

From Digital Fatwas to Generative AI: Algorithmic Patriarchy, Women's Agency, and the Reconstruction of Islamic Family-Law Authority

Muhammad Khotami¹

¹ Universitas Al-Azhar Cairo Mesir

✉ Corresponding Author:
Muhammad Khotami
Email: mkhotami4@gmail.com

How to Cite:

Muhammad Khotami. (2026). *From Digital Fatwas to Generative AI: Algorithmic Patriarchy, Women's Agency, and the Reconstruction of Islamic Family-Law Authority*, 1(1), 1–18



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article History

Submitted: July, 3, 2026
Revised: July, 24, 2026
Accepted: July, 27, 2026

Kata Kunci:

bias gender;
kesalehan platform;
literasi keagamaan;
maqāṣid al-syarī'ah;
kekerasan berbasis
teknologi.

ABSTRAK

Perkembangan media sosial dan kecerdasan artifisial telah mengubah cara masyarakat Muslim memperoleh, memproduksi, dan menyebarkan pengetahuan mengenai relasi keluarga. Nasihat tentang kepemimpinan suami, ketaatan istri, poligami, perceraian, serta pembagian peran domestik tidak lagi hanya disampaikan oleh ulama dan lembaga keagamaan, tetapi juga dimediasi oleh platform, sistem rekomendasi, dan chatbot. Perubahan tersebut memperluas akses terhadap informasi keagamaan, sekaligus menimbulkan risiko reproduksi bias gender, normalisasi subordinasi, dan kaburnya pertanggungjawaban atas nasihat yang dihasilkan mesin. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis transformasi otoritas keagamaan dalam ekosistem berbasis algoritma, mengidentifikasi pola reproduksi ketimpangan serta ruang pemberdayaan, dan merumuskan kerangka otoritas keagamaan yang responsif terhadap keadilan. Penelitian menggunakan studi kepustakaan dengan pendekatan normatif-konseptual dan analisis wacana kritis. Data diperoleh dari 35 artikel jurnal bereputasi yang diterbitkan pada 2021–2026 dan dianalisis melalui teknik analisis isi tematik serta komparatif-kritis. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa sistem rekomendasi dan model bahasa tidak bersifat netral karena dapat mengulang bias dalam data pelatihan, memperluas narasi keagamaan yang hierarkis, serta mempersonalisasi nasihat tanpa memahami pengalaman sosial dan kerentanan pengguna. Namun, ekosistem yang sama juga menyediakan ruang bagi ulama perempuan, akademisi, dan aktivis Muslimah untuk membangun kontra-narasi dan memperluas partisipasi dalam produksi pengetahuan. Penelitian ini menawarkan model otoritas keagamaan responsif gender yang dibangun atas kompetensi ilmiah, transparansi sumber dan sistem, perlindungan kelompok rentan, partisipasi setara, serta akuntabilitas manusia. Model tersebut menegaskan bahwa teknologi hanya berfungsi sebagai sarana pendukung, sedangkan legitimasi dan tanggung jawab moral tetap berada pada manusia dan institusi yang kompeten.

ABSTRACT

The expansion of social media and artificial intelligence has transformed how Muslim communities access, produce, and circulate knowledge concerning family relations. Advice on husbands' leadership, wives' obedience, polygamy, divorce, and domestic roles is no longer communicated solely by religious scholars and institutions but is increasingly mediated by platforms, recommendation systems, and chatbots. This

Keywords:

*gender bias;
platform piety;*

*religious literacy;
maqāṣid al-sharī'ah;
technology-facilitated
violence.*

transformation broadens access to religious information while creating risks of reproducing gender bias, normalizing subordination, and obscuring accountability for machine-generated advice. This study analyzes the transformation of religious authority within algorithmic ecosystems, identifies patterns through which inequality is reproduced and opportunities for empowerment, and formulates a justice-responsive framework of religious authority. It employs qualitative library research using normative-conceptual and critical discourse approaches. The data comprise 35 peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2021 and 2026 and are analyzed through thematic content analysis and critical-comparative analysis. The findings demonstrate that recommendation systems and language models are not neutral: they may reproduce biases embedded in training data, amplify hierarchical religious narratives, and personalize advice without adequately understanding users' social experiences and vulnerabilities. Nevertheless, the same ecosystem creates space for female Muslim scholars, academics, and Muslim women activists to develop counter-narratives and broaden participation in knowledge production. This study proposes a gender-responsive model of religious authority grounded in scholarly competence, transparency of sources and systems, protection of vulnerable groups, equal participation, and human accountability. The model affirms that technology should remain a supporting instrument, while legitimacy and moral responsibility must remain with qualified human actors and accountable institutions.

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has reshaped the production and distribution of religious knowledge within Muslim societies. Explanations concerning marriage, family leadership, spousal obedience, polygamy, divorce, post-divorce rights, and domestic violence are no longer obtained solely through religious study circles, classical texts, fatwa institutions, or direct consultation with religious scholars. Social media, search engines, video channels, and conversational applications have emerged as new spaces in which Islamic teachings and legal opinions are produced, contested, and widely consumed. Religious authority in digital spaces is determined not only by the depth of scholarly expertise but also by popularity, follower counts, communication skills, content visibility, and platform recommendation mechanisms (Selby & Sayeed, 2023). Although this transformation expands public access to religious information, it also raises new concerns regarding source validity, legal oversimplification, the fragmentation of authority, and accountability for religious advice disseminated to the public.

The development of generative artificial intelligence has extended this transformation to a more complex level. Users no longer merely receive sermons or fatwas produced by human actors; they can now submit personal concerns to chatbots and receive rapid, personalized, and seemingly persuasive religious responses. Generative language models can formulate systematic moral and religious explanations despite lacking consciousness, social experience, legal responsibility, and the scholarly authority possessed by religious scholars or institutions. Research on AI's understanding of religion indicates that its responses are shaped by linguistic patterns, data corpora, and moral tendencies embedded in the system rather than by an autonomous process of theological reasoning (Tsuria & Tsuria, 2024). Consequently, responses that sound normative and coherent do not necessarily possess reliable sourcing, contextual sensitivity, or the capacity to recognize user vulnerability.

These concerns become particularly significant when artificial intelligence is used to answer questions relating to Islamic family law. The family is not merely a private domain; it is an arena in which religious norms, social structures, patriarchal culture, economic interests, and power relations intersect. Advice concerning wives' obligations, husbands' authority, the justification of polygamy, conflict resolution, and divorce decisions may affect women's safety, dignity, and access to justice. Studies of digital fatwas indicate that platform-mediated religious

media can reproduce patriarchal relations through narratives that primarily require women to obey, yield, and preserve the family without adequately considering unequal relationships or experiences of violence ([Falah & Riyanta, 2025](#)). In such a context, algorithms do not operate merely as neutral channels; they also determine which narratives are most frequently viewed, repeated, and eventually treated as dominant representations of Islamic teaching.

This study employs the concept of algorithmic patriarchy to explain the intersection between gender biases embedded in social structures and the operation of digital systems that rank, recommend, and generate content. Artificial intelligence models are developed from data that reflect the language, values, and inequalities of society. Their outputs may therefore preserve stereotypes, hegemonic masculinity, and representations that demean or marginalize women. Analyses of language models have found that natural language processing technologies may reproduce gender and racial biases contained in their training data ([Palacios Barea et al., 2025](#)). Other studies have identified patterns in generative-model outputs that associate women with victimization, sexual violence, marriage, and control over women's bodies ([Wyer & Black, 2025](#)). These findings demonstrate that artificial intelligence cannot be regarded as an entirely objective system, particularly when it is used to generate views on family relations and the position of women.

Nevertheless, digital spaces are not solely instruments for reproducing subordination. Social media and communication technologies also provide Muslim women with opportunities to articulate their experiences, reinterpret norms, build solidarity, and challenge monopolies over the production of religious knowledge. Women's agency in Muslim societies does not always take the form of direct rejection of tradition; it may be expressed through negotiation, reinterpretation, institutional participation, and the formation of alternative authorities. Putri and Poerwandari demonstrate that constructions of piety do not necessarily eliminate women's agency, because women may negotiate religious values in relation to their experiences and subjective interests ([Putri & Poerwandari, 2024](#)). The middle-path feminist strategies developed by Muslim women's organizations likewise show that struggles for justice may proceed through dialogue among religious texts, social needs, and institutional transformation ([Syamsiyatun, 2023](#)). Women's roles in transmitting Qur'anic knowledge and constructing religious authority further demonstrate that the production of Islamic knowledge has never been an exclusively male domain ([Wibowo & Fathiyaturrahmah, 2025](#)).

Within the field of family law, such agency is evident in women's efforts to secure post-divorce rights, reject harmful relationships, use judicial mechanisms, and participate in mediation and the production of legal knowledge ([Fadil et al., 2024](#); [Hanapi et al., 2025](#); [Yazid, 2023](#)). The family dynamics of women living in socially vulnerable circumstances also demonstrate that inequality cannot be separated from stigma, economic dependence, and limited access to social support ([Zakiyah et al., 2025](#)). In other contexts, the empowerment of Muslim women through education, law, and social networks shows that transformation occurs not only through normative change but also through strengthening women's capacity as social and legal subjects ([Insani et al., 2024](#)).

Contemporary Islamic family-law scholarship has identified multiple forms of inequality experienced by women. Polygamy, for example, may result in physical, psychological, economic, and social harm when it is not accompanied by adequate protection of rights and effective oversight ([Aziz et al., 2025](#); [Yazid, 2023](#)). In divorce proceedings, women continue to face obstacles in securing maintenance, property division, protection, and the enforcement of judgments ([Aini & Hidayati, 2025](#); [Fadil et al., 2024](#)). Domestic violence is not always recognized in physical form, because psychological pressure, economic control, coercion, and threats may be sustained through social or religious legitimation ([Cholil et al., 2025](#); [Nasyiah, 2024](#)). Protecting the rights of wives who face health risks, including HIV/AIDS, demonstrates that familial responsibility must encompass openness, harm prevention, and equitable access to health

services ([Thahir & Al-Fatih, 2024](#)). These studies provide an important foundation for understanding women's vulnerability within the family; however, most continue to examine social practices, judicial decisions, local traditions, or social-media discourse in isolation.

The diversity of social contexts also demonstrates that Islamic family law continually negotiates with custom, migration, and legal pluralism. Interfaith marriage, local Marapu traditions, bajapuik practices, and the family lives of Muslim diasporic communities indicate that meanings of authority, rights, and justice are not constructed within a homogeneous social space ([Aristeus et al., 2025](#); [Jafar et al., 2024](#); [Salam et al., 2024](#); [Zumrotun et al., 2026](#)). Cultural pluralism and Islamic legal ethics require contextual approaches, while Islamic judicial practice in Indonesia demonstrates the use of a fusion approach that combines religious norms, state law, and the requirements of social justice ([Muchimah et al., 2026](#); [Wirdyaningsih et al., 2026](#)). Legal hermeneutics is likewise essential to prevent normative texts from being read literally without considering their purposes and consequences ([Yasmar et al., 2025](#)).

At the same time, scholarship on artificial intelligence ethics from an Islamic perspective has proposed *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*, public welfare, justice, virtue, and *amānah* as principles for evaluating technology. Elmahjub emphasizes the need for plural ethical benchmarks that are sensitive to Islamic traditions in the development of AI ([Elmahjub, 2023](#)). Raquib advances a virtue-based approach that places the cultivation of moral character within technology governance ([Raquib et al., 2022](#)). Ali further proposes trusteeship ethics, which affirms that human beings remain trustees and are accountable for the design, use, and social consequences of artificial intelligence systems. This framework is important for rejecting the assumption that algorithmic decisions can be detached from the responsibilities of developers, platform operators, religious institutions, and professional users ([Ali et al., 2025](#)).

Although research on digital fatwas, women's agency, inequalities in family law, and Islamic ethics of artificial intelligence has continued to develop, the interconnection among these four fields remains limited. Studies of digital authority generally examine changes in the roles of religious scholars and media, whereas research on AI bias tends to focus on technical issues and social representation in broader terms. Meanwhile, Islamic family-law research typically analyzes injustice through norms, judicial practice, culture, and domestic relations without explaining how recommendation systems and generative AI increasingly shape public understandings of family law. This gap is significant because algorithms now do more than circulate existing religious opinions; they can also formulate, personalize, and deliver new advice to users without clear authorization mechanisms.

This study offers an original integrative analysis of the shift in Islamic family-law authority from digital fatwas to generative AI through three analytical arenas. The first is the discursive arena, referring to the production and reinforcement of narratives concerning gender, piety, and marital relations. The second is the sociotechnical arena, encompassing the relationship among data, system design, platform recommendations, and biases that affect the visibility of particular viewpoints. