity, and state-led reform have shaped educational provision (Liow, 2009). Such variation means that the same national AI principle may carry different implications depending on the institutional and community context in which Islamic education takes place.

Selection of material

A deliberate, criterion-driven selection method was employed. The principal collection consists of nine public policy or governance documents: Thailand's national AI strategy or action plan; Malaysia's National Artificial Intelligence Roadmap and National Guidelines on AI Governance and Ethics; Indonesia's National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence; Saudi Arabia's National Strategy for Data and AI; UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence along with its guidance for educational policy and generative AI in education; and the OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence. Documents were incorporated when they were released by a national or intergovernmental entity, namely pertaining to AI strategy, AI ethics, or educational governance, and could be traced back to a public official or institutional origin.

The four national papers were chosen to offer a comparable policy framework, rather than serving as substitutes for Islamic educational practices. The evaluation was conducted based on three standards: pertinence to AI governance or education, identifiable institutional authorship, and direct applicability to at least one analytical field. Unsubstantiated assertions and insufficient citations in the previous version were omitted. Academic references regarding maqasid, TPACK, document analysis, thematic analysis, and previous AI-in-education studies guided the interpretation but were not considered supplementary national policy papers. The research constitutes a targeted comparative examination instead of a systematic review, so it does not assert comprehensive retrieval or statistical representativeness.

Research Methodology

The analysis adhered to a clear progression. Initially, every document was thoroughly examined in its whole or via its official executive summary and policy segments, while bibliographic information and the producing organization were recorded. Secondly, pertinent excerpts were incorporated into a comparative matrix and categorized according to five foundational domains: (1) governance and accountability; (2) inclusion and access; (3) data protection and transparency; (4) human agency and educator capacity; and (5) cultural, linguistic, or religious context.

Third, inductive subcodes were incorporated where the papers highlighted specific concerns, such as national capacity enhancement, risk mitigation, or sector-oriented execution. Fourth, the matrix was analyzed across the four national contexts and international directives to discern similarities, discrepancies, and gaps. Ultimately, the ideas were evaluated through the three analytical perspectives and incorporated into the suggested framework. This method employs a thematic framework for documentary content (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The examination was performed by a single investigator. No statistic for inter-coder reliability or assertion of saturation is suitable for this limited document corpus. To facilitate an audit trail, the document delineates the inclusion criteria, corpus, coding domains, and inferential boundaries. The emphasis on an audit trail reflects established criteria for trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry, particularly dependability and confirmability, which require that analytic decisions be documented so that readers can follow and evaluate the reasoning (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Nowell et al., 2017). Because the coding was undertaken by one researcher, the analysis is best understood as a reflexive interpretation of the documents rather than an attempt to establish coding consensus, consistent with reflexive approaches to thematic analysis that treat researcher subjectivity as a resource to be made transparent rather than a bias to be eliminated (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

Interpretations were maintained separately from the assertions within documents: the articulated goals of a national plan are not seen as proof of policy execution or the realization of educational

Principles and constraints of the design

The research examines public records and did not involve human subjects or utilize confidential learner information; thus, it does not disclose participant consent or institutional review board permission. The examination is constrained by the range and linguistic accessibility of the documents, by variances in their objectives and content, and by the lack of information regarding school-level implementation. The interpretation by a solitary researcher may influence the choice of themes. These limitations restrict the reliability of the analyzed traceable text and hinder judgments regarding genuine adoption, stakeholder experiences, or learning outcomes.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The subsequent discoveries are themes derived from the chosen policy and governance papers. They do not pertain to interview topics or empirical findings on Islamic educational institutions. The analysis reveals the priorities of the scriptures and indicates where further interpretation is necessary prior to implementing overarching AI policy concepts in Islamic education.

National initiatives create conducive environments yet fail to delineate protections for Islamic education.

