Between Prompt and Adab: The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence Use by Students from the Perspective of Islamic Education Axiology

Adam Malik[1], Muhammad Adib[2], Figo Rangga Bagaskara[3], Jamal Fakhri[4], Andi Thahir[5], Chairul Anwar[6]
[1,2,3,4,5,6]UIN Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia
Email: adammalik0800@gmail.com

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) has become part of students' everyday academic life, yet its ethical dimensions have rarely been examined within the value framework of Islamic education. This study describes AI usage patterns, ethical perceptions and practices, and interprets them through the axiology of Islamic education (ethics, aesthetics, and utility) among Islamic Religious Education (PAI) students at UIN Raden Intan Lampung. Using a descriptive qualitative approach, data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with four students (main informants) and two lecturers (supporting informants), complemented by policy document review, and analyzed with the Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña model with source and technique triangulation. The findings show that (1) ChatGPT and Gemini serve as multifunctional academic assistants, mostly at the pre-writing stage, driven by social environment and efficiency; (2) students' ethical awareness is high but practice is inconsistent, with low disclosure of AI use, verification relying largely on search engines, and no formal regulation at program or campus level; and (3) axiologically, honesty and trustworthiness (*akhlaq*) frame ethics, a knowledge–lecturer–AI hierarchy expresses *adab*, and AI's utility is conditional (conditional *maslahah*) because it threatens critical thinking. The study concludes that a gap exists between axiological awareness and academic practice, widened by the absence of formal regulation, and recommends *adab*-based AI governance.

Keywords: *AI Ethics, Axiology of Islamic Education, PAI Students.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) has moved from the laboratory to students' study desks. A survey by the Digital Education Council of 3,839 students from 16 countries shows that 86% of respondents have used AI in their studies, 54% of them weekly, with an average of 2.1 tools per student (Council, 2024). A similar picture, even more intense, appears in Islamic religious higher education. As reported in the media, research by the National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) involving 293 students from 17 State Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PTKIN) found that more than 90% of respondents used ChatGPT four to six times a week; respondents were aware of the risks, but this did not reduce the intensity of use, and they hoped for specific guidelines for PTKIN (Mashabi & Utomo, 2025).

At the same time, the literature warns that this convenience is not risk-free. Kasneci et al. (2023) map the opportunities and challenges of large language models in education, Cotton et al. (2024) highlight their threat to academic integrity, Zhai et al. (2024), through a systematic review, show that over-reliance on AI dialogue

systems is associated with weakened decision-making, critical thinking, and analytical reasoning, while Gerlich (2025) links the use of AI tools to *cognitive offloading* and a decline in critical thinking. Principles of AI ethics have been formulated globally (Floridi & Cowls, 2019; Jobin et al., 2019; Miao & Holmes, 2023; UNESCO, 2021), and in Indonesia the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (Kemendikbudristek) has issued guidelines on the use of GenAI in university learning (Kusumawardani et al., 2024).

For Islamic education, the problem does not stop at academic integrity. Knowledge is understood as a trust (*amanah*) obtained through *adab* toward knowledge and teachers, not merely the accumulation of information (Al-Attas, 1980; Al-Ghazali, 2005). The use of AI by Islamic Religious Education (PAI) students, who are prospective religious educators, therefore touches on a question of values: how should they treat a machine that can answer almost anything, including questions of religion?

Several previous studies have touched on this issue. Rahman dan Afandi (2024) examined PAI students' perceptions of the ethics of AI use at UINSI Samarinda using a phenomenological approach. Kurnaesih et al. (2025) involved 85 PAI students at STIT Al-Khairiyah Cilegon and reported that ChatGPT was the most popular tool (50%), 55% of respondents paraphrased and cited AI output, 32% copied without paraphrasing, and 58% always verified information. Marpaung et al. (2026), studying first-semester PAI students at UIN Sumatera Utara, found varied Islamic ethical literacy guided by the values of *sidq*, *amanah*, *mas'uliyyah*, and *maslahah*, while Che Nordin et al. (2025), studying Islamic studies students at Universiti Malaya, reported ChatGPT use at 58.64% along with a need for guidelines based on Islamic values. These studies agree that AI needs to be framed by Islamic values, but they generally stop at perceptions and lists of values.

Based on the author's review of the available literature, there are three gaps. *First*, few studies use axiology (the theory of values encompassing ethics, aesthetics, and utility) as the main analytical framework, so the dimension of *adab* (aesthetics) is often overlooked. *Second*, students' views are rarely confronted with lecturers' observations, making the distance between claims and practice difficult to assess. *Third*, the context of PAI at UIN Raden Intan Lampung has not been documented in existing studies. This study therefore answers three questions: (1) what are the patterns of AI use among students of the PAI Study Program at UIN Raden Intan Lampung in their coursework; (2) what are their ethical perceptions and practices in using AI in academic activities; and (3) how is the ethics of AI use viewed from the perspective of the axiology of Islamic education (ethics, aesthetics, and utility).

Axiology is the branch of philosophy that discusses the theory of values related to the use of knowledge ((Suriasumantri, 2005), with two main assessments, namely ethics and aesthetics (Sadulloh, 2007). In Islamic education, ethics is translated as *akhlaq* (the good and bad of behavior, especially honesty and trustworthiness), aesthetics as *adab* (propriety of attitude toward knowledge, teachers, and sources of knowledge)) (Al-Attas, 1980), and utility as *maslahah*, namely benefit measured

against the objectives of the Shari'ah (*maqasid al-shari'ah*) and governed by the principle of preventing harm (Al-Suyuti, 1990; Al-Syatibi, 1997).

B. METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach to understand the meanings students attach to the use of AI in its natural context (Creswell & Poth, 2018). This approach was chosen because the research focuses on patterns, perceptions, and values, not on measuring frequencies or relationships between variables. The study was conducted in the PAI Study Program at UIN Raden Intan Lampung, with data collected through interviews in September–October 2026.

Informants were selected purposively. The main informants were four active PAI students in semesters 3 and 5 who use AI in their coursework; the supporting informants were two PAI lecturers who interact directly with students' assignments and were involved for source triangulation (Table 1). Identities are anonymized with codes I-1 to I-6.

Table 1. Research Informants

Code	Role	Description
I-1	PAI student	Female, semester 5; 20 years old
I-2	PAI student	Female, semester 3, 19 years old
I-3	PAI student	Male, semester 3, 19 years old
I-4	PAI student	Female, semester 5, 20 years old
I-5	PAI lecturer	Male; supporting informant (questions E1–E5)
I-6	PAI lecturer	Female; supporting informant (questions E1–E5)

Data were collected through two techniques. *First*, semi-structured interviews: students answered questions B1–D9 covering usage patterns, ethical perceptions and practices, and axiological dimensions, while lecturers answered questions E1–E5 about their observations, responses, policies, risks, benefits, and suggestions for guidance. *Second*, documentation in the form of a review of the Guidelines for the Use of GenAI in University Learning (Kusumawardani et al., 2024) and confirmation of the presence or absence of written policies at the study-program and campus levels through the lecturer informants. Direct observation of AI use in the classroom was not a data source at this stage; lecturers' observations of student assignments (I-5 and I-6) serve as indirect observation and are noted as a limitation.

The analysis uses the model of Miles et al. (2014) with three simultaneous flows, namely data condensation (selecting answers relevant to the research questions, summarizing, applying open codes, and grouping them into categories), data display (a matrix for each research question and a triangulation matrix), and conclusion drawing and verification. This process produced seven themes. Categories were derived deductively-inductively from the three dimensions of axiology (Table 2). Answers that were ambiguous or did not match the question were flagged and interpreted with caution.

Table 2. Operationalization of Axiological Dimensions

Dimension	Analytical Focus	Indicators in the Data
Ethics (*akhlaq*)	Honesty, trustworthiness (*amanah*), responsibility	Claims of authorship, AI disclosure, verification, rejection of copy-pasting
Aesthetics (*adab*)	Propriety of attitude toward knowledge, teachers, and sources	Knowledge–lecturer–AI hierarchy, attitude toward lecturers, changes in learning attitude
Utility (*maslahah*)	Benefit and harm	Efficiency, access, dependence, critical thinking, accuracy of information, conditions of use

Data validity was maintained through source triangulation (students and lecturers) and technique triangulation (interviews and documentation) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1999). Findings were compared across informants and across informant groups in a convergence–divergence matrix; inconsistent findings were flagged and not generalized.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Patterns of AI Use among PAI Students

All student informants use ChatGPT and Gemini. Other AI tools mentioned are Dola (I-3) and Claude and Gamma (I-4). Use began around 2025 or at the start of their studies, prompted by friends' invitations, advertisements, TikTok, and the surrounding environment. Frequency of use varies, ranging from almost every day (I-2) to several times a week (I-4).

The purposes of use are diverse, ranging from finding ideas, outlining papers, summarizing, translating, understanding material, correcting and composing sentences, to recalling material. AI is used for papers, presentations, discussion questions, and Arabic/English assignments (I-4), even in all courses (I-1, I-2); I-3 also uses it for material outside the field of religion. In terms of stages, I-2 and I-4 mainly use it before writing, I-1 before, during, and after writing, and I-3 at the correction stage (Table 3). Their motivation rests on three things, namely time efficiency (I-1, I-3, I-4), the influence of friends and the environment (I-2, I-3), and difficulty understanding material (I-2, I-4). I-3 said that he initially followed his friends and now uses AI to save time; I-4 stated that she is aware of not wanting to become too dependent.

Table 3. Matrix of Students' AI Use Patterns

Informant	Main AI	Dominant purpose	Stage	Trigger/motivation
I-1	ChatGPT, Gemini	Finding assignments and information, asking about material, translating, summarizing	Before, during, and after writing	Time efficiency; still seeks information outside AI

I-2	ChatGPT, Gemini	Finding ideas, new vocabulary, paper outlines	Early (outlining)	Environment where most people use AI; need to understand
I-3	ChatGPT, Dola, Gemini	Finding ideas, recalling material, correcting writing	Correction (final)	Initially friends, now saving time
I-4	ChatGPT, Claude, Gamma	Ideas, outlines, summaries, Arabic/English translation, sentence improvement	Mainly before writing, sometimes during writing	Difficulty with material, limited time; aware of not wanting to be overly dependent

Lecturers confirmed this tendency. I-5 sees students as "complacent" (*terlena*) in using AI, from papers and discussions to other assignments, with a focus on finishing quickly. I-6 estimates that almost 90% of students in semester 3 and above use AI to find religious evidence (*dalil*), summarize, and prepare lesson plans (RPP); this figure is the lecturer's estimate, not measured data.

2. Ethical Perceptions and Practices

Students' normative perceptions are uniform. They position AI as an aid or idea finder, not a replacement for the student's role, and reject copying its output in full. Ethics is understood as filtering information, verifying, being honest, being responsible, not plagiarizing, thinking critically, and being wise. In practice, as Table 4 shows, there is more variation. Verification is done through Google and journals (I-1, I-2, I-3) or by comparing books, journals, and lecturers' materials (I-4). Disclosure of AI use is low: I-1 never states it, I-2 does not state it, I-4 states it only when the lecturer asks, and only I-3 has ever stated it. Full copying of AI output is acknowledged to occur in their environment: many friends do it because they want instant results (I-1), it has happened (I-2), and it has been seen in papers (I-4); I-3 states that he has never seen it.

Table 4. Matrix of Students' Ethical Perceptions and Practices

Informant	Limits of Use	Verification	AI Disclosure	Religious Issues
I-1	Idea finder; not all results are used	Checks links, Google, journals	Never	Has done so; prefers to ask experts
I-2	Not too often, not replacing one's own role	Includes journals	Not stated	Often; then verifies through journals or Google
I-3	Do not copy-paste everything; draw conclusions oneself	Google	Has stated it	Has done so; most answers judged incorrect
I-4	Aid, not a replacement	Books, journals, lecturers' materials	Only if the lecturer asks	Has done so; not absolute truth, refers to the Qur'an, hadith, classical books (*kitab*), scholars

Regarding rules, I-1 and I-2 state that there are no campus rules. I-5 and I-6 affirm that there is no policy from the study program or the campus; there is only an

oral appeal in lecturer meetings that AI may be used as long as it is not 100% copy-paste (I-6). At the classroom level, I-2 and I-4 mention guidance from certain lecturers, while I-3 refers to limits set by friends. In the religious domain, I-1, I-2, and I-4 have asked AI but then consulted experts or primary sources, whereas I-3 judges that many of AI's answers in religion are incorrect, although elsewhere in the interview he said the answers were correct but lacked detail, an inconsistency that is noted and not used as a basis for generalization.

Lecturers provide a comparison from the side of observation. According to I-6, signs of excessive use are language that is too formal and perfect, generic references without classical texts, and an inability to explain when asked back; according to I-5, it is fading critical thinking. Their responses differ: I-5 applies role-based discussions (presenter, questioner, rebutter, supplementer) with preparation two days in advance (H-2) and a ban on opening phones or notes during discussion. Meanwhile, I-6 uses a *tabayyun* approach without immediately judging plagiarism, changes assignments into critical responses to AI answers, and requires prompts to be listed in the reference list.

3. Axiological Dimensions

On the dimension of ethics (*akhlaq*), all students consider submitting AI output as one's own work to be dishonest. I-2 calls it "reprehensible character" (*akhlaq tercela*), I-3 links it to the spread of invalid information, I-4 to honesty toward the learning process and rejection of shortcuts, and I-1 affirms that AI output must be disclosed and reinforced by other references. Religious values (honesty, trustworthiness, and responsibility) are said to influence the decision to use AI, with special caution in the religious domain (I-2). From the lecturers' side, I-6 mentions the risk of a "crisis of honesty (*siddiq*)" and offers cultivating *muraqabah*.

On the dimension of aesthetics (*adab*), knowledge is placed as the pinnacle and main source. AI is merely a tool, not a source of knowledge. Lecturers act as confirmers of truth. Lecturers are considered clearer and more accurate, but students sometimes feel reluctant (*sungkan*) to ask because of limited time (I-2). AI is fast but does not replace lecturers (I-4), and I-4 stresses not lying to lecturers. I-6 formulates a "crisis of *adab* and scholarly *sanad*" and instant *fatwas* without authority as risks, and suggests AI as a *khadim* (helper), not a teacher. Students acknowledge a change in learning attitude: finding information is easier and more efficient, but there is a risk of becoming lazy to search and think for themselves.

On the dimension of utility (*maslahah*), what students mention is time efficiency, easy and up-to-date access to information, and help understanding material and composing sentences. Lecturers add faster access to knowledge and help in creating teaching media. The harms are laziness in writing and thinking ("lazy to write", *mager menulis*, I-1), dependence, declining critical thinking, half-baked understanding (I-3), and answers that are not necessarily correct (I-4). Meanwhile, I-5 says critical thinking has declined drastically. Suggestions for use converge: within

limits, wise, verified against trusted sources, avoiding plagiarism, and very careful in the religious domain (Table 5).

Table 5. Matrix of Axiological Dimensions (Students)

Informant	Ethics (*Akhlaq*)	Aesthetics (*Adab*)	Utility (*Maslahah*)
I-1	AI output must be disclosed and reinforced by other references; claiming it as one's own is dishonest	Knowledge is the pinnacle, AI a tool, lecturer the confirmer; asking the lecturer is more relevant	Benefit: efficient. Harm: lazy to write, copy-paste, lazy to think
I-2	AI for ideas is acceptable; claiming AI output as one's own is reprehensible character	AI is not the main source; going to the lecturer is better but often feels reluctant	Benefit: fast, up to date. Harm: uncritical, dependence
I-3	Honest so as not to spread invalid information; AI output is not the fruit of one's own thinking	Knowledge and lecturers above AI; AI prone to bias; lecturers more accurate	Benefit: simple, saves time. Harm: half-baked understanding, laziness, less critical
I-4	Honest toward the learning process; no shortcuts	Respects the process; does not lie to lecturers; AI does not replace lecturers	Benefit: understanding material, ideas, sentences. Harm: comfortable then lazy to think; answers not necessarily correct

4. Comparison of Student and Lecturer Views

The intergroup comparison (Table 6) shows four convergent aspects and two partially divergent aspects. Students and lecturers agree on the intensity of use, the decline in critical thinking, the absence of institutional policy, and the occurrence of full copying. Divergence appears in the quality of verification, as students feel they verify while lecturers observe generic references and difficulty explaining content, and in AI disclosure, which students generally do not state while some lecturers have begun to require it.

Table 6. Comparison Matrix of Student and Lecturer Views

Aspect	Student view	Lecturer view	Status
Intensity of use	Routine, from almost every day to several times a week	Very widespread (I-6's estimate about 90%)	Convergent
Impact on critical thinking	Acknowledge a risk of decline (I-2, I-3, I-4)	Fading or declining drastically (I-5, I-6)	Convergent
Institutional policy	None from the campus	No written policy; only oral appeals	Convergent
Full copying	Occurs among friends, not oneself	Clear signs in assignments	Convergent
Quality of verification	Claim to verify, mainly through Google	Generic references; difficulty explaining content	Partially divergent
AI disclosure	Generally, not stated	Lecturers begin to require prompts (I-6)	Divergent: practice not yet uniform

The cross-data analysis produced seven themes: (1) AI as a multifunctional academic assistant driven by the social environment and efficiency; (2) high ethical

awareness, inconsistent ethical practice; (3) a vacuum of formal regulation and lecturer-dependent arrangements; (4) special caution in the religious domain; (5) honesty and trustworthiness as the framework of *akhlaq*; (6) the hierarchy of knowledge, lecturers, and AI (AI as *khadim*); and (7) conditional *maslahah* between the benefit of efficiency and the threat to critical thinking.

The finding that all informants use ChatGPT and Gemini for a variety of tasks is in line with the global picture (Digital Education Council, 2024) and the national one (Mashabi & Utomo, 2025), as well as with studies of PAI and Islamic studies students elsewhere, where ChatGPT is the dominant tool (Che Nordin et al., 2025; Kurnaesih et al., 2025). The functions chosen, from gathering ideas, outlining, summarizing, and translating to improving sentences, also match the map of opportunities formulated by Kasneci et al. (2023) and Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019), namely AI as a support for understanding and writing.

Two things appear distinctive in these data. *First*, social triggers such as friends' invitations, advertisements, and social media precede academic needs, so AI use is initially a practice normalized by the environment before turning into a need for efficiency (Theme 1). *Second*, the pre-writing stage dominates (I-2, I-4). This stage seems light, yet it is where students formulate the problem and build the structure of their argument. If this stage is delegated, the risk feared by Zhai et al. (2024) and Gerlich (2025), namely weakened analytical reasoning and critical thinking, begins upstream in the writing process. Lecturers' observations of students who are "complacent" (I-5) and unable to explain when asked back (I-6) reinforce this possibility. Even so, these qualitative data are not intended to prove a causal relationship.

The most prominent pattern is the gap between norms and practice (Theme 2). All students state that AI is only an aid and reject copy-pasting, but three of the four do not disclose AI use on their own initiative, verification generally relies on Google, and full copying is acknowledged to occur around them. Lecturers' observations, generic references without classical texts and an inability to explain the content of assignments (I-6), indicate that the "verification" claimed is not necessarily a search of primary sources. This pattern is similar to the finding of Kurnaesih et al. (2025), in which 58% of students claimed to always verify but 32% still copied without paraphrasing. Marpaung et al. (2026) also found that PAI students' Islamic ethical literacy varied, and Cotton et al. (2024) affirm that the ease of AI demands explicit affirmation of academic integrity. The added value of this study is that it complements students' self-reports with lecturers' observations, so that the gap is not merely assumed but visible from two angles.

The strongest explanation based on the data is the regulatory vacuum (Theme 3). Students and lecturers alike state that there is no written policy at the study-program or campus level; ethical limits are determined by individual lecturers or peers. Yet national guidelines are already available (Kusumawardani et al., 2024) and PTKIN students' hope for specific guidelines has been recorded (Mashabi & Utomo, 2025). Chan (Chan, 2023) shows that AI policies in universities require pedagogical,

governance, and operational dimensions; the absence of the operational dimension in this study program helps explain why AI disclosure, for example, depends on lecturers' requests (I-4). The lecturers' responses found here, *tabayyun* before accusing plagiarism, the obligation to list prompts (I-6), and role-based discussions without phones (I-5), are pedagogical innovations in line with the national guidelines' emphasis on the learning process, but they remain individual.

In the religious domain (Theme 4), students do not treat AI as an authority: they consult experts or primary sources (I-1, I-2, I-4), and I-3 judges many answers to be incorrect. This attitude is in line with Che Nordin et al.'s (2025) concern about the authenticity of knowledge and the continuity of *sanad*, as well as with the command to verify news in QS. Al-Hujurat [49]: 6 and the prohibition on following something without knowledge in QS. Al-Isra' [17]: 36 (Kementerian Agama RI & Lajnah Pentashihan Mushaf Al-Qur'an, 2019). The risk of "instant *fatwas* without authority" and answers that are textually correct but dry, as mentioned by I-6, indicates that this caution needs to be institutionalized, not left to personal habit. I-3's inconsistency regarding the quality of religious answers needs to be clarified through re-checking with the informant.

Students use firm moral language, namely that claiming AI output as one's own work is dishonest, even "reprehensible character" (I-2). In the Islamic tradition, deception is strongly condemned, as in the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him) that whoever deceives is not one of his community (Muslim, n.d., hadith no. 101), and scholarship demands scholarly trustworthiness (*amanah*). This finding resonates with the values of *sidq*, *amanah*, and *mas'uliyyah* reported among PAI students at UIN Sumatera Utara (Marpaung et al., 2026). From the standpoint of general AI ethics, disclosing AI use is an expression of transparency and accountability (Floridi & Cowls, 2019; UNESCO, 2021). Thus the "scholarly *amanah*" formulated by I-6 (listing the prompt, the AI's answer, and one's own corrections) translates that global principle into the language of *akhlaq*.

However, the data show that this value works so far as a judgment, not yet as a habit. Students know that claiming AI output is dishonest, yet do not disclose their use. This is where the idea of *muraqabah* (the awareness of being watched by Allah) offered by I-6 becomes relevant as an internal control when external oversight is absent. Ali et al. (2025) propose the ethics of *amanah* or *trusteeship* as a framework for Islamic AI ethics rooted in ethical philosophy, not merely legal rules. This finding is in line with that direction, since effective control appears to lie not in the threat of sanctions but in the internalization of *amanah*.

All students place knowledge as the pinnacle and main source, AI as a tool, and lecturers as confirmers of truth. I-6 formulates it as AI being a helper, not a teacher. This formulation can be read through Al-Attas (1980), concept of *adab*, namely the recognition and acknowledgment of the proper place of everything in the order of knowledge, with the crisis of knowledge beginning from the loss of *adab*. Placing AI as a helper means recognizing its proper place, namely to assist, not to hold authority.

I-6's concern about a "crisis of *adab* and scholarly *sanad*" also corresponds to Al- Al-Ghazali (2005) emphasis on the *adab* of the student of knowledge toward the teacher.

One finding deserves attention, namely that *adab* toward lecturers can be double-edged. I-2 acknowledges that lecturers are clearer and more accurate, but often feels reluctant (*sungkan*) to ask because of limited time. This reluctance, valued as *adab*, opens room for AI as a shortcut that does not demand reluctance. This interpretation is tentative because it rests on one informant, but it suggests that a safe and accessible space for asking questions is part of a learning design that embodies *adab*. Chan dan Hu (2023) note that students appreciate AI as a learning aid while worrying about its accuracy and its impact on personal development; these data add a relational dimension distinctive to Islamic education, namely the relationship between student and teacher.

Students and lecturers mention benefits (efficiency, access to information, help understanding material, teaching media) as well as harms (laziness in thinking, dependence, declining critical thinking, half-baked understanding, answers that are not necessarily correct). The convergence of both groups on these harms reinforces the findings of Zhai et al. (2024) and Gerlich (2025). Within the framework of *maqasid al-shari'ah*, the protection of the intellect (*hifz al-'aql*) is among the principal objectives of the Shari'ah (Al-Syatibi, 1997), and the legal maxim states that preventing harm takes precedence over acquiring benefit (Al-Suyuti, 1990). Therefore efficiency, which in the data functions as the main benefit, cannot be used as a justification if it erodes the capacity to think. The benefit of AI becomes *maslahah* only when accompanied by limits, verification, and honesty, as the informants suggest. Ali et al. (2025) note the limitations of the *maqasid* approach and legal maxims when used without a broader ethical framework; this study therefore combines them with the dimensions of *akhlaq* and *adab*.

Overall, AI use by PAI students is instrumental and conditionally *maslahah*, with a gap between axiological awareness and academic practice widened by the absence of formal regulation. Table 7 summarizes the findings, gaps, and implications for each dimension.

Table 7. Axiological Synthesis and Governance Implications

Dimension	Core finding	Gap	Implication
Ethics (*akhlaq*)	Honesty and *amanah* strongly understood	Low AI disclosure; shallow verification	AI disclosure form; listing prompts and own corrections; cultivating *muraqabah*
Aesthetics (*adab*)	Knowledge–lecturer–AI hierarchy; AI as *khadim*	Reluctance to ask; references without classical texts	Accessible consultation space; assignments requiring primary sources; oral explanation of assignments
Utility (*maslahah*)	Conditional *maslahah*	Efficiency versus critical thinking	Process-based assignments; literacy on the pros and cons of AI; classroom rules and study-program policy

D. CONCLUSION

This study of PAI students at UIN Raden Intan Lampung shows that ChatGPT and Gemini have become multifunctional academic assistants. They are used mainly at the pre-writing stage, namely finding ideas, outlining, summarizing, and translating, and are driven by the social environment and the need for efficiency. Students' ethical awareness is high: AI is seen as an aid, copy-pasting is rejected, and submitting AI output as one's own work is judged dishonest. Practice, however, is not yet consistent. Disclosure of AI use is low, verification relies mostly on search engines, and full copying is acknowledged to occur in their environment. Lecturers' observations reinforce these findings, namely generic references, difficulty explaining the content of assignments, and declining critical thinking. The gap between awareness and practice is widened by the absence of written policy at the study-program and campus levels, so ethical limits depend only on each lecturer's policy and peer influence.

From the perspective of the axiology of Islamic education, honesty and trustworthiness serve as the measure of ethics (*akhlaq*). The knowledge–lecturer–AI hierarchy, with AI as a "helper" and not a teacher, expresses *adab*. The utility of AI is conditional (conditional *maslahah*) because efficiency is set against a threat to critical thinking, so that benefit is legitimate only when accompanied by limits, verification against primary sources, and honesty. Its implication is that AI governance in PAI needs to be designed on the basis of *adab*: written policy, an obligation to disclose AI use together with prompts and one's own corrections, cultivating *muraqabah*, accessible lecturer consultation space, and process-oriented assignments. This study has limitations, namely that it involved only four students and two lecturers without direct classroom observation, so its findings are contextual and cannot be generalized. Further research with broader coverage and direct observation is needed to test the effectiveness of this *adab*-based governance model.

REFERENCES

1. 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).
2. Al-Ghazali, A. H. M. ibn M. (2005). *Ihya' 'ulum al-din*. Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.
3. Al-Suyuti, J. al-D. 'Abd al-R. ibn A. B. (1990). *Al-Ashbah wa al-naza'ir*. Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.
4. Al-Syatibi, I. ibn M. (1997). *Al-Muwafaqat fi usul al-shari'ah* (M. ibn H. Al Salman (ed.)). Dar Ibn 'Affan.
5. Ali, F., Bouzoubaa, K., Gelli, F., Hamzi, B., & Khan, S. (2025). Islamic ethics and AI: An evaluation of existing approaches to AI using trusteeship ethics. *Philosophy & Technology*, *38*(3), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-025-00922-4
6. Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3
7. Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions,

benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

8. Che Nordin, M. K. N., Othman, N. A., Mohd Azhar, M. H., Syed Abdul Rahman, S. M. H., & Mohd Azhar, A. H. (2025). The use of artificial intelligence in Islamic studies: An analysis of students' perceptions and the need for guidance based on Islamic values. *Jurnal Usuluddin*, *53*(2), 109–148. https://doi.org/10.22452/usuluddin.vol53no2.5
9. 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
10. Council, D. E. (2024). *How students use AI: The evolving relationship between AI and higher education*. https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/post/how-students-use-ai-the-evolving-relationship-between-ai-and-higher-education
11. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
12. Floridi, L., & Cowls, 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
13. Gerlich, M. (2025). AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006
14. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The Global Landscape of AI Ethics Guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, *1*(9), 389–399.
15. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
16. Kementerian Agama RI, & Lajnah Pentashihan Mushaf Al-Qur'an. (2019). *Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahannya Edisi Penyempurnaan 2019* (Edisi Peny). Lajnah Pentashihan Mushaf Al-Qur'an.
17. Kurnaesih, U., Faizudin, Sayuti, Munji, A., & Romadan, A. I. (2025). Ethics of using artificial intelligence in learning: Perception of college students in the Islamic education study program. *Ta'dibuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *14*(6), 740–766. https://doi.org/10.32832/tadibuna.v14i6.21188
18. Kusumawardani, S. S., Wulandari, D., Pannen, P., Ekadiyanto, F. A., Wiryana, I., Purwarianti, A., & Alfarozi, S. A. I. (2024). *Panduan penggunaan generative artificial intelligence (GenAi) pada pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi*. Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan~….
19. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. SAGE Publications. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=2oA9aWlNeooC
20. Marpaung, W. R., Salminawati, & Dahlan, Z. (2026). Islamic ethical literacy in the

use of artificial intelligence (AI) for writing scientific articles among first semester PAI students at university. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, *14*(1), 472–484. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v14i1.9891

21. Mashabi, S., & Utomo, Y. W. (2025). Riset terbaru BRIN: 90 persen mahasiswa PTKIN bergantung pada ChatGPT! In *Kompas.com*. https://www.kompas.com/edu/read/2025/12/13/194500771/riset-brin-di-ptkin--90-persen-mahasiswa-pakai-chatgpt-4-6-kali-seminggu
22. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535
23. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3 ed.). Sage Publications.
24. Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the Quality and Credibility of Qualitative Analysis. *Health Services Research*, *34*(5, Pt. 2), 1189–1208.
25. Rahman, M. R. N., & Afandi, N. K. (2024). Islamic education students' perceptions: A phenomenological study on the ethical of using artificial intelligence (AI) in learning. *J-PAI: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, *11*(1), 45–57. https://doi.org/10.18860/jpai.v11i1.27932
26. Sadulloh, U. (2007). *Pengantar filsafat pendidikan*. Alfabeta.
27. Suriasumantri, J. S. (2005). *Filsafat ilmu: Sebuah pengantar populer*. Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
28. UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455
29. 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*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0
30. Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7