

Religious Humanism Above Algorithms: Transforming Educators Through a Holistic Paradigm and Exemplary Ethics

Hamka Al Hakim^a✉ | Supriyanto Abdi^b 

^aDepartment of Islamic Studies, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Indonesia.

^bDepartment of Islamic Studies, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education not only brings technological changes, but also affects the epistemological and normative meaning of education. Behind the narrative of efficiency and data-driven personalization, AI has the potential to give birth to algorithmic reductionism that simplifies education and obscures the ethical and humanistic dimensions of learning. This article aims to critically examine the integration of AI in education through the perspective of religious humanism, by placing educators as the main pedagogical and ethical subjects through a holistic paradigm and exemplary ethics. This research uses a qualitative approach with a critical-conceptual literature review design of reputable international and national scientific literature that discusses AI in education, humanism, hidden curriculum, educator professional identity, and multiculturalism. The results of the study show that the dominance of algorithmic logic in education risks eroding the essence of education if it is not accompanied by strengthening the role of educators as value bearers, ethical examples, and mediators of diversity. This article asserts that meaningful AI integration must subordinate technology to the goal of humanity, with religious humanism as the foundation of educator transformation. The contribution of this study is conceptual and paradigmatic, offering a reflective framework for policy development, pedagogical practice, and educational research direction in the era of artificial intelligence

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 17 January 2026

Revised: 26 March 2026

Accepted: 30 March 2026

KEYWORDS

Religious Humanism; AI in Education; Role of Educators; Holistic Paradigm; Hidden Curriculum.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) disruption in the global education realm takes place massively, rapidly, and often creates very limited space for reflection. The presence of adaptive learning platforms, algorithm-based evaluation systems, and AI-based teaching assistants has driven significant changes in the way knowledge is learned, taught, and assessed in different regions of the world [1]. On the one hand, AI is promoted as solving efficiency problems, personalizing learning, and limiting human resources in education. However, on the other hand, the increasingly penetrating of algorithms has actually led to a tendency to reduce the essence of education, from a value-laden humanization process to a technocratic practice that focuses on data optimization, behavior prediction, and performance measurement alone [2]. This phenomenon raises concerns that education has the potential to lose its ethical, relational, and transformative dimensions, especially when pedagogical decisions are increasingly determined by machine logic rather than human wisdom as educators. Within this framework, the relationship between humans, technology, and values is transformed into a problematic arena that demands a critical and profound rereading, especially from the point of view of religious humanism that positions human dignity as the core and main goal of education [3].

However, the massive adoption of AI in education cannot be understood as a value-neutral application of technology. Epistemologically, algorithms operate in a logic that is "dry", i.e., binary, deterministic, and relies

on probabilistic calculations, so that it tends to reduce the reality of education to measurable and predictable data [4]. On the other hand, Islamic education operates in a "wet" space, which is a realm of meaning rich in values, ethics, affection, example, and spiritual relations between educators and students. Education in this perspective does not stop at the transfer of knowledge, but is a process of holistic human formation through the internalization of values, moral habituation, and character development that cannot be simplified into purely algorithmic variables [5]. It is at this point that there is an increasing academic anxiety, that when the logic of cold and efficient algorithms is forced into the ecosystem of valuable education, there is a risk of pedagogic reductionism that underestimates human complexity and marginalizes the ethical-spiritual dimension of education. Thus, this clash cannot be seen as a mere technical problem, but rather as a paradigmatic problem that demands critical reflection on the direction of educational transformation, especially in the framework of Islamic education that relies on religious humanism [6].

Although the discussion about AI in education is developing very quickly, most of the existing research is still focused on instrumental questions, such as the effectiveness of the use of AI, its integration strategies in the learning process, and efforts to improve educational performance through intelligent technology. This strong emphasis on technical and operational aspects leaves an important gap in educational studies, namely the lack of critical reflection on how to strengthen the human subject so as not to be reduced or even "colonized" by the algorithmic logic itself [1], [4]. In this context, the role of educators is often reduced to simply being a system operator in charge of managing digital platforms, data, and learning flows, even though substantively educators function as *hidden curriculum* which transmits the values, attitudes, and life orientation of students through daily examples in interactions, pedagogical decision-making, and how to respond to the learning process [7]. The limitations of studies that place educators at the center of ethical resistance to educational algorithmization show a paradigmatic vacuum, especially from the perspective of Islamic education. Therefore, an alternative approach is needed that not only addresses the human-AI relationship at the technical level, but also offers a holistic paradigm and exemplary ethics as the basis for transforming the role of educators, so that technology is placed as a supporting tool, not a determinant of the direction of education.

Based on these study gaps, this article expressly aims to propose a conceptual framework of religious humanism placed above algorithms, with a major emphasis on the transformation of the role of educators as the main ethical and pedagogical subjects in the era of artificial intelligence. In contrast to the tendency of previous studies that center AI as the core of educational innovation, this article places educators as *hidden curricula* that convey human values, spirituality, and multicultural insights through a holistic paradigm and exemplary ethics, so that technology is seen as a supporting tool, not a regulator of educational direction [8]. Substantively, this paper examines how strengthening the human dimension of educators is the main strategy in dealing with algorithmic reductionism that has the potential to erode the essence of value education. To realize this goal, this study applies a qualitative approach through a literature study by critically analyzing and synthesizing relevant international and national literature on AI in education, religious humanism, holistic education, and educator professional identity. Through this conceptual synthesis, the article aims to make a theoretical contribution to the development of educational discourse that emphasizes that educational transformation must be oriented towards strengthening the role of humans, not solely on adaptation to technological developments.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative approach with a *critical-conceptual literature review* design, aligned with its primary objective of analyzing the transformation of educators' roles in the era of artificial intelligence (AI) through the lenses of religious humanism, holistic paradigm, and exemplary ethics. Rather than testing

empirical hypotheses, this approach is intended to explore, interpret, and synthesize theoretical discourses in order to construct a coherent and integrative conceptual framework concerning the intersection of algorithmic technologies and value-based education. Epistemologically, the study is grounded in an interpretive-critical tradition that seeks to interrogate underlying assumptions, reveal potential biases, and examine the limitations of contemporary educational discourse shaped by increasing digitalization.

In this research, participants are not human subjects but rather selected bodies of literature, which function as epistemic agents representing diverse scholarly perspectives. The data corpus consists of reputable international and national journal articles, academic books, and conference proceedings relevant to AI in education, religious humanism, hidden curriculum, holistic education, and multiculturalism within the context of educator transformation. These sources are purposively selected based on thematic relevance, conceptual contribution, scholarly rigor, and academic credibility, including indexing in recognized databases and publication by established academic publishers. Efforts are also made to incorporate diverse philosophical and geographical perspectives to enrich the analytical depth.

The primary research instrument is the researcher, supported by structured analytical tools, including a literature review matrix and a conceptual analysis framework. The literature review matrix is used to systematically organize key elements from each source, such as research focus, theoretical orientation, principal arguments, and contributions to the discourse on educational transformation. The conceptual analysis framework facilitates the identification of recurring themes, patterns of reasoning, and interconnections among key concepts. To ensure analytical consistency, evaluative criteria are applied, encompassing relevance, depth of analysis, coherence of argumentation, and theoretical implications.

The data collection process is conducted through a systematic and iterative procedure. Initially, a comprehensive literature search is performed using academic databases such as Google Scholar, Scopus, and accredited national journal repositories. Keywords employed include “AI in education,” “religious humanism,” “holistic education,” “hidden curriculum,” “ethical exemplarity,” and “multicultural education.” The initial search results are then screened based on titles and abstracts to determine relevance. Selected sources undergo in-depth reading to extract core arguments and conceptual insights. This process is iterative, allowing for continuous refinement and expansion of the dataset until theoretical saturation is achieved.

Data analysis is carried out through critical reading and literature mapping to identify dominant discursive trends, epistemological assumptions, and argumentative gaps within existing studies. Subsequently, a process of conceptual thematic coding is undertaken to categorize and synthesize recurring issues across the literature. The findings are then integrated using a comparative and interpretive approach to construct a comprehensive conceptual framework. The analytical framework of this study is structured around three central axes: (1) a critique of algorithmic reductionism in education, which tends to instrumentalize human agency; (2) the affirmation of educators as embodiments of the hidden curriculum through exemplary ethical conduct that cannot be replicated by technological systems; and (3) the development of holistic and multicultural paradigms as foundational principles for transforming educators in the AI era.

To enhance the validity and credibility of the study, strategies such as theoretical triangulation are employed by engaging multiple theoretical perspectives across the literature, alongside reflective critical analysis to ensure interpretive rigor. Through this methodological approach, the study aims to offer a substantive theoretical contribution to contemporary educational discourse by reasserting human empowerment and ethical formation as central orientations in educational transformation amid the growing dominance of algorithmic systems.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Matching AI Reductionism: A Holistic Paradigm in Education

The proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) within educational contexts signifies not merely a technological shift, but a profound epistemological reconfiguration of how knowledge, learning, and human development are conceptualized [9], [10], [11]. A growing body of international scholarship indicates that AI systems operate predominantly through a reductionist logic, whereby the inherent complexity of educational processes is translated into measurable, classifiable, and predictable variables governed by algorithmic structures. Within such a framework, learning is increasingly reframed as the accumulation of quantifiable performance data; students are rendered as statistical representations; and educational success is narrowly defined through metrics that can be optimized and automated [12]. While this paradigm offers efficiency and scalability, it simultaneously introduces a critical epistemic risk: the displacement of education as a process of meaning-making and human formation by an instrumental orientation toward technocratic control and performance optimization.