The national documents delineate AI chiefly in terms of national capacity, infrastructure, economic and social advancement, governance, or extensive sectoral uses. Thailand's action plan for 2022–2027 establishes a national framework for the advancement and utilization of AI (National Electronics and Computer Technology Center [NECTEC], 2022). Malaysia's strategic plan outlines a national development framework; however its subsequent governance and ethical directives offer a clearer focus on responsible AI (Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation [MOSTI], 2021, 2024).

Indonesia's policy for 2020–2045 positions AI as integral to national development (Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology [BPPT], 2020). Saudi Arabia's approach

integrates data and artificial intelligence with its national transformation objectives ([Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority \[SDAIA\], 2020](#)). The examination revealed an absence of a unified, comprehensive approach to Islamic education as a specific high-sensitivity application. This represents a gap in the analyzed corpus, not evidence that necessary protections are absent in other contexts.

The pragmatic consequence is that organizations cannot presume that a comprehensive national AI policy provides guidelines for validating religious sources, interpretative diversity, or limitations on automated religious counsel. This omission is understandable, given that national strategies are written for entire economies and societies rather than for particular educational traditions. It nonetheless leaves Islamic educational institutions to interpret general provisions on their own, often without the technical, legal, or financial capacity available to larger public institutions.

Principles of international governance are pertinent but necessitate contextual adaptation

UNESCO and OECD recommendations constantly emphasize human-centric principles, inclusivity, openness, accountability, and protective measures for learners ([Miao et al., 2021](#); [Miao & Holmes, 2023](#); [OECD, 2019](#); [UNESCO, 2021a](#)). These principles tackle many dangers highlighted in the manuscript's subject, namely ambiguous results, data utilization, and inequitable access. Nonetheless, their overall phrasing fails to delineate how an institution ought to record the origins of religious sources, articulate valid interpretive dissent, or ascertain when an AI-generated response necessitates consultation with a trained educator or expert. The writings serve as an ethical foundation rather than a comprehensive paradigm for Islamic educational governance. This finding echoes the broader critique that ethical principles, however widely shared, require mediating mechanisms before they can guide concrete decisions ([Mittelstadt, 2019](#)). In this case, the missing mediation concerns the religious-pedagogical layer: who is qualified to judge an AI-generated explanation of a Qur'anic verse or a juristic ruling, and on what basis.

Human facilitation connects system protections with expertise.

The emphasis on human agency in the policy guidance, along with the TPACK framework's focus on the interplay of technology, pedagogy, and content, underscores a fundamental institutional obligation: educators must evaluate the appropriateness of a tool for specific learning objectives ([Miao & Holmes, 2023](#); [Mishra & Koehler, 2006](#)).

In Islamic education, this encompasses assessing the quality of sources, delineating the boundaries of created or adapted results, and maintaining teacher accountability for interpretation and ethical development.

This represents an analytical inference derived from the materials and framework, rather than a quantifiable conclusion regarding teaching methods. The point is reinforced by research on generative AI, which notes that fluent outputs may contain fabricated or unverifiable content and that users may over-trust such outputs when they appear coherent ([Bender et al., 2021](#)). In settings where religious knowledge is involved, the teacher's role as a mediator who verifies sources, explains context, and models critical engagement is therefore not a peripheral safeguard but a central pedagogical function ([Holmes et al., 2022](#)).

Equity and data stewardship are interrelated responsibilities, not opposing duties

The agreements' pledges to inclusivity and reliable AI suggest that access and data security must be regarded in conjunction. Adaptive learning may necessitate learner data; however, disparities in device or connectivity availability can restrict the beneficiaries of digital offerings. The examination thus regards data minimization, informed permission, explicit retention, available

alternatives, and a pathway to human support as interconnected governance necessities. The corpus endorses them as design inquiries; it does not ascertain if any particular nation's Islamic schools presently fulfill or neglect them.

Comparative analysis

The four national plans provide varied policy environments, although the documentary evidence fails to endorse a simplistic description of “advanced,” “moderate,” or “weak” adoption in Islamic education. The subsequent comparison delineates the policy priorities apparent in the selected texts and the ongoing challenge confronting educational institutions.

