



AI, Moral-Religious Authority, and Muslim Identity: An Interactional Sociolinguistic Analysis of the YouTube Podcast *The Thinking Muslim*

Moh Khoirul Anam^{1*}, Isna Laili Qurroti A'yun²

¹ Fakultas Adab dan Humaniora, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60237, Indonesia

² Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah 50275, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: 02 June 2026	The use of AI has now developed into various aspects of life. For Muslims, this development requires addressing not only technological capabilities but also how AI is used in a way aligning with Islamic values. This study aims to examine how artificial intelligence (AI) is discussed and presented to a global Muslim audience in an episode of the podcast <i>The Thinking Muslim</i> . This study employs a qualitative approach using a single-case study design. This analysis draws on Gumperz's interactional sociolinguistics supported by stance theory, identity-in-interaction, and audience design. The data comes from a 60-minute 17-second episode titled "The New AI Empires," between host Muhammad Jalal and AI expert Waleed Kadous. The episode on YouTube was downloaded and transcribed. The data was then divided into 61 conversational units, coded, and grouped into five main themes. The results of this study show that AI is discussed not only as technology, but also as a geopolitical, ideological, moral, religious, and civilizational issue. Kadous's authority is constructed through hybrid translation, which builds on his professional background and his position as a Muslim. The identity of the Muslim group is depicted as underrepresented and dependent on the technology of others. However, this group is seen as having responsibilities and morals, as well as the ability to build technological sovereignty. Changes in language variety, personal pronouns, analogies, and re-explanations help direct the audience toward education, investment, evaluation, and institutional cooperation. Therefore, this study encourages AI that aligns with Islamic values.
Accepted: 28 July 2026	
Published: 06 August 2026	
Keywords:	
Artificial Intelligence, Interactional, Muslim Identity, Moral-Religious Authority, Sociolinguistics	

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)

Published by CV Wahana Publikasi.

This article is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence is increasingly used in various fields, from education and government to employment and media, for everyday decision-making. Due to its widespread use, AI should be developed and evaluated openly, fairly, and responsibly. Furthermore, AI should be sensitive to cultural and moral values. Therefore, AI should be viewed not only for its efficiency benefits but also for how it is used. Ali et al. (2025) proposed an ethics of trust that links technology with spiritual responsibility, good intentions, justice, and the common good. Nacar et al. (2025) also emphasized that sensitivity to religion and culture should be incorporated from the language model assessment stage. General principles of AI ethics include transparency, fairness, non-harm, responsibility, human rights, cultural diversity, and human oversight (Floridi et al., 2018; Jobin et al., 2019; UNESCO, 2022). Therefore, AI issues need to be understood as both technological and social, as well as power issues (Bender et al., 2021; Blodgett et al., 2020; Weidinger et al., 2022).

For Muslim communities, AI is not sufficient for merely seeking accurate Islamic religious information. It also needs to be used to address human dignity, shared responsibilities, benefits, and dangers. Therefore, a shared platform for Muslim communities to discuss these issues is necessary. Digital da'wah (Islamic outreach) can fill this space. Digital da'wah also enables assistance to Muslim communities with social and technological issues, connects them with Islamic ethics, and brings together experts from diverse fields. Therefore, discussions of AI in Muslim digital spaces should combine technological expertise with religious and moral considerations, without equating tech experts with religious scholars. Digital platforms are also changing how expertise, visibility, and religious beliefs are constructed and debated (Bunt, 2018, 2018; Fauzi, 2023; Khamis, 2026). This is to prevent cultural and religious bias in AI.

However, in reality, this is not yet the case. Recent research shows that Large Language Models (LLMs) still harbor cultural and religious biases. Plaza-del-Arco et al. (2024) found that Islam and Judaism are more frequently associated with rejection, stigma, and less diverse images. Naous et al. (2024) also found Western cultural bias. This means that good language skills do not necessarily indicate good cultural understanding. Nacar et al. (2025) show that AI evaluation materials can also be culturally controversial, particularly regarding religious and moral issues. This is not a matter of how much AI knows about Islam, but rather a matter of which values are considered normal within the AI system and which religious perspectives are underrepresented. Other studies have also found discrepancies between ethics and culture, selective rejection of responses, religious bias in language with limited data, and model weaknesses in accepting commands that trigger bias. Simply changing the language of the commands is not enough to eliminate cultural bias (Khorramrouz & Levy, 2026; Ramezani & Xu, 2025; Sadhu et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2026; Zhao et al., 2025).

At the same time, digital media is changing the way religious authority is portrayed and understood. An individual is considered authoritative and influential if he or she is easily accessible, has strong communication skills, is professionally recognized, and is able to connect religion to current issues. Campbell (2023) describes the emergence of online religious leaders whose influence is shaped by digital and communication skills, not just formal religious education. However, this shift does not directly replace religious scholars with influencers or tech experts. Religious authority in digital media is constructed through interaction. Speakers need to demonstrate knowledge, acknowledge the limits of their expertise, and adapt their speech to the needs of their audience. Therefore, a figure's influence depends on the interconnectedness of religious expertise, media literacy, public recognition,

and audience acceptance.

These changes raise new sociolinguistic issues. For example, when a Muslim discusses AI on a YouTube podcast, we need to look beyond the topic and the ethics of its use; we also need to examine how technical terms are explained. This explanation of technical terms can reveal who is speaking, an expert or a religious scholar. We can also examine whether the register used encompasses both technological and religious registers, or whether only one register is dominant. We can also examine whether the limitations in the use of this register are related to the speaker's competence or to the speaker's self-imposed limitations along the lines of an expert, such as a religious scholar. Technical words, pronouns like *we* and *our*, modals like *should* and *must*, analogies, questions, re-explanations, and Arabic-Islamic terms can transform AI from a technical issue into a moral, political, religious, and civilizational one. Therefore, this research asks not only what speakers say about AI but also how the conversation shapes understandings of expertise, authority, and identity.

Several previous studies have examined this topic. Digital religion studies address changes in religious participation, identity, agency, and authority on the internet (Abusharif, 2023; Campbell, 2023; Patel, 2025; Rahman, 2023). Islamic AI ethics studies offer principles for assessing technology in light of cultural and religious values (Ali et al., 2025; Ghaly, 2024). Computational research demonstrates religious stigma, Western cultural bias, and assessment tools that are not always culturally appropriate (Nacar et al., 2025; Naous et al., 2024; Plaza-del-Arco et al., 2024). Global Englishes studies address the use of English in digital and cross-cultural communication (Baker et al., 2026; Canagarajah, 2006; Jenkins, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2011), while Islamic sociolinguistics examines the relationship between Islamic perspectives, language, and cultural practices (Bhatt et al., 2025). In contemporary *da'wah*, the choice of linguistic codes, such as Arabic expressions, register variations, and code-switching, can signal religious identity and authority, as well as social relationships (Bouzenita, 2008; Mardi et al., 2025). Other studies explain that social identity and meaning are constructed through language choices, styles, attitudes, and social relationships (Agha, 2006; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Du Bois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009; Kiesling, 2009; Silverstein, 2003). However, previous research has not detailed the conversational processes through which these areas converge in English-speaking Muslim discourse. Little research has explored how Muslim presenters and experts collectively explain AI. This study fills this gap by analyzing the episode "The New AI Empires" on the podcast *The Thinking Muslim*.

Based on this background, this study aims to explain how English-language Muslim podcasts portray AI to imagined Muslim societies. Therefore, this study has three research questions: how AI is explained as a moral, religious, and civilizational issue to a global Muslim audience; how presenters and speakers construct technological expertise, moral-religious authority, and Muslim identity through conversation and stance-making; and how Muslim presenters and experts construct technological expertise, moral-religious authority, and Muslim identity through conversation and stance-making. Moreover, how changing language variations and audience design strategies help build alignment and encourage collective action.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Interactional Sociolinguistics

The main Framework in this research is Interactional Sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982). He argues that meaning can be inferred from sequential context and contextualization, not just from the text of a single sentence. Contextualization clues are verbal signs that direct

participants to a particular meaning of an utterance. In this study, these signs are constructed from the use of technical, geopolitical, everyday, and Islamic registers. Historical analogies and comparisons are also part of the research.

Furthermore, question sentences and interlocutors' reformulations are included. The use of inclusive pronouns, such as *we* and its derivatives, also needs to be considered. Furthermore, epistemic markers, such as hedging, also need to be considered. Expressions of deontic modality are also part of the analysis in this study. Furthermore, Arabic Islamic terms are also part of the analysis. This Framework is important because the data sources do not only discuss AI in one register. Technical descriptions of AI are repeatedly used to interpret issues of power, ideology, moral influence, responsibility, and religious guidance.

This Framework also considers inferences within conversations. Meaning can be formed from previous utterances and the responses of other speakers. For example, technical statements in AI can become ideological when juxtaposed with contexts in which the AI does not address religious issues.

2.2 Supporting Framework

The supporting Framework in this study consists of Du Bois (2007) stance triangle, which links three actions: evaluating an object, positioning a social actor, and aligning or misaligning oneself with other participants. Bucholtz & Hall's (2005) identity-in-interaction framework is used. The Two-Bois framework is used to examine how speakers position themselves as presenters, experts, Muslim professionals, or representatives of a Muslim audience. This Framework is also used to examine how speakers align with one another and how they evaluate the AI discussion topic. Jaffe (2009) and Kiesling (2009) further demonstrate that recurring stances can become recognizable social styles. This idea helps explain why technical descriptions, moral judgments, and responsibilities consistently shape the expert identities of informants.

Meanwhile, Bucholtz & Hall's (2005) identity-in-interaction framework treats Muslim and professional identities as dynamic relationships rather than fixed attributes. Identities are constructed through the repeated use of pronouns, contrasts, category labels, and self-positioning. Bell (1984) Bell's audience design model explains how speakers adapt discourse to their intended and imagined audiences. Agha (2006) and Silverstein (2003) explain how recurring forms, such as *we*, *our*, *ummah*, technical terms, and Arabic-Islamic expressions, can index broader social meanings.

These frameworks are used in an integrated manner. The first Framework explains how reframing occurs through contextualization clues and conversational sequences. The second Framework is used to identify evaluations, speaker positioning, and alignment between speakers. While the latter Framework explains the formation of Muslim and professional identities, audience design explains how audiences who are not directly present are given a role in the discussion.

3. Method

This research uses a qualitative case study design to examine how AI is re-explained to the global Muslim public. The case study examines a specific case from a podcast episode of *The Thinking Muslim* and analyzes it in depth. The goal is not to generalize but to understand the language patterns of interaction and social meaning in that particular case (Yin, 2018). The data for this research comes from the English-language YouTube podcast "The New AI Empires," hosted by *The Thinking Muslim* (The Thinking Muslim, 2026). This episode was

relevant because it brings together discussions of AI with questions with moral, religious, political, and future issues for Muslims worldwide in contemporary technological development.

The data in this study consists of a 60-minute, 17-second SRT transcription of the podcast. Before the transcription process, the video was downloaded for offline reuse. During the transcription process, we used the CapCut app (*CapCut AI Video Editor: Smart Online Video Editing with Advanced AI Tools*, n.d.). The transcription results were then independently reviewed to ensure that the transcribed text matched the video. The researchers divided these conversations into 61 units. Each unit consisted of conversational segments with a clear topic and function. Statements from the same speaker were combined as long as the topic and purpose remained the same. New units were created when the topic and function of the speaker changed. They units consist of 37 core unit, 12 contextual units and 12 excluded unit. The relevant units were analyzed using the theories of stance, authority, and audience design. There were 28 relevant and recurring units. These units were then categorized into five themes.

After the data was grouped, it was then assigned descriptive codes based on Saldaña's (2021) criteria. The codes included questions, restatements, coherence, inconsistencies, attitudes toward uncertain information, technical and professional skills, moral and religious values, pronoun use, and actions. Each unit may contain more than one code, as a single conversation segment can serve multiple functions simultaneously. The next step was to group frequently occurring codes into five themes: AI as a geopolitical and ideological force; hybrid expertise and religious authority; Muslim identity and technological sovereignty; explanations of AI through Islamic concepts; and alignment and audience responsibility. Twenty-eight units were selected for more detailed analysis. The analysis began by coding each interactional unit for observable features such as questions, reformulations, pronoun use, epistemic and deontic expressions, technical and professional positioning, moral-religious references, and action-oriented statements. These feature were then analyzed using Gumperz's (1982) ,concepts of contextualization cues, contextual inference, sequential context, and the interpretation of utterances in interaction. The selected units were then examined more closely using stance, identity-in-interaction, and audience design to answer the research questions. It is supported by Du Bois's (2007) stance theory and Bucholtz & Hall's (2005) theory of identity in interaction. In the analysis process, we used the frameworks of Miles et al. (2014) regarding data condensation, data presentation, and the drawing and verification of conclusions.

4. Results and Discussion

The transcripts in this study were divided into 61 complete conversational units. Thirty-seven units were used as primary evidence, 12 units as supporting context, and 12 units were excluded because they were promotional in nature, truncated quotes, or closing statements irrelevant to the analysis. From the entire dataset, 28 units were selected for in-depth discussion because these units most clearly demonstrated recurring patterns in language and interaction. The second stage of analysis yielded five interrelated themes: (1) AI as a geopolitical and ideological force; (2) hybrid expertise and moral-religious authority; (3) Muslim identity and technological sovereignty; (4) explanations of AI through Islamic concepts; and (5) audience alignment and responsible action. The five themes and their distribution are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Mapping Themes

Theme	Main unit	Supporting Unit
AI as a geopolitical and ideological Power	14	7
Reframing AI through Islam	3	6
Hybrid expertise and moral-religious authority	9	12
Collective Muslim identity and technological sovereignty	9	6
Audience alignment and responsible action	14	16

As shown in Table 1, the five themes appear to overlap, as the total number of primary units exceeds 28. Collectively, they form the basis of the analysis to answer the three research questions discussed below.

4.1 How AI is Reframed as a Moral, Religious, and Civilizational Issues

a. AI as Geopolitical and Ideological Power

Kadous first broadens his perspective on AI through a strategic analogy: “You have something to do with the geopolitical impact of nuclear weapons now being made by private companies” (U08, 00:02:20–00:03:57). This comparison of AI to nuclear weapons is not literal. Here, Kadous attempts to shift the discussion from commercial technological innovation to strategic power. Gumperz’s (1982) framework explains this as a form of contextualization. Kadous’s analogy shifts the perspective in the subsequent discussion. Jalal aligns with this framing and directs attention to those who control AI.

The next shift occurs when Kadous states, “It’s not that these models are incapable of talking about religion; it’s that these models are choosing not to talk about religion.” (U27, 00:24:09–00:26:07). This statement contrasts the inability to talk about religion with the choice not to talk about religion. This utterance is part of the Stance strategy (Du Bois, 2007). Kadous attempts to evaluate the behavior of the AI model, positioning the AI company as a decision-maker and aligning it with ideological interpretations related to religion. Kadous’s interpretation of the model’s behavior and relevance is supported by research that finds religious resistance, stigmatization, and cultural incongruence in language models (Khorramrouz & Levy, 2026; Nacar et al., 2025; Naous et al., 2024; Plaza-del-Arco et al., 2024). This sequence demonstrates that contextualization and stance function together. The contrasting content allows Kadous to frame his view of AI, which Jalal then aligns with. Thus, ideological meaning is constructed collaboratively, rather than through a single, isolated statement.

The next shifting pattern is evident when Kadous states, “What you don’t want to happen is that the rich are subsidized by the poor.” (U50, 00:46:57–00:49:01). This comparison between the rich and the poor shifts the issue from AI as a technological infrastructure issue to a social justice issue. Here AI is no longer talking about technological sophistication, but about who gets the benefits and who bears the burden. Of course, this shift is towards the power built behind the sophistication of AI (Bender et al., 2021; Blodgett et al., 2020; Weidinger et al., 2022).

b. Islamic Reframing of AI

The Islamic terminology used by the speaker also changes how AI is viewed. When Kadous says, “It’s the same for us as Muslims... we have been given an *amanah* by Allah to make the world a better place” (U17, 00:12:44–00:14:03), he appears to be trying to shift the discussion of the sophistication of AI technology, where profit-orientedness is prioritized, to

a moral responsibility within religion. Herijanto (2022) notes that *amanah* concerns not only the relationship between humans but also the relationship between humans and God. The term *amanah* which Kadous uses comes from Arabic, meaning trustworthy. This term is also one of the qualities possessed by the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him).

This shows that the use of AI has moral implications for every Muslim. The most striking example is Kadous' statement about perfume sellers and blacksmiths: "We developed a benchmark called JaleesBench, and it is based on the hadith... about perfume sellers and blacksmiths." (u43, 00:37:45–00:42:20). This hadith serves as a benchmark for assessing whether AI is used for good moral actions or for actions that are inconsistent with Islamic ethics. This benchmark aligns with research by Ali et al. (2025), who stated that a trustworthy ethical framework for AI use is recommended for more comprehensive AI governance.

Kadous also uses terms such as printing press, *iqra'*, *ijtihad*, *ra'iyah*, *maṣāliḥ*, *maḥāsīd*, and *ḥikmah*. These terms are used to situate technology within an Islamic framework. In this way, technology is seen not only as a practical tool but also as a belief that carries moral implications. He says, "Each of us has a responsibility to our community" (U53, 00:50:07–00:53:33). However, he also emphasizes the hierarchy of guidance: "Ideally, you should go to the imam... if you can't... tell AI... if you want to be a *jalīs ṣāliḥ*." (U57, 00:58:14–00:59:18). From these statements, it is clear that AI is placed in a secondary position. AI is not intended to replace the ulama, but rather as an assistant. This shift in register reflects Islamic sociolinguistics: English carries global technical discourse, while Arab-Islamic concepts reshape standards of evaluation (Bhatt et al., 2025).

4.2 How Expertise, Moral-Religious Authority, and Muslim Identity are Constructed

a. Hybrid Expertise and Moral-Religious Authority

In the podcast, Jalal explicitly highlights the similarities between the two fields: "Here, religious authorities and industry leaders share the stage, discussing AI and moral boundaries." (U22, 00:16:56–00:17:23). This statement puts religious authorities and AI industry leaders in the same boat. It positions Kadous as a figure who is expected to explain the relationship between religious authority and industry. Kadous is consistent with this statement. He states, "There are two aspects of my life—the technical aspect and the religious aspect—and now, suddenly, these two aspects collide." (U23, 00:17:26–00:19:47). With this explanation, Kadous positions himself as a bridge between technical expertise and religious authority. His authority is built through technical terminology, professional experience, discussions of benchmarks, and a careful approach to presenting arguments. However, his repeated references to religious scholars place religious authority in the hands of certain figures.

This pattern is consistent with research showing that digital religion creates new leadership roles without automatically replacing established institutions (Abusharif, 2023; Campbell, 2007, 2010, 2023). Online Islamic spaces can expand authority through visibility and communication capabilities, but they also spark debates about institutional boundaries (Bunt, 2018; Fauzi, 2023; Khamis, 2026; Patel, 2025). This podcast provides a detailed explanation of how this interaction process takes place. Jalal opens a cross-disciplinary discussion, while Kadous demonstrates his expertise in engineering and religious understanding. From Du Bois's (2007) perspective, authority arises not only from a person's biography but also from how they position themselves, evaluate conversations, and align their views within a speech event. However, his repeated use of hedging demonstrates his caution in presenting religious arguments that he feels are not his authority. This, in fact, appears to

maintain his credibility and prevent him from portraying himself as an all-knowing figure. This condition is what this research terms hybrid translation, in which technical professional skills combine with religious understanding. This is interactional because the roles are constructed collaboratively through questions, answers, and reformulation. However, this authority remains limited because it does not confer formal legal authority.

b. Collective Muslim Identity and Technological Sovereignty

Interactions in the podcast also shape a collective Muslim identity. When Jalal asks, “There is money being spent on AI... does that amount to real sovereignty from where you’re standing?” (U29, 00:26:37-00:27:02), Kadous responds with, “There’s so much potential for us as an ummah... we could actually be building aspects of tech sovereignty ourselves... [and] making something that encodes our values.” (U30, 00:27:18-00:28:39). The repeated use of pronouns *us*, *our*, and the diction *ummah* make the communication more inclusive. These words contextualize the speaker, professionals, investors, and the imagined global Muslim audience. The modal could also demonstrate careful presentation of arguments. Thus, the language used not only conveys content but also forms open and potentially inclusive social and political relations.

On the other hand, Kadous also rejects the view that a lack of talent is the primary problem. In his statement, he stated, “I think it’s the lack of will... we have the talent... (but) no deep alignment among the various Muslim nations.” From this, we can see that the main problem is a lack of interest. This stance shows that Muslim communities are positioned as those capable of adapting to technology, while the problem is burdened with a lack of political will. Kadous also explained strategic adaptation through the analogy of a fast follower, “Sometimes there are shortcuts you can take when you are the fast follower... [through] post-training... where you still have most of the values.” (U41, 00:36:13-00:37:22). This supports the identity of global Muslims as potential strategic producers, not eternally dependent consumers. Moreover, the language used is English. The use of English as a lingua franca in transnational Muslim communities does not make speakers imitate the norms of native English speakers, but they negotiate local identities and values (Baker et al., 2026; Bolander, 2016; Canagarajah, 2006; Jenkins, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2011; Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018).

4.3 How Register Shifts and Audience Design Construct Alignment and Calls for Action

In terms of register usage, Jalal makes the audience a participant in the communication by inviting Kadous to experiment: “Can we do an experiment... put [the prompt] in the pinned comment... and ask our viewers?” (U45, 00:42:38–00:42:58). Kadous approves the invitation. Within the framework of Bell’s (1984) Model, the expression *our viewers* function as an audience design cue, whereby speakers adapt or create their activities for people outside the recorded conversation to follow. This interaction invites audience participation but does not indicate whether the audience actually carries out the activities.

Jalal also conveys resistance to Kadous’s analogy: “There was some pushback in the comments... your analogy with the past doesn’t quite make sense.” (U52, 00:49:07–00:49:49). This strategy seems to be used to get a clearer explanation from Kadous. According to Gumperz (1982), conversation sequences help reveal interaction patterns. Typically, a technical explanation is followed by a rebuttal or reformulation of the statement. After this explanation, Kadous reformulates his statement and provides evidence based on concepts in Islam. This pattern keeps the interaction cooperative while also testing the validity of the claim.

In another interaction, Jalal mentioned his experience as a former educator. He asked what he should do in the future: “What should I do now to be prepared for the future so that I still have a job five years from now?” (U54, 00:53:52–00:54:53). This question demands concrete action, particularly regarding professional behavior. Kadous responded by highlighting the capabilities and benefits of AI for Muslims. The shift toward concrete action is also evident when Jalal said, “What can we convey to our audience today, not just about what to think, but about what to do?” (U56, 00:57:56). The distinction between *thinking* and *acting* shifts the expected response from mere reflection to a recommendation for action. Kadous responded by emphasizing the importance of religious guidance, which humans continue to provide.

5. Conclusion

This study examines how artificial intelligence (AI) is portrayed in episodes of the YouTube podcast, *The Thinking Muslim*, for an imagined global Muslim community. Finding 1 shows that AI is portrayed not only as a technological innovation but also as a geopolitical, ideological, moral, religious, and civilizational issue. Across the segments analyzed, the explanations of models and infrastructure are linked to cultural representations and religious sensitivities. Finding 2 showed by demonstrating that technological expertise, moral-religious authority, and identity are constructed through the establishment of professional expertise between host and guest, the limited use of text to explain religious authority, and the technological autonomy of the imagined Muslim collective. Meanwhile, finding 3 indicates that register shifts, the use of audience-oriented strategies (audience design), sentence reformulation using alternative structures, and questions tailored to the audience render technical explanations of the technology suitable for the envisioned Muslim public. This marks a shift from a discussion focused solely on technical terms to a call for responsible action.

A key concept that emerges from this study is a “hybrid authority”, in which expert explanations of technology are delivered to a religious audience, drawing on technical knowledge and professional expertise. In this context, the technical and religious registers are constrained to prevent the guest from exceeding the boundaries of formal religious authority. The speaker attempt to bridge the gap between AI experts and concerned Muslims. This study also demonstrates that English can be a global technical lingua franca, while Arab-Islamic concepts lead to moral interpretations. The constructed discourse portrays Muslims not only as affected users of AI, but also as evaluators and investors.

This study has limitations. As this is a case study, generalizations cannot be applied to all cases. Furthermore, this study only examined transcribed texts; therefore, multimodal and comparative research on Muslim subjects and audiences is needed to determine whether Muslims accept, negotiate, or reject AI.

Funding information

This research receives no specific grant from any agency.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authors' Contribution

Moh Khoirul Anam was responsible for the conceptualization, research design and methodology, data collection and organization, coding and thematic analysis, data interpretation, literature review, manuscript preparation, revision, and final approval of the manuscript. **Isna Laili Qurroti A'yun** contributed to the translation and proofreading of the manuscript, particularly in ensuring language accuracy, readability, and consistency.

Statement of the use of AI

Generative AI (ChatGPT 5.6 Sol-High – chat mode) was used to assist with transcript organization, data coding and theme development, reference checking, language editing, and consistency checking. All data interpretation, analytical decisions, verification, and final revisions were reviewed and determined by the authors. The authors take full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of this research.

References

- Abusharif, I. N. (2023). Islam and digital religion. In H. A. Campbell & P. H. Cheong (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of digital religion* (pp. 52–67). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197549803.013.2>
- Agha, A. (2006). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618284>
- 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, 120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-025-00922-4>
- Baker, W., Fang, F., & Gimenez, T. (2026). Global Englishes: Research agendas and tasks in English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444826101281>
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001037X>
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Bhatt, I., Barnawi, O. Z., & Ahmad, R. (2025). Exploring a sociolinguistics of Islam. *Applied Linguistics*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaf043>
- Blodgett, S. L., Barocas, S., Daumé III, H., & Wallach, H. (2020). Language (technology) is power: A critical survey of “bias” in NLP. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 5454–5476). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.485>
- Bolander, B. (2016). English and the transnational Ismaili Muslim community: Identity, the Aga Khan, and infrastructure. *Language in Society*, 45(4), 583–604. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404516000439>
- Bouzenita, A. I. (2008). The impact of language in the formation of an Islamic identity: ‘Arabi and A’jami. *Afkar: Jurnal Akidah dan Pemikiran Islam*, 9(1), 101–128.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>

- Bunt, G. R. (2018). *Hashtag Islam: How cyber-Islamic environments are transforming religious authority*. University of North Carolina Press. <https://doi.org/10.5149/northcarolina/9781469643168.001.0001>
- Campbell, H. A. (2007). Who's got the power? Religious authority and the Internet. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(3), 1043–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00362.x>
- Campbell, H. A. (2010). Religious authority and the blogosphere. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15(2), 251–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2010.01519.x>
- Campbell, H. A. (2023). Approaching religious authority through the rise of new leadership roles online. In H. A. Campbell & P. H. Cheong (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of digital religion* (pp. 344–360). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197549803.013.16>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 197–218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000109>
- CapCut AI Video Editor: Smart Online Video Editing with Advanced AI Tools. (n.d.). Retrieved July 28, 2026, from <https://www.capcut.com/>
- Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebreton (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139–182). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164.07du>
- Fauzi, N. A. F. (2023). Zulkarnain EL Madury and the micro-celebrity ustaz phenomenon: Tracing Muhammadiyah's struggle in maintaining religious authority in cyberspace. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 51(151), 304–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2023.2274708>
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Ghaly, M. (2024). What makes work 'good' in the age of artificial intelligence (AI)? Islamic perspectives on AI-mediated work ethics. *The Journal of Ethics*, 28, 429–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10892-023-09456-3>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611834>
- Herijanto, H. (2022). Al amanah in al Qur'an vs trust: A comparative study. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 38(4), 549–575. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-03-2021-0064>
- Jaffe, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331646.001.0001>
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1, 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- Khamis, S. (2026). Cyber Islam, digitalized identities, and the paradoxes of reform. In E. Hamdeh & N. J. DeLong-Bas (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Islamic reform* (pp. 135–152). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197532805.013.10>
- Khorramrouz, A., & Levy, S. (2026). Characterizing selective refusal bias in large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026* (pp. 11305–11326). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.550>

- Kiesling, S. F. (2009). Style as stance: Stance as the explanation for patterns of sociolinguistic variation. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 171–194). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331646.003.0008>
- Mardi, I., Musthafa, I., & Nandang, A. (2025). Dīnāmikiyyah al-‘Alāqah bayna al-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah wa Huwiyyah al-Fard wa al-Binā` al-Ijtimā’ī fī Siyāq al-Da‘wah al-Mu‘āṣirah. *HuRuf Journal: International Journal of Arabic Applied Linguistic*, 5(2), 122–143. <https://doi.org/10.30983/huruf.v5i2.9784>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nacar, O., Sibae, S. T., Ahmed, S., Ben Atitallah, S., Ammar, A., Alhabashi, Y., Al-Batati, A. S., Alsehibani, A., Qandos, N., Elshehy, O., Abdelkader, M., & Koubaa, A. (2025). Towards inclusive Arabic LLMs: A culturally aligned benchmark in Arabic large language model evaluation. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Language Models for Low-Resource Languages* (pp. 387–401). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.loreslm-1.29/>
- Naous, T., Ryan, M. J., Ritter, A., & Xu, W. (2024). Having beer after prayer? Measuring cultural bias in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (pp. 16366–16393). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.862>
- Patel, S. (2025). What’s AI got to do with it? Muslims, social media, and religious authority. In L. Khan (Ed.), *Oxford intersections: Social media in society and culture*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198945253.003.0020>
- Plaza-del-Arco, F. M., Cercas Curry, A., Paoli, S., Cercas Curry, A., & Hovy, D. (2024). Divine LLaMAs: Bias, stereotypes, stigmatization, and emotion representation of religion in large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024* (pp. 4346–4366). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.251>
- Rahman, F. (2023). Islam, digital media, and identity. In H. A. Campbell & P. H. Cheong (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of digital religion* (pp. 272–288). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197549803.013.32>
- Ramezani, A., & Xu, Y. (2025). The discordance between embedded ethics and cultural inference in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 14715–14736). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.743>
- Sadhu, J., Saha, M. R., & Shahriyar, R. (2025). Social bias in large language models for Bangla: An empirical study on gender and religious bias. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Language Models for Low-Resource Languages* (pp. 204–218). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.loreslm-1.16/>
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(3–4), 193–229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309\(03\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2)
- Taguchi, N., & Ishihara, N. (2018). The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca: Research and pedagogy in the era of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38, 80–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190518000028>
- Tan, Q., Jiang, L., Zeng, Y., Ding, S., & Xu, X. (2026). Mitigating cultural bias in LLMs via multi-agent cultural debate. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL*

- 2026 (pp. 8600–8612). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.418>
- The Thinking Muslim. (2026, July 17). The new AI empires | Dr Waleed Kadous [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4tHAm2o1Uyg>
- UNESCO. (2022). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>
- Weidinger, L., Uesato, J., Rauh, M., Griffin, C., Huang, P.-S., Mellor, J., Glaese, A., Cheng, M., Balle, B., Kasirzadeh, A., Biles, C., Brown, S., Kenton, Z., Hawkins, W., Stepleton, T., Birhane, A., Hendricks, L. A., Rimell, L., Isaac, W., & Gabriel, I. (2022). Taxonomy of risks posed by language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 214–229). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533088>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Zhao, J., Fang, M., Ye, F., Xu, K., Zhang, Q., Zhou, J. T., & Pechenizkiy, M. (2025). Understanding large language model vulnerabilities to social bias attacks. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (pp. 17620–17636). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.862>