This reductionist tendency is further exacerbated by the structural limitations of AI itself. As numerous studies suggest, AI systems fundamentally rely on pattern recognition derived from historical datasets, thereby lacking the capacity for intentionality, ethical judgment, and relational understanding that are intrinsic to human pedagogical practice [13]. Consequently, dimensions such as moral deliberation, empathy, and dialogical engagement—central to transformative education—remain largely inaccessible to algorithmic mediation. The increasing dominance of such systems risks narrowing the telos of education, gradually reconstituting it as a domain of technical efficiency rather than ethical and humanistic development. In this regard, AI does not merely function as a neutral tool but actively reshapes the ontology of education by privileging what is measurable over what is meaningful [14].

From a critical perspective, this shift reflects a broader tendency within contemporary educational policy and practice toward what may be termed *algorithmic epistemology*—a mode of knowing that prioritizes datafication, standardization, and predictive analytics at the expense of contextual, interpretive, and value-laden dimensions of learning. Such an epistemology risks marginalizing forms of knowledge that are inherently qualitative, experiential, and relational [15]. Moreover, it implicitly redefines the role of educators, positioning them as facilitators of system-optimized learning pathways rather than as moral agents and intellectual guides. This transformation raises fundamental questions regarding agency, authority, and the ethical foundations of education in the digital age. In contrast to this reductionist paradigm, the literature on religious humanism offers a fundamentally divergent ontological and epistemological orientation [16]. Within this perspective, education is conceived not as a process of technical transmission or performance enhancement, but as a holistic endeavor aimed at the cultivation of fully realized human beings. It emphasizes the integration of cognitive, affective, spiritual, and moral dimensions, thereby affirming that authentic learning is inseparable from the development of ethical consciousness and meaningful human relationships. Particularly within Islamic educational thought, this integrative vision is deeply embedded, wherein education is understood as a process of *ta'dīb* (moral cultivation) that harmonizes intellect (*'aql*), heart (*qalb*), and action (*'amal*) in relation to both the Divine and the social order [17].

The critical juxtaposition between AI-driven educational models and religious humanist frameworks reveals a fundamental tension: while the former is grounded in instrumental rationality and computational efficiency, the latter is rooted in ethical intentionality and holistic human development. This tension cannot be resolved through incremental technological refinement alone, as it reflects a deeper paradigmatic divergence concerning the purpose and nature of education itself [18]. Efforts to “humanize” AI without addressing its underlying epistemological assumptions risk superficiality, as they fail to confront the structural logic that prioritizes quantification over meaning.

In response to these challenges, the holistic paradigm in education emerges as a critical counter-framework that reasserts the primacy of human wholeness in the educational process. This paradigm advances a multidimensional

understanding of learning, wherein intellectual development is inseparable from emotional maturity, ethical integrity, spiritual awareness, and social responsibility. Rather than rejecting technology outright, the holistic approach repositions it within a value-governed framework, wherein AI functions as a supportive instrument subordinate to educational aims, rather than as a determinative force shaping them [19]. Importantly, this repositioning entails a normative reordering: educational values and philosophical commitments must precede and guide technological integration, not be retrofitted in response to it. Without such a paradigm, the incorporation of AI risks exacerbating existing inequities, reinforcing standardized models of intelligence, and further marginalizing non-quantifiable aspects of human development. Conversely, when grounded in a holistic and humanistic framework, AI can be appropriated in ethically bounded and pedagogically meaningful ways—for instance, to enhance personalized learning while preserving the centrality of teacher-student relationships and moral formation [20].

Thus, this study critically argues that confronting AI reductionism requires more than technical adaptation; it necessitates a paradigmatic reorientation that redefines education as an inherently ethical, relational, and humanizing enterprise. The holistic paradigm, informed by religious humanism, provides a robust conceptual foundation for such a reorientation, ensuring that the integration of AI in education remains aligned with the broader aim of cultivating fully developed human beings rather than merely optimizing measurable outcomes.

Educators as a Hidden Curriculum: Ethics of Exemplary as an Irreplaceable Algorithm

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into educational systems has not only transformed instructional delivery but has also subtly reconfigured the perceived role of educators. Increasingly, educators are repositioned from value-laden pedagogical agents to technical facilitators responsible for managing platforms, interpreting analytics, and optimizing digital learning environments [21]. This shift is underpinned by an implicit technocratic assumption: that educational processes can be rendered neutral, objective, and efficient through algorithmic systems, thereby minimizing—or even substituting—the ethical and relational dimensions historically embodied by educators. Such an assumption, however, reflects a deeply problematic reduction of education to procedural functionality, neglecting its inherently normative and humanistic character [22].

Educational theory consistently challenges this reduction by asserting that teaching is never a value-neutral activity. Every pedagogical decision, mode of interaction, and behavioral disposition enacted by educators carries implicit ethical orientations that shape students' cognitive, emotional, and moral development. This dimension is conceptualized as the *hidden curriculum*—the tacit transmission of values, norms, and dispositions that occurs through lived pedagogical practice rather than through formal curricular content [23]. Unlike explicit instruction, the hidden curriculum operates through relational dynamics, institutional culture, and, most critically, the embodied example of the educator. Consequently, any educational model that recenters AI as the primary locus of learning risks obscuring the fundamental reality that the deepest layers of value formation remain rooted in human interaction. In this regard, the marginalization of educators in AI-mediated environments is not merely a functional shift but an epistemic displacement of the primary source of ethical formation in education [24].

