Volume 4 Number 2 (2026)
July – December 2026
Page: 2335-2345

EDUJAVARE: International Journal of Educational Research
ISSN: 3031-2884
https://edujavare.com/index.php/edujavare
DOI: 10.70610/edujavare.v4i02.2087

Cognitive Aids, Epistemic Dependence, and Epistemic Verifications of Religious Knowledge in the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Religious Education: A Scoping Review

Rama Yusuf Figo[1], Hawwin Huda Yana[2]
[1] STIT Bustanul 'Ulum Lampung Tengah, Indonesia; ramafigo29@gmail.com
[2] STIT Bustanul 'Ulum Lampung Tengah, Indonesia; hawwin2233@gmail.com

Article history Submitted: 2026/08/20; Revised: 2026/09/15; Accepted: 2026/10/31

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) offers new forms of support for information seeking, conceptual explanation, and learning within Islamic Religious Education (IRE), while simultaneously raising concerns regarding epistemic dependence and the responsibility for knowledge. This study aims to map the relationships between cognitive assistance, epistemic dependence, and religious epistemic verification, utilizing the Population Concept Context (PCC) framework and the PRISMA-ScR reporting guidelines. A scoping review was conducted to examine the scope of existing evidence, study characteristics, conceptual patterns, and research gaps concerning cognitive assistance, cognitive offloading, epistemic agency, epistemic dependence, and verification behaviors. The analyzed corpus comprises 20 primary empirical studies: 17 within the field of IRE/Islamic Studies (85%) and 3 within general education (15%) for comparative purposes. The findings indicate that cognitive assistance does not automatically lead to epistemic dependence. Such dependence becomes more pronounced when processes such as evaluation, justification, source selection, and final decision-making are increasingly delegated to AI. The relationship between cognitive assistance and epistemic dependence must be interpreted with caution, given that some of the evidence is correlational and specific to particular contexts. These findings support the design of learning approaches that prioritize the preservation of reasoning, tabayyun (verification/clarification), source evaluation, teacher mediation, and human responsibility in knowledge related decision-making.

Keywords Cognitive Assistance; Epistemic Dependence; Epistemic Verification; Generative Artificial Intelligence; Islamic Religious Education.

© 2026 by the authors. This is an open-access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

The development of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has expanded the way students and educators search, process, explain, and produce information in the learning process. A large language model-based system can be used to obtain initial explanations, organize ideas, summarize materials, prepare learning materials, provide feedback, and assist

in the completion of various academic tasks. In Islamic Religious Education (PAI), these uses are beginning to be seen in the preparation of learning modules, the search for religious information, the learning of the Qur'an and Hadith, the development of concept understanding, and independent learning activities. (Kurniawan et al., 2024), for example, shows the use of ChatGPT by religious teachers in the preparation of modules, while (Mulya et al., 2025) shows that Islamic Education students use ChatGPT to obtain explanations and support learning problem solving.

A number of studies show that the use of technology does not always go hand in hand with the weakening of thinking skills. In the context of Islamic Education, GenAI is more often used as a learning support: providing alternative explanations, opening early access to materials, and helping to decipher concepts that are considered difficult. (Abdulghani & Touré, 2025), for example, reported an increase in achievement in Hadith learning over four weeks, although issues of accuracy and overuse still arose. (Salim & Habibi, 2025) also noted a positive relationship between the guided use of ChatGPT and critical thinking and moral reasoning. Therefore, cognitive assistance needs to be distinguished from epistemic dependency from the start; the two cannot be equated simply because they involve AI.

The problem becomes more complex when technology no longer only assists instrumental work, but begins to replace the function of user judgment. When source selection, evidence evaluation, justification, interpretation, or final decision are left to AI systems without adequate scrutiny, research questions shift from efficiency to epistemic responsibility. (Najib & Darnoto, 2026) provides a direct example in the context of PAI students by distinguishing between AI dependency and AI-assisted learning patterns. This distinction is important because it shows that the problem is not solely how often AI is used, but rather how users place AI in the process of thinking and assessment.

The general educational literature provides an analytical mechanism that helps read the differences. (Zhu et al., 2026) distinguishes dependent cognitive offloading from autonomous cognitive offloading. In the first pattern, core cognitive functions are increasingly left to AI; in the second pattern, AI is used as a scaffold while users retain engagement and judgment. However, the study used a three-wave design that generated associative evidence, so the distinction cannot be used as evidence that offloading causes a universal decline in ability. This boundary is important for PAI research: the mechanisms of general education are useful as a comparator, but they should not replace the evidence of the religious domain.

The peculiarity of PAI arises because the validity of religious knowledge cannot be reduced to factually correct or false. An answer may seem factually inaccurate but still problematic if the source is not authentic, the text of the verse or Hadith is incorrect, the postulates are placed out of context, or the scientific references are unclear. (Darmu'in et al., 2025) shows that Islamic Studies students question the integration of ChatGPT, among other things, because of issues of scientific authority, sanad, and the accuracy of the evidence. (Almajdoub et al., 2026) highlighting the issues of accuracy, authenticity, and the risk of over-reliance in Qur'anic education. (Syukur et al., 2026) shows that ChatGPT is used as an initial

access point for learning Hadith as well as a shift in some authority from the guru-sanad tradition to an algorithmic system.

On that basis, verification in PAI is not enough to be understood as a generic fact check. Verification also concerns the origin of the source, the accuracy of the representation of religious texts, the scientific basis of an explanation, the authority of reference, the context of interpretation, and comparison with primary sources or scientific sources that can be accounted for. (Syamsudduha et al., 2026) reinforcing this direction through the development of Islamic AI literacy that places evaluation, ethics, and knowledge responsibility as an important part of the use of AI. In this article, the entire process is formulated as the epistemic verification of religious knowledge.

Verification is also not enough to judge from intent. (Vu et al., 2026) Found that inoculation training could improve actual examination behavior, while changes in reported verification intent were not as large as changes in behavior. (Ren, 2026) shows another pattern: metacognitive reflection decreases acceptance of erroneous AI suggestions. These two studies are derived from general education, so they are not used to describe PAI directly. The function here is to explain that the quality of AI use is more accurately read from the user's examination and decision actions, rather than from attitude statements alone.

The study of GenAI in Islamic Education is growing rapidly, but the focus is still scattered. Some of the research discusses the acceptance of technology and learning efficiency; others highlight academic integrity, digital religious agency, religious authority, Islamic AI literacy, and the use of AI in learning the Qur'an and Hadith. At the same time, general education research more explicitly develops cognitive offloading, reliance, metacognitive monitoring, and verification behavior. The gap that is visible is not the absence of research, but the lack of connection between these cognitive mechanisms and the demand for validation of religious knowledge in PAI.

On that basis, this article does not place cognitive offloading, epistemic agency, or AI reliance as new concepts. The focus of the analysis is directed at the relationship of three layers: GenAI as a cognitive aid, a possible shift towards epistemic dependency as evaluative functions are increasingly delegated, and epistemic verification as a way of maintaining user responsibility. To keep the focus of the domain strong, 17 PAI/Islamic Studies studies were used as the main basis for the analysis, while three general education studies were retained as a group of comparative mechanisms.

Based on this background, this study aims to map and synthesize empirical evidence regarding the use of GenAI as cognitive aid, agency patterns and epistemic dependencies, as well as epistemic verification of religious knowledge in Islamic Religious Education. The analysis is directed at the following five research questions.

METHODS

This study uses a scoping review to map the scope of evidence, study characteristics, conceptual patterns, and research gaps related to cognitive assistance, cognitive offloading,

epistemic agency, epistemic dependence, and verification behavior that are still being operationally operated. Reporting refers to the PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) and JBI's methodological principles for scoping review (Peters et al., 2020; Tricco et al., 2018). The Population–Concept–Context (PCC) framework used with Population includes students, students, teachers, lecturers, and education users who interact with GenAI; Concepts include cognitive assistance, cognitive offloading, epistemic agency, dependence/dependence on AI, resource evaluation, verification behavior, epistemic authority, and responsibility for knowledge decisions; while Context focuses on PAI, Islamic Studies, Qur'an and Hadith education, madrasas, Islamic higher education, and religious knowledge learning. The included studies are primary empirical research for 2023–2026 that discusses GenAI or the large language model in education/knowledge acquisition and has a direct relationship with at least one main research concept, especially related to PAI, Islamic Studies, Al-Qur'an/Hadith, madrasahs, or religious knowledge. Conceptual, editorial, systematic review, books, and nonempirical publications are not included as primary corpus, but are used as supporting methodological or conceptual literature.

Search was carried out through indexes and academic journal portals, keyword-based searches, citation searches, and bibliography checks of relevant articles. The search block combines the terms GenAI/ChatGPT with Islamic education, Islamic religious education, Islamic Studies, Qur'an, Hadith, religious knowledge, cognitive offloading, AI dependence/reliance, epistemic agency, source verification, and verification behavior, with search updates and bibliographic audits until September 22, 2026. The previous exploratory corpus consisted of 34 studies, namely 12 studies in the domain of Islamic Education and 22 studies in general education. After conducting a bibliographic audit and domain relevance, an analytical corpus of 20 studies consisting of 17 PAI/Islamic Studies domain studies (85%) and three comparative mechanism studies (15%) was obtained. The proportion of 85:15 is the composition of the analytical corpus after rebalancing, not the overall proportion of literature found at the identification stage. Domain studies whose metadata or full text cannot be verified are not maintained solely to preserve quantity. Because the database export documentation at the initial identification and deduplication stage is not fully available, the number of records at each stage is not retrospectively reconstructed and reporting is focused on the final corpus whose bibliographic identity, relevance, and analytical function have been audited.

Data were extracted in a matrix that included authors, year, context, sample, research design, form of GenAI use, cognitive assistance indicators, dependency/agency, verification behavior, dimensions of religious knowledge, key findings, limitations, and reasons for inclusion. The synthesis was carried out thematically through a combination of deductive and inductive coding with initial themes in the form of cognitive assistance, cognitive offloading, epistemic agency/dependence, verification, epistemic verification of religious knowledge, and pedagogical protection. The principle of thematic synthesis is used to integrate findings from heterogeneous research designs (Thomas & Harden, 2008). The three comparative mechanism studies are not used to represent the PAI condition, but rather as a comparative lens to explain

a mechanism that has not been sufficiently tested directly in the corpus domain, namely autonomous/dependent cognitive offloading (Zhu et al., 2026), verification behavior (Vu et al., 2026), and metacognitive dependence (Ren, 2026). Thus, interpretation is limited to findings supported by the source design and causal claims are avoided if the research design does not support causal inference.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristic Corpus Analytic

The final corpus consists of 20 primary empirical studies. A total of 17 studies (85%) directly focus on PAI, Islamic Studies, Qur'an/Hadith learning, or the use of AI in religious knowledge. Three studies (15%) are from general education and are maintained as a group of comparative mechanisms. Domain studies include PAI teachers, high school students, PAI/Islamic Studies students, Hadith study students, Qur'an educators, and students in Islamic higher education. The research design includes qualitative case studies, phenomenology, narrative inquiry, surveys, comparative studies, pre-experiments, quasi-experiments, mixed methods, and instrument development.

Outcomes Based on RQ1: Cognitive Assistance and Cognitive Load Shifting

In the corpus domain, GenAI is most often used as a tool for initial information search, explanation of concepts, material preparation, module development, brainstorming, tutoring, and self-study support. This pattern is seen in PAI teachers who use ChatGPT to compile modules (Kurniawan et al., 2024), Islamic Education students who use it to understand the material (Mulya et al., 2025), as well as learning Hadith using ChatGPT as a supplemental tutor (Abdulghani & Touré, 2025). Thus, cognitive assistance in the corpus does not show a single consequence.

An important difference arises in the types of functions that are switched. When AI is used for initial orientation, simplification, or organization of material while the user remains examining the results, usage still retains room for reasoning. In contrast, when systems begin to take over evaluation, justification, source selection, or final decisions, usage patterns become closer to dependent offloading. (Zhu et al., 2026) helps provide an analytical language to distinguish between the two patterns, but because the findings are correlational, the category is used as a comparison mechanism, rather than a causal diagnosis for PAI learners.

RQ1 shows that the intensity of AI use alone is not enough to assess whether the use is adaptive or dependent. The more important questions are what cognitive work is being diverted, how far the user is still examining the results, and whether the final reasons and decisions can still be accounted for.

Results Based on RQ2: Agency and Epistemic Dependence

Epistemic agency in the corpus appears through the act of selecting sources, comparing information, questioning outputs, and maintaining final decisions on the user. Epistemic dependence, on the other hand, arises when AI systems are no longer treated as aids, but rather as accepted references with little evaluation. (Najib & Darnoto, 2026) show the difference in

these patterns directly to PAI students. (Afzainizam & Rahman, 2026) shows a variation of digital religious agency, while (Ardana et al., 2026; Syukur et al., 2026) highlighting the changing relationship of religious authorities as AI enters the classroom.

The corpus comparative mechanism corroborates those readings without replacing domain proofs. (Ren, 2026) show that users can accept incorrect AI suggestions even when their confidence levels are high; metacognitive reflection reduces such acceptance. These findings confirm that reliance needs to be read at the level of actual decisions, not just at the user's perception of themselves.

Overall, epistemic dependency is more precisely understood as a pattern of delegating evaluative functions than as a label inherent in the use of AI itself. The available evidence is insufficient to state that cognitive assistance causes dependency universally; the apparent relationship is still associative, contextual, and influenced by the design of use.

Results Based on RQ3: Verification as an Epistemic Process

Verification emerges as one of the main differentiators between uses that maintain agency and more dependent uses. In the corpus of Islamic domains, the act of verification includes examining sources, confirming postulates, comparing answers with other references, and asking educators or more authoritative sources for clarification. In the corpus of comparators, (Vu et al., 2026) shows that actual verification behavior can be improved through inoculation training even if the reported verification intent does not change equally.

This pattern shows that verification needs to be read as a process, not just a cautious attitude. There is a difference between intending to check, actually starting the check, choosing a reputable source, comparing evidence, and making a decision after the check.

In RQ3, verification was repeatedly present in uses that still retained human judgment. However, the study did not test verification as a statistical mediator and did not conclude that verification always prevents dependence. A more limited conclusion is that checking behavior tends to accompany the use of AI that still places the ultimate responsibility on the user.

Results Based on RQ4: Epistemic Verification of Religious Knowledge

The synthesis of domain studies shows that fact-checking alone is not enough to handle GenAI's output related to religion. Based on a repeating pattern in the corpus, the epistemic verification of religious knowledge is formulated in the following six dimensions:

1. Source authenticity: assessing the origin of the information and whether it can be accounted for in the relevant scientific tradition.
2. Accuracy of text and evidence: checking verses, hadiths, translations, quotations, reference numbers, and the suitability of the evidence with the claim.
3. Scientific basis and reference authority: distinguishing the fluency of AI language from the scientific legitimacy of its source or interpretation.
4. Context of interpretation: pay attention to the discipline, the context of the use of texts, and the space for legitimate dissent.
5. Factual verification: examining historical facts, terms, figures, figures, numbers, or other information that can be tested externally.

6. Cross-verification: comparing AI output with primary sources, scientific literature, relevant books/references, and experts if the problem requires special competence.

The construct is positioned as the result of analytical synthesis, not as a validated psychometric instrument. Its value lies in its ability to organize the types of repeated examinations in the study of PAI, the Qur'an, and Hadith and provide the basis for subsequent empirical testing.

Results Based on RQ5: Pedagogical Protection

The most consistent pedagogical safeguards include teacher/lecturer mediation, AI literacy, source literacy, tabayyun, metacognitive reflection, obligation to include sources, comparison of AI answers with primary sources, and assessments that ask for reasons or justifications. In the context of PAI, such strategies are relevant because AI outputs can be generally correct but weak in the source, postulate, or context of interpretation.

Interventions from general education can be inspiring, but they require adaptation. Inoculation training (Vu et al., 2026) dan reflection prompt (Ren, 2026) indicates that user behavior can be changed through task design. However, the effectiveness of transfers to PAI has not been directly tested and therefore should not be considered automatic.

RQ5 ultimately leads to a fairly simple principle: the responsible use of GenAI in PAI is not primarily built through prohibition, but through tasks that still require learners to read, examine, compare, explain, and account for their knowledge decisions.

Discussion

Cognitive Assistance Needs to Be Distinguished from Dependence

The results of the review show that cognitive assistance and epistemic dependence do not have an automatic relationship. GenAI can help teachers and students speed up material preparation, get alternative explanations, or gain initial orientation. However, the same ease can reduce engagement when AI answers are treated as a final product that is no longer examined. Thus, the problem is not just the existence of AI, but the way AI is placed in the learning flow.

From an analytical standpoint, the boundary between the two lies in ownership of the grading process. As long as the user can still explain why an answer was received, what sources are used, which parts need to be revised, and what decisions are made after examining the evidence, AI-assisted is still in a relatively agential pattern. Dependencies become more relevant as those reasons and decisions move into the system. This formulation is more cautious than stating that frequent usage or high offloading is always bad.

The differentiation also helps place the results (Najib & Darnoto, 2026) side by side with (Zhu et al., 2026). The PAI study provides domain evidence of dependency and assisted learning patterns, while general studies provide mechanisms that distinguish dependent and autonomous offloading. The two illuminate each other, but cannot be combined into a single causal chain.

Epistemic Dependence as a Shift in Responsibility

The term epistemic dependency in this article is not used to name every form of use of AI. The focus is on shifting responsibility in determining what is worthy of belief. When AI becomes the first source, as well as the last source, the space for human evaluation narrows. In the context of religious knowledge, the consequences are more than just the possibility of misinformation; users may accept inaccurate postulates, truncated contexts, or interpretations that seem convincing but lack adequate grounding.

Findings on the shift in authority in the study (Ardana et al., 2026) shows that AI does not just enter the learning process as a technical tool. It can also occupy epistemic positions previously filled by teachers, books, sanad, or the scientific community. This shift does not necessarily mean that traditional authority is lost, but it demands a new literacy to distinguish between quick access and the legitimacy of knowledge.

The main issue, therefore, is not whether learners simply 'trust AI'. What needs to be observed is when they suspend their own assessments, when they receive answers without examination, and when they return to accountable sources. Formulations like this are easier to translate into learning design as well as empirical research.

Verification as an Epistemic Boundary

Verification can be understood as a working boundary between a use that still maintains judgment and an increasingly passive use. This limit is certainly not black-and-white. A superficial check can still end up receiving the wrong answer, while a better check can make users reject the AI output after finding stronger evidence. Therefore, the quality of verification needs to be seen from the sources used, the examination process, and the resulting decisions.

Vu et al. (2026) help clarify the difference between intentions and actual behavior. In learning, the statement that learners will examine AI answers is not enough. The task needs to provide evidence that the examination was actually carried out, for example through primary sources, a comparison of two references, or an explanation of the rejected part of the AI output. Ren (2026) adds that metacognitive reflection can reduce acceptance of incorrect suggestions. Both are useful as a basis for design, but cannot be assumed to work in the same way in every PAI context.

This analysis brings verification from an additional position to a core part of using GenAI. In PAI, the ability to generate a good prompt or obtain a quick answer is not enough if the learner is unable to determine the validity of the source and the underlying postulate.

Peculiarities of Epistemic Verification of Religious Knowledge

The contribution of the PAI domain is most clearly seen when verification is read beyond fact-checking. (Almajdoub et al., 2026; Darmu'in et al., 2025; Hanifah et al., 2026; Syukur et al., 2026) shows that religious problems touch authority, authenticity, text, context, and knowledge transmission. Therefore, factual AI outputs at one level are not necessarily epistetically adequate to be used as a basis for religious understanding.

The six dimensions formulated in this review—source authenticity, text/postulate accuracy, scientific basis and authority, interpretive context, factual verification, and cross-

verification are not intended as a final list. It is an analytical structure that can be further tested. Its added value is that it provides a bridge between general AI literacy and the tradition of knowledge evaluation in Islamic education.

At this point, tabayyun can be understood not as a normative slogan, but as a practice that needs to be operationalized. In learning, tabayyun can be realized through the request for evidence, examination of primary sources, identification of differences in interpretation, and recording the reasons why an AI output is accepted or rejected.

Reading the RQ1–RQ5 Findings as a Single Framework

When read together, the five RQs form an interrelated analytical flow. GenAI provides cognitive assistance; it always involves a certain level of delegation; the type of function delegated relates to whether the user maintains or submits the assessment; verification helps maintain that responsibility; and in PAI, the verification process has additional demands on the source, text, authority, and context of interpretation. This flow is used as a synthesis framework, not as a validated causal model.

CONCLUSION

This review of the scope shows that the use of GenAI in Islamic Religious Education is not sufficiently judged by the choice of using or not using technology. More fundamental is the division of cognitive work and epistemic responsibility between the user and the system. GenAI can serve as a productive aid when used for initial orientation, explanation, information organization, or scaffolding, while the evaluation and final decision remains with the user.

Epistemic dependencies become more relevant as evidence evaluation, source selection, justification, interpretation, and final decisions are increasingly delegated to AI. Nonetheless, there is not enough evidence available to state that cognitive aids universally cause dependence. Some relationships are still correlational, highly context-dependent, and influenced by the design of use.

In PAI, verification is an important part of the responsible use of GenAI. The corpus synthesis shows six recurring elements: the authenticity of the source, the accuracy of the text and the evidence, the scientific basis and authority of reference, the context of interpretation, factual verification, and cross-verification. These elements explain why a smooth and convincing AI output may not necessarily be immediately accepted as valid religious knowledge.

The implication is the need for a learning design that still places learners as the owners of the assessment process. AI can help, but the responsibility for checking, weighing, and making decisions cannot be completely transferred. In Islamic Religious Education, tabayyun, resource literacy, educator mediation, and scientific manners need to be understood as part of AI literacy, not as an additional element outside of the use of technology.

REFERENCES

Abdulghani, N. A., & Touré, Y. A. (2025). Intelligent tutoring for Hadith: Evaluating ChatGPT-enhanced pedagogy in Islamic higher education. *Indonesian Journal of Islamic Education Studies (INJURIES)*, *3*(3), 190–204. https://doi.org/10.61227/injuries.v3i3.211

Afzainizam, M., & Rahman, M. F. (2026). Constructing digital religious agency: Generative AI literacy and Islamic learning within the Merdeka Curriculum framework. *Al-Tadzkiyyah: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *17*(1), 16–32. https://doi.org/10.24042/atjpi.v17i1.30279

Almajdoub, Z., Fidalgo, P., Alramamneh, Y., AlHakmani, R., & Kasasbeh, N. (2026). Artificial intelligence in Qur'anic education: Pedagogical promise, practical challenges, and ethical concerns. *Frontiers in Education*, *11*, 1876380. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1876380

Ardana, A., Kristiyaningrum, K., & Harfiani, R. (2026). ChatGPT dan konstruksi otoritas keagamaan generasi Z: Implikasinya terhadap pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam. *Al-Hikmah: Jurnal Theosofi Dan Peradaban Islam*, *8*(1), 45–65. https://doi.org/10.51900/alhikmah.v8i1.30198

Darmu'in, D., Nasikhin, N., Darnoto, Sofanudin, A., Maarif, M. A., & Haryanto, J. T. (2025). Perceived barriers to ChatGPT integration in Islamic studies education: Insights from Malaysian international students in Indonesia. *Journal of International Students*, *15*(11), 141–164. https://doi.org/10.32674/h99a4p06

Hanifah, Z., Supaat, S., & Mutholib, A. (2026). The effectiveness of using artificial intelligence ChatGPT (Generative Pre-Trained Transformer) in Qur'an and Hadith learning among PAI students at UIN Sunan Kudus. *TA'DIBUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, *9*(1), 55–69. https://doi.org/10.30659/jpai.9.1.55-69

Kurniawan, S., Herlambang, S., Sari, N., Fadian, F., Suratman, B., Nurhidayah, V. A., Naffati, A. K., & Torikoh. (2024). Making peace with change: The effect of GPT Chat utilization on the performance of Islamic religion teachers in creating teaching modules. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, *21*(2), 492–509. https://doi.org/10.14421/jpai.v21i2.9767

Mulya, B. D. P., Nasikhin, Fihris, & Junaedi, M. (2025). Islamic Religious Education learning process through the utilization of ChatGPT. *JIE (Journal of Islamic Education)*, *10*(1), 36–54. https://doi.org/10.35723/jie.v10i1.554

Najib, A. C., & Darnoto. (2026). Intellectual degradation amidst the development of AI technology: A comparison between AI dependency students and AI assisted learning students. *Tafkir: Interdisciplinary Journal of Islamic Education*, *7*(4), 1045–1060. https://doi.org/10.31538/tijie.v7i4.3207

Peters, M. D. J., Marnie, C., Tricco, A. C., Pollock, D., Munn, Z., Alexander, L., McInerney, P., Godfrey, C. M., & Khalil, H. (2020). Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*, *18*(10), 2119–2126.

Ren, S. (2026). College students' metacognitive awareness of generative-AI reliance: An experimental study of decision confidence and attribution bias. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *17*, 1926110. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1926110

Salim, M. A., & Habibi, F. (2025). AI ChatGPT based Islamic religious education to enhance students' critical thinking and moral reasoning. *ISLAMIKA*, *7*(4), 716–729. https://doi.org/10.36088/islamika.v7i4.5915

Syamsudduha, S., Suwandi, S., & ZA., T. (2026). Islamic AI literacy as responsible knowledge

practice: Development and validation of AILS-IIUS in Indonesian Islamic higher education. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *12*(1), 187–201. https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v12i1.54254

Syukur, H., Nasrulloh, N., & Fachmuroji, I. (2026). Living Hadith in the age of artificial intelligence: A phenomenological study of the use of ChatGPT as a source for studying Hadith among college students. *Asian Journal of Islamic Studies and Da'wah*, *4*(3), 189–204. https://doi.org/10.58578/ajisd.v4i3.10228

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *8*(1), 45.

Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., & Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *169*(7), 467–473. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850

Vu, C. B., Cummings, J. J., & Park, D. Y. (2026). Student engagement with ChatGPT for educational tasks: Effects of inoculation training on verification intentions and behavior. *Computers and Education Open*, *10*, 100335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2026.100335

Zhu, Q., Li, X., Dong, Y., Chang, P., & Fan, M. (2026). Not all cognitive offloading is equal: Distinguishing dependent and autonomous offloading to generative AI. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *17*, 1878629. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1878629