Context	Emphasis on policy content within chosen document(s)	Examination of the regulatory framework for Islamic education
Thailand	National priorities for AI development and implementation in the 2022–2027 strategic plans.	In what manner might overarching strategies be adapted for educational environments catering to minority Muslim populations and their native languages?
Malaysia	National AI strategy, accompanied by national AI regulatory and ethical frameworks.	In what manner should overarching ethical directives consider the integrity of religious sources and the diversity of interpretations?
Indonesia	Prolonged national AI strategy associated with national development objectives.	What institutional mechanisms link national goals with local pesantren and madrasah environments?
Saudi Arabia	National data and artificial intelligence plan synchronized with national transformation objectives.	What methods can be employed to harmonize institutional scale with transparency, human evaluation, and scholarly diversity?

Note: These represent characterizations of the chosen policy texts, rather than evaluations of national execution or data concerning specific schools.

The AMANAH Framework

The study endorses a suggested structure that links Islamic ethical objectives with educational and AI regulatory protections. AMANAH represents a normative synthesis rather than a tool evaluated by students or educational entities. Its six facets are intended to facilitate pre-deployment assessment, continuous oversight, and subsequent empirical analysis.

Assessment	Significance	Operational inquiries for organizations
A — Accountability	Designated accountability,	Who grants approval for the tool? Who is capable of examining its sources,

Assessment	Significance	Operational inquiries for organizations
	traceability, and evaluation throughout acquisition, utilization, and disposal.	inaccuracies, and data methodologies? Is there a procedure for appeals and incidents?
M — Maslahah-oriented design	Evaluate the anticipated educational and societal advantages in conjunction with any detriments.	Does the system enhance a certain educational requirement? Who stands to gain, who might suffer detriment, and is there an alternative with reduced risk?
A — Amanah and privacy	Regard learner information as a trust that necessitates reduction, consent, security, and explicit boundaries.	What information is gathered, for what purpose, for what duration, and with whose consent? Can students employ a suitable substitute?
N — Nuanced hermeneutics	Honor the integrity of the source, the context of the language, and the validity of diverse interpretations.	Are the sources recorded and evaluated? Are ambiguities and varying interpretations apparent?
A — Accessibility and equity	Address affordability, connectivity, accessibility for individuals with disabilities, linguistic considerations, and equitable assistance.	Is it possible for learners to engage without access to a high-performance device or constant internet connectivity? Are inequalities being tracked?
H — Human oversight	Hold educators and competent academics accountable for educational and spiritual discernment.	Is it possible to contest or elevate an output? Are employees instructed to authenticate, contextualize, and reject inappropriate usage?

The structure incorporates the aforementioned perspectives. Maqasid al-Shariah emphasizes purpose, benefit, dignity, and harm prevention; international governance principles stress accountability, privacy, inclusion, and transparency; and TPACK outlines the necessity for educators to evaluate the compatibility of technology, pedagogy, and content (Auda, 2008; Miao et al., 2021; Mishra & Koehler, 2006; OECD, 2019). AMANAH is designed to organize human evaluation. It does not convey a religious decree nor suggest that a singular governing model is appropriate for all educational institutions or customs.

Discussion

The analysis of the study elucidates the necessity of linking general AI ethics with Islamic educational ethics without conflating the two. Global standards establish a foundation for rights, responsibility, and the responsible utilization of systems. Maqasid-informed thinking introduces inquiries regarding educational objectives, ethical implications, and the safeguarding of religious

knowledge. TPACK situates these choices inside the realm of education, rather than relegating them exclusively to technology vendors or governmental policies.