A critical comparison between algorithmic systems and the ethics of exemplarity further illuminates the structural limitations of AI in value-laden educational contexts. Algorithms operate through formalized rules, logical consistency, and the processing of historical data to generate predictions or decisions that are efficient and scalable [25]. While such systems excel in pattern recognition and optimization, they lack the capacity for moral intentionality, situational judgment, and empathetic engagement—qualities that are indispensable in pedagogical practice. In contrast, the ethics of exemplarity embodied by educators emerge from reflective consciousness, contextual sensitivity, and lived moral experience. Ethical action in education is not the execution of predefined rules but the result of ongoing interpretation, negotiation, and responsibility within complex human situations [26].

From this perspective, it may be analytically useful to conceptualize educators as “living algorithms”—not in a mechanistic sense, but as dynamic agents capable of integrating knowledge, context, and ethical reasoning in ways that transcend computational logic [27]. Unlike artificial systems, educators do not merely process inputs to produce outputs; they interpret meaning, exercise judgment under conditions of uncertainty, and model ethical comportment through their presence and actions. Empirical and theoretical studies on teacher identity further reinforce this distinction, demonstrating that educators’ integrity, moral commitments, and value orientations are decisive factors in shaping the quality and depth of pedagogical engagement. These dimensions are inherently irreducible to algorithmic replication, as they are constituted through biography, reflection, and moral agency rather than programmable logic [28].

The limitations of AI in this domain are not incidental but structural. Attempts to encode ethical behavior into algorithmic systems—through frameworks such as machine ethics or value alignment—remain constrained by their reliance on predefined rules and datasets, which cannot fully capture the fluid, context-dependent nature of moral life. Consequently, while AI can simulate certain aspects of decision-making, it cannot authentically embody ethical responsibility or serve as a moral exemplar [29]. This distinction is critical, as education is not solely concerned with what learners know, but with who they become—a process fundamentally mediated by human models of conduct rather than abstract systems of calculation [30].

Within the Islamic educational tradition, this emphasis on exemplarity is even more pronounced and foundational. Educators are not merely transmitters of knowledge but serve as *uswah hasanah* (exemplary models) whose lives embody the integration of knowledge, ethics, and practice. The classical principle of prioritizing *adab* (ethical comportment) over knowledge underscores the conviction that knowledge devoid of moral grounding risks becoming directionless or even detrimental [31]. In this framework, values are not primarily conveyed through didactic instruction but are internalized through sustained relational engagement and observation of lived example. This reflects an early and sophisticated recognition of what contemporary theory terms the hidden curriculum, wherein ethical formation occurs implicitly through pedagogical presence and practice. In the context of AI-mediated education, this tradition offers a critical corrective to the prevailing technocentric paradigm. As learning environments become increasingly mediated by systems that lack moral awareness, intentionality, and accountability, the role of educators as ethical anchors becomes not less but more indispensable [32]. The absence of embodied exemplarity in algorithmic systems creates a normative vacuum that cannot be filled by technical sophistication alone. Thus, rather than displacing educators, the integration of AI necessitates a renewed emphasis on their role as moral agents and custodians of educational values.

Critically, this reassertion of the educator’s centrality also challenges dominant narratives of technological determinism that position AI as an inevitable replacement for human functions. Such narratives overlook the fundamentally relational and ethical nature of education, which resists full automation [33]. A more balanced and theoretically grounded approach recognizes AI as a tool with bounded capabilities—one that can support administrative efficiency and personalized learning, but cannot replicate the ethical depth and relational richness of human pedagogy. Therefore, this study argues that the ethics of exemplarity embodied by educators constitutes an “irreplaceable algorithm” in education—not in the computational sense, but as a metaphor for a uniquely human system of ethical reasoning, relational engagement, and value transmission that cannot be codified into artificial systems [34]. The meaningful integration of AI in education thus depends on a clear hierarchical ordering: technology must remain subordinate to pedagogical ethics, with educators functioning as the primary agents of value formation. Without such a foundation, the expansion of AI risks not only diminishing the role of educators but also eroding the very ethical and humanistic core upon which education is built.

Educator Professional Identity and Multicultural Insights in the Filter Bubble Era

Beyond its epistemological and pedagogical implications, the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education introduces significant socio-cultural risks, particularly through the dynamics of *filter bubbles* and algorithmic bias [35]. The concept of the filter bubble refers to a condition in which algorithmic systems curate and personalize information based on users' prior behaviors, preferences, and interactions, thereby limiting exposure to diverse perspectives and alternative viewpoints. Within educational contexts, this phenomenon extends beyond content delivery to the subtle shaping of students' cognitive frameworks, influencing not only what they learn but also how they perceive truth, difference, and legitimacy. In such environments, knowledge risks becoming increasingly homogenized, reinforcing pre-existing assumptions rather than challenging them [36].

This concern is compounded by the well-documented tendency of algorithmic systems to reproduce and amplify biases embedded within their training data. Rather than functioning as neutral mediators, AI systems may inadvertently privilege dominant discourses while marginalizing minority perspectives, thereby reinforcing structural inequalities and epistemic exclusion. When educational processes become overly dependent on such systems, there is a tangible risk that learning spaces may evolve into closed cognitive ecosystems—characterized by limited dialogical engagement, reduced critical exposure, and diminished intellectual plurality [37]. Consequently, education risks shifting from a liberatory practice aimed at expanding human understanding into a mechanism that reproduces existing preferences, ideologies, and socio-cultural hierarchies.

In confronting these challenges, the professional identity of educators emerges as a decisive mediating force. Far from being neutral transmitters of knowledge, educators are inherently value-laden agents whose beliefs, ethical commitments, and professional orientations shape every dimension of the learning process—from curriculum design and material selection to pedagogical interaction and epistemic framing [38]. This recognition is particularly critical in AI-mediated environments, where algorithmic systems may constrain the diversity of accessible knowledge. In such contexts, educators assume the role of epistemic gatekeepers and facilitators of intellectual openness, actively counterbalancing the narrowing tendencies of algorithmic personalization.

A critically reflective professional identity enables educators to engage with technology not as passive adopters but as active interpreters and regulators. Through reflexive awareness, educators can interrogate the assumptions embedded within AI systems, identify potential biases, and deliberately expand the scope of learning beyond algorithmically curated content [39]. This includes introducing alternative perspectives, fostering dialogical engagement, and cultivating critical thinking skills that empower students to question and transcend the limitations of digital systems. Empirical and theoretical studies on teacher professionalism consistently underscore that such reflective capacity is integral to maintaining pedagogical integrity in technologically mediated environments. Without it, educators risk becoming extensions of algorithmic logic rather than agents of intellectual and ethical formation [40].

Importantly, the role of educators in this context is not merely corrective but transformative. By consciously mediating between algorithmic outputs and human values, educators can reorient learning toward inclusivity, critical inquiry, and social responsibility [41]. This positions professional identity not simply as an individual attribute but as a structural safeguard within the educational system—a buffer against the epistemic narrowing induced by AI. In this sense, the educator's role evolves into that of a *critical curator*, who navigates between technological affordances and pedagogical imperatives to ensure that education remains a space of openness and intellectual diversity.

As a normative and pedagogical response to the risks associated with filter bubbles and algorithmic standardization, multiculturalism offers a robust ethical and conceptual framework. Multicultural education challenges the notion of knowledge as singular and universal, instead affirming the plurality of perspectives, experiences, and cultural narratives that constitute human understanding. It positions education as a dialogical space where differences are not erased but engaged, fostering critical consciousness and a commitment to social justice [42]. Within this framework, diversity is not treated as an obstacle to coherence but as a necessary condition for meaningful learning.

In the context of AI-driven education, multiculturalism functions as a critical counterbalance to algorithmic homogenization. It compels educators to intentionally diversify learning materials, question dominant narratives, and create pedagogical spaces that encourage encounter with difference [43]. This is particularly significant given that algorithmic systems tend to optimize for relevance and engagement—often at the expense of diversity and critical disruption. By embedding multicultural principles into pedagogical practice, educators can resist the closure of intellectual horizons and instead cultivate learners who are capable of navigating complexity, ambiguity, and plurality [44].

This perspective resonates strongly with the principles of inclusive Islamic education, which emphasize values of justice (*'adl*), human dignity (*karāmah*), and respect for diversity as foundational to the educational mission. Within this tradition, education is inherently oriented toward the common good (*maṣlahah*), requiring openness to difference and a commitment to ethical coexistence. Such a framework reinforces the argument that multiculturalism is not merely a curricular addition but a deeply rooted pedagogical ethic that aligns with broader humanistic and spiritual objectives.

Therefore, this study critically contends that in the era of AI, multiculturalism must be reconceptualized as an essential dimension of educator professionalism rather than an optional pedagogical strategy. It demands that educators actively function as guardians of epistemic diversity and facilitators of dialogical engagement, ensuring that education remains a process of intellectual expansion rather than restriction. The convergence of professional identity and multicultural insight thus constitutes a vital counterforce to the algorithmic tendencies of standardization and bias, reaffirming education as a fundamentally humanizing endeavor that broadens, rather than narrows, the horizons of human thought.

Strategic Implications

The pedagogical implications of this study confirm that the transformation of education in the era of artificial intelligence cannot be simplified solely on improving the technical skills of educators in operating learning technology devices and systems. Educators need to be consciously repositioned as pedagogical subjects who play a major role in the formation of values, the determination of learning orientation, and the management of ethical relationships between students, knowledge, and technology in the educational process. Thus, the professional development of educators should be directed not only at the aspect of digital competence, but also at strengthening reflective, ethical, and cultural capacity, so that educators are able to assess, limit, and utilize technology critically and contextually. Within this framework, technology is placed as a functional supporting instrument, while pedagogical decisions remain based on human considerations, educational values, and long-term learning goals oriented towards the formation of the whole human being.

At the policy level, the findings of this study imply the need for the formulation of an education regulatory framework that is not solely oriented towards efficiency, digital innovation, and data-driven achievements, but also explicitly protects and strengthens the humanistic, ethical, and multicultural dimensions in education. Ideally, AI integration policies should be equipped with strategies that reaffirm the role of educators as value agents, as well as an evaluation mechanism that not only measures technical performance, but also considers the social and cultural impacts of the

use of technology in the educational process. In addition, this study opens up opportunities for the development of advanced research, especially empirical research that examines how the role of educators, pedagogical ethics, and how multicultural insights can be contextually integrated in AI-based educational practices. Although conceptual, this study makes an important contribution by providing a reflective framework that emphasizes that the direction of sustainable education transformation must be based on strengthening the human dimension, not just accelerating technology adoption.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms that the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education presents paradigmatic implications that cannot be reduced to mere technical issues. Through a critical literature review, this paper shows that AI tends to present algorithmic reductionism logic that has the potential to reduce the meaning of education to just a measurable and automated process. On the contrary, the essence of education operates in relational, ethical, and cultural dimensions that educators realize through *the hidden curriculum*. In this frame, the educator's professional identity, exemplary ethics, and multicultural insight appear as key elements that ensure education remains geared towards the humanization process. These conceptual findings confirm the paper's main claim that the integration of AI without strengthening religious humanism risks accelerating the dehumanization of education, not only because of the presence of technology, but because of the absence of a value paradigm that subordinates technology to the goal of humanity.

The main contribution of this study is conceptual and paradigmatic, namely offering a framework of thinking that positions educators as the center of value in the AI-based education ecosystem. The implications of this study confirm that strengthening the role of educators as ethical agents, value carriers, and perspective openers must take precedence over the adoption of technology in educational policies and practices. Although conceptual based on literature review, this study provides a reflective foundation for policy development, pedagogical practices, and advanced research that emphasizes more on strengthening the humanitarian dimension in the scope of education. Thus, a meaningful future of education in the era of artificial intelligence can only be achieved if technology is placed as an instrument, while the values of religious humanism remain the main foundation of educator and educational transformation.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express sincere gratitude to Supriyanto Abdi, Ph.D., the second author and research supervisor, for his invaluable guidance, academic mentorship, and insightful suggestions throughout the semester. Appreciation is also extended to the Faculty of Islamic Studies, Universitas Islam Indonesia (UII), for providing the necessary institutional support and facilities for this research. The author further acknowledges the Faculty of Islamic Studies (FAI) at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS) for the opportunity to present this work at the 6th International Conference on Islamic and Muhammadiyah Studies (ICIMS). Finally, a heartfelt thank you is dedicated to the author's family for their endless prayers and unwavering support throughout this academic journey.

Author Contribution

All authors made substantial contributions to the development of this manuscript. Hamka Al Hakim was responsible for the conception, analysis, synthesis, and drafting of the paper. Hamka Al Hakim developed the conceptual framework and executed the entire research process. Supriyanto Abdi, Ph.D. provided continuous revisions and critical refinements throughout the academic semester. All authors contributed equally to the final manuscript writing and revisions. We have collectively reviewed and approved the final version of the paper for publication.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper. This research was conducted as part of an academic course, and no financial or personal relationships influenced the findings or conclusions presented.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Williamson, "Education, technology and the politics of digital data.," *Learn. Media Technol.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 1–14, 2021.
- [2] G. Biesta, "What is education for? On good education, teacher judgement, and educational professionalism. European Journal of Education," *Eur. J. Educ.*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 75–87, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12109>.
- [3] M. Taufik, "Strategic Role of Islamic Religious Education In Strengthening Character Education In The Era Of Industrial Revolution 4.0.," *J. Ilm. Islam Futur.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 86–104, 2020, doi: [10.22373/jiif.v20i1.5797](https://doi.org/10.22373/jiif.v20i1.5797).
- [4] N. Selwyn, *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press. 2019.
- [5] M. Sofa, "Prinsip-Prinsip Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam dalam Perspektif Al-Qur'an. Kordinat," *J. Komun. Antar Perguru. Tinggi Agama Islam*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 10–27, 2022.
- [6] A. N. Andri Nirwana et al., "SWOT Analysis of AI Integration in Islamic Education: Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor Impacts," *Qubahan Acad. J.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 476–503, 2025, doi: [10.48161/qaj.v5n1a1498](https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v5n1a1498).
- [7] A. Sahiba, "Ruang lingkup pendidikan Islam kontemporer," *J. Ilmu Pendidik. dan Kearifan Lokal*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 224–232, 2022.
- [8] L. Philip Barnes, "Reviewing the place of Humanism in religious education," *Br. J. Relig. Educ.*, pp. 137–149, 2023.
- [9] E. Kosasih, M. R. F. Islamy, and R. S. Wiwaha, "Artificial Intelligence in the Era of Society 5.0: Compromising Technological Innovation Through the Wasathiyah Approach within the Framework of Islamic Law," *Al-Istinbath J. Huk. Islam*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 519–540, 2024, doi: [10.29240/jhi.v9i2.9596](https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v9i2.9596).
- [10] J. C. G. Corpuz, "Faith and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Catholic Education: A Theological Virtue Ethics Perspective," *Religions*, vol. 16, no. 8, 2025, doi: [10.3390/rel16081083](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16081083).
- [11] W. Przygoda, A. Rynio, and M. Kalisz, "Artificial Intelligence: A New Challenge for Human Understanding, Christian Education, and the Pastoral Activity of the Churches," *Religions*, vol. 16, no. 8, 2025, doi: [10.3390/rel16080948](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16080948).
- [12] F. Syukur, A. Maghfurin, U. Marhamah, and P. Jehwae, "Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Higher Education: Comparative Responses between Indonesia and Thailand," *Nazhruna J. Pendidik. Islam*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 531–553, 2024, doi: [10.31538/nzh.v7i3.13](https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v7i3.13).
- [13] M. Yamaç and N. İsbilen, "Religion Paradigm of Artificial Intelligence," *Ilah. Stud.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 233–253, 2024, doi: [10.12730/IS.1444746](https://doi.org/10.12730/IS.1444746).
- [14] I. Nord and L. Schleier, "A Lack of Agency: Artificial Intelligence Has So Far Shown Little Potential for Church Innovation—An Exploratory Interview Study with Protestant and Catholic Leaders in Germany," *Religions*, vol. 16, no. 7, 2025, doi: [10.3390/rel16070885](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16070885).
- [15] C. Papakostas, "Artificial Intelligence in Religious Education: Ethical, Pedagogical, and Theological Perspectives," *Religions*, vol. 16, no. 5, 2025, doi: [10.3390/rel16050563](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16050563).
- [16] H. Barrios-Tao, V. Díaz, and Y. M. Guerra, "Purposes of Education Along With Artificial Intelligence Developments," *Cad. Pesqui.*, vol. 51, 2021, doi: [10.1590/198053147767](https://doi.org/10.1590/198053147767).
- [17] A. Salim, R. Gonibala, I. Talibo, and M. A. Baba, "Divine Concepts, Tawhid, and Algorithmic Thinking: A Comparative Analysis of Christian and Islamic Perspectives on Educational Theology in the Era of Artificial Intelligence," *Nazhruna J. Pendidik. Islam*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2026, doi: [10.31538/nzh.v9i1.196](https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v9i1.196).
- [18] P. K. Fallon, "Neil Postman on AI and education: An imagined speech (2025)," *Explor. Media Ecol.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 335–341, 2025, doi: [10.1386/eme_00264_7](https://doi.org/10.1386/eme_00264_7).
- [19] D. Sachyani and A. Gal, "Artificial Intelligence Tools in Environmental Education: Facilitating Creative Learning about Complex Interaction in Nature," *Eur. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 395–413, 2025, doi: [10.12973/eu-jer.14.2.395](https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.14.2.395).

- [20] S. Ferretti, "AI in Heritage Education: Teaching History through Iconography," in *International Conference "The Future of Education"*, Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy: Pixel Associazione, 2025.
- [21] A. Wedi and D. Mardiana, "Digital Transformation Model of Islamic Religious Education in the AI Era: A Case Study of Madrasah Aliyah in East Java, Indonesia," *Int. J. Learn. Teach. Educ. Res.*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 842–863, 2025, doi: 10.26803/ijlter.24.8.37.
- [22] B. Baker, K. A. Mills, P. McDonald, and L. Wang, "AI, Concepts of Intelligence, and Chatbots: The 'Figure of Man,' the Rise of Emotion, and Future Visions of Education," *Teach. Coll. Rec.*, vol. 125, no. 6, pp. 60–84, 2023, doi: 10.1177/01614681231191291.
- [23] H. Hwang, "Grace and Community in the Age of AI: A Wesleyan-Theological Dialogue on Digital Technology and Religious Education†," *Relig. Educ.*, 2026, doi: 10.1080/00344087.2026.2627117.
- [24] M. Turós *et al.*, "Beyond Utility: The Impact of Religiosity and Calling on AI Adoption in Education," *Religions*, vol. 16, no. 8, 2025, doi: 10.3390/rel16081069.
- [25] L. Kurata, M. A. Ayanwale, R. R. Molefi, and T. Sanni, "Teaching religious studies with artificial intelligence: A qualitative analysis of Lesotho secondary schools teachers' perceptions," *Int. J. Educ. Res. Open*, vol. 8, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.ijedro.2024.100417.
- [26] Z. Moola, T. Dhurumraj, and S. Ramaila, "Teachers' Views on the Interdependence of Humanity and Technology in Life Sciences Teaching and Learning within the Context of the 5IR," *Int. J. Learn. Teach. Educ. Res.*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 476–498, 2024, doi: 10.26803/ijlter.23.7.24.
- [27] H. Widodo, "An AI-Gamification-Religiosity Learning Model to Enhance Critical Literacy in Private Islamic Universities," *Islam. Q.*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 75–120, 2025.
- [28] M. Birgün, "Integrating AI into Qur'an learning: Technical advances and pedagogical gaps," *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open*, vol. 13, 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102499.
- [29] A. Zubaidi, A. Munip, S. A. Widodo, and T. Zerrouki, "Enhancing Arabic writing skills using Chat GPT-based AI learning models: A tridimensional human-AI collaboration framework," *Indones. J. Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 87–101, 2025, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v15i1.75378.
- [30] M. Chrostowski and A. J. Najda, "From Verse to Vision: Exploring AI-Generated Religious Imagery in Bible Teaching," *Religions*, vol. 16, no. 8, 2025, doi: 10.3390/rel16081051.
- [31] K. H. Bin Jamil, "Between Traditionalising and Futuring: Applying The Broader Maqasid Paradigm to Hadith Studies," *Asia Pacific J. Educ. Educ.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 183–196, 2024, doi: 10.21315/apjee2024.39.2.10.
- [32] A. Inversini, "Human centered digital transformation in travel: a horizon 2050 paper," *Tour. Rev.*, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 326–337, 2025, doi: 10.1108/TR-12-2023-0886.
- [33] S. Brumec and I. Platovnjak, "Artificial Intelligence and Spirituality: A Tool for Engagement or a Threat to Transcendence?," *Sci. Fides*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 221–238, 2025, doi: 10.12775/SetF.2025.023.
- [34] S. Wang, "Public Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence in 20 Countries: Assessing Individual- and Country-Level Factors," *Cross-Cultural Res.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 651–676, 2025, doi: 10.1177/10693971251336803.
- [35] H. Kopecka, J. Such, and M. Luck, "Preferences for AI Explanations Based on Cognitive Style and Socio-Cultural Factors," *Proc. ACM Human-Computer Interact.*, vol. 8, no. CSCW1, 2024, doi: 10.1145/3637386.
- [36] K. Nasir, R. K. Zaman, A. B. A. Hilmi, A. H. Mahadzir, and A. M. B. Mustafa, "Artificial Intelligence Integration in Mobile Applications: Innovation and Challenges in Supporting Quran Memorization and Review," *Quranica*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 612–645, 2025.
- [37] R. Hosna, K. Idawati, A. Mahsun, E. M. Budiarti, and I. I. Ilahiyah, "Development of Artificial Intelligence-Based Akidah Akhlak Teaching Materials for Islamic Senior High Schools in Indonesia," *Nazhruna J. Pendidik. Islam*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 207–226, 2026, doi: 10.31538/nzh.v9i1.355.
- [38] P. Perera and A. Wathsala, "AI in the House of God: Threat, Tool or Transformation?," *Proc. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 1051–1055, 2025, doi: 10.1002/pra2.1338.
- [39] V. Nikitenko *et al.*, "Developing the Concept of Digital Humanism as Human Interaction with Artificial Intelligence," *Pakistan J. Life Soc. Sci.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 238–248, 2025, doi: 10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.0021.
- [40] F. H. N. Athief, I. Mawardi, K. Assholihah, F. Mukhlis, and M. S. Apriantoro, "Artificial Intelligence and Islamic Law in

- Finance: Assessing ChatGPT's Responses to Public Doubts on Riba," *Manchester J. Transnatl. Islam. Law Pract.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 92–107, 2025.
- [41] J. Simmerlein and M. Tretter, "Robots in Religious Practices: A Review," *Theol. Sci.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 255–273, 2024, doi: 10.1080/14746700.2024.2351639.
- [42] B. Sepehri, A. I. Almulhim, M. A. Adibhesami, S. Makaremi, and F. Ejazi, "Artificial Intelligence Role in Promoting Saudi Arabia's Smart Cities: Addressing SDGs for Socio-Cultural Challenges," *Russ. Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 20–47, 2024, doi: 10.17323/1728-192x-2024-4-20-47.
- [43] T. Supriyadi, J. Julia, U. Supriadi, N. Rahminawati, and A. Sarvinoz Baxtiyorovna, "DEEP-AI Pedagogical Model for Strengthening Al-Qur'an Interpretation Literacy in Islamic Religious Education," *J. Pendidik. Agama Islam*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 275–294, 2025, doi: 10.14421/jpai.v22i1.11053.
- [44] Y. Chen, X. Wang, and R. Fu, "From 'Dual' to 'Triple': Pathway Reconstruction for Instructional Digital Transformation," in *Proceedings of 2025 3rd International Conference on Educational Knowledge and Informatization, EKI 2025*, Shanghai Open University, East Pudong Branch, Shanghai, China: Association for Computing Machinery, Inc, 2025, pp. 179–184. doi: 10.1145/3765325.3765357.