The primary conceptual contribution is hence a translational pathway. A policy tenet like transparency transforms, inside a religious educational context, into a need to provide sources and uncertainties examinable. Human supervision is explicitly designated for educators and competent academics, incorporating a protocol for addressing inquiries that beyond the system's limitations. Inclusion entails a focus on language, connectivity, cost, and learner assistance. These translations suggest design considerations; subsequent study must evaluate their usability and efficacy in real institutional environments. This translational logic is consistent with calls to move AI ethics from abstract principles toward practical, context-specific guidance developed together with the communities affected ([Holmes et al., 2022](#); [Mittelstadt, 2019](#)). It also reflects the maqasid emphasis on the purposes behind rules, so that the evaluation of a technology asks not merely whether it complies with stated requirements but whether it advances the ends those requirements are meant to serve ([Auda, 2008](#)).

The comparison framework also warns against interpreting national AI initiatives as indicators of educational methodologies. National plans reflect policy objectives and governance frameworks; nevertheless, they do not confirm the implementation of a system inside a school, user acceptance, or enhancements in learning outcomes. The assertions on country-specific pilots and stakeholder apprehensions in the original manuscript surpassed the evidence provided in its methodology and are omitted here. A justifiable subsequent phase would integrate this theoretical examination with clear empirical research, such as interviews and observations within chosen institutions, contingent upon ethical scrutiny and a publicly available sample and analysis framework. Policy research has long emphasized that implementation depends on the interpretations, resources, and capacities of actors at the local level, and that the same policy text can produce very different outcomes across institutions ([Ball, 1993](#)). The history of educational technology similarly shows that large-scale initiatives often deliver uneven results when introduced into diverse school settings ([Reich, 2020](#)).

Outcomes for Research and Implementation

Institutions contemplating AI-enhanced Islamic education may utilize AMANAH as an evaluative framework. Prior to purchase, they can delineate the learning issue, evaluate options, pinpoint responsible decision-makers, and scrutinize data flows and source integrity. While in operation, they can facilitate educator training, convey system constraints, oversee disparities in access, and maintain human oversight, and record mistakes or grievances. During the assessment, they can evaluate educational results, user satisfaction, privacy implications, and the tool's handling of religious texts and interpretative variety. These suggestions stem from the analysis and necessitate involvement from local academics and community members. Such participatory involvement matters because the legitimacy of AI governance in religious education depends not only on technical safeguards but also on whether learners, parents, teachers, and scholars recognize the process as consistent with their values ([Holmes et al., 2022](#)).

Three priorities ensue for the research. Initially, empirical investigations must thoroughly record the system, institutional framework, participant recruiting methods, instruments utilized, analytical procedures, and ethical approval with adequate detail for evaluation. Secondly, comparative research ought to differentiate between policy promises and the execution at the school level, and refrain from considering nation labels as uniform instances. Thirdly, assessment must gage both educational results and governance results, encompassing source precision, clarity, data reduction, accessibility, educator autonomy, and the management of dissent. Such research would yield the necessary evidence to evaluate and enhance AMANAH

CONCLUSION

This qualitative comparative examination of documents scrutinized national AI policies and international governance texts in relation to the requirements of Islamic education. It discovered that comprehensive strategies and ethical frameworks serve as beneficial foundations for accountability, inclusion, privacy, transparency, and human agency, yet they fail to consistently delineate how these principles should tackle religious source integrity, interpretive diversity, or the constraints of automated religious guidance.

The paper introduces AMANAH, accountability, maslahah-centered design, trust and privacy, sophisticated interpretation, accessibility and fairness, and human supervision—as a framework influenced by Maqasid for institutional discourse. This is a theoretical input rather than a model substantiated by empirical evidence. The subsequent phase involves clear, ethics-evaluated research in authentic educational environments to evaluate its practicality and enhance its aspects.

LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

This manuscript provides a concentrated conceptual analysis based on documents, rather than an empirical examination across multiple nations regarding Islamic educational institutions. The chosen corpus is intentional and restricted to publicly accessible materials in the consulted languages and sources; it is not comprehensive. Policy documents vary in breadth and specificity, and their release does not guaranty execution. The examination was performed by a single researcher, which may have affected the interpretive decisions on coding and synthesis; there was no independent coding or validation by participants. The framework is just introduced and has yet to be corroborated by educators, students, academics, or politicians. These constraints restrict the assertions regarding the chosen texts and conceptual reasoning, inhibiting generalizations about stakeholder perspectives, adoption frequencies, or learning outcomes

Author contributions: The source manuscript identifies **Naved Alam as first author** and lists **Tania Hossain, Riaz Ahmad, and Naveela Rehman as co-authors**.

REFERENCES

- Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology. (2020). *Strategi nasional kecerdasan artifisial Indonesia 2020–2045 [National strategy for artificial intelligence 2020–2045]*. <https://ai-innovation.id/server/static/ebook/stranas-ka.pdf>
- Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1980). *The concept of education in Islam: A framework for an Islamic philosophy of education*. Muslim Youth Movement of Malaysia (ABIM).
- Al-Raysuni, A. (2005). *Imam al-Shatibi's theory of the higher objectives and intents of Islamic law*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Auda, J. (2008). *Maqasid al-Shariah as philosophy of Islamic law: A systems approach*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(2), 10–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203>
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- Dusuki, A. W., & Abdullah, N. I. (2007). Maqasid al-Shari'ah, maslahah, and corporate social responsibility. *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, 24(1), 25–45.
- Elmahjub, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI) in Islamic ethics: Towards pluralist ethical benchmarking for AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, 36, Article 73.
- Floridi, L., & Cows, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1>
- Halstead, J. M. (2004). An Islamic concept of education. *Comparative Education*, 40(4), 517–529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006042000284510>
- Hefner, R. W., & Zaman, M. Q. (Eds.). (2007). *Schooling Islam: The culture and politics of modern Muslim education*. Princeton University Press.
- Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holstein, K., Sutherland, E., Baker, T., Buckingham Shum, S., Santos, O. C., Rodrigo, M. T., Cukurova, M., Bittencourt, I. I., & Koedinger, K. R. (2022). Ethics of AI in education: Towards a community-wide framework. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(3), 504–526. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00239-1>
- Ibn Ashur, M. al-T. (2006). *Treatise on maqasid al-Shari'ah* (M. el-T. El-Mesawi, Trans.). International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- Kamali, M. H. (2008). *Maqasid al-Shari'ah made simple*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge? *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 60–70.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Liow, J. C. (2009). *Islam, education and reform in southern Thailand: Tradition and transformation*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson.
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>
- Miao, F., Holmes, W., Huang, R., & Zhang, H. (2021). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/PCSP7350>
- Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. (2021). *Malaysia national artificial intelligence roadmap 2021–2025 (AI-RMAP)*. Government of Malaysia. <https://www.mosti.gov.my/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/AIR-Map-Playbook-Overall-19102021-RTG.pdf>
- Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. (2024). *National guidelines on artificial intelligence governance and ethics (AIGE)*. Government of Malaysia. <https://www.mosti.gov.my/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/NATIONAL-GUIDELINES-OF-AIGE-20241118.pdf>
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
- Mittelstadt, B. (2019). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(11), 501–507. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0114-4>
- National Electronics and Computer Technology Center. (2022). *Thailand national AI strategy and*

- action plan (2022–2027). AI Thailand. <https://www.ai.in.th/en/about-ai-thailand/>
- 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, Article 1609406917733847. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence* (OECD/LEGAL/0449). <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0449>
- Rahman, F. (1982). *Islam and modernity: Transformation of an intellectual tradition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Raquist, A., Channa, B., Zubair, T., & Qadir, J. (2022). Islamic virtue-based ethics for artificial intelligence. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 2, Article 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-022-00028-2>
- Reich, J. (2020). *Failure to disrupt: Why technology alone can't transform education*. Harvard University Press.
- Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority. (2020). *National strategy for data and AI*. <https://sdaia.gov.sa/en/SDAIA/SdaiaStrategies/Pages/NationalStrategyForDataAndAI.aspx>
- Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004>
- Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10), 1510–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479366>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>
- van Dijk, J. (2020). *The digital divide*. Polity Press.
- Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. MIT Press.
- Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 223–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995>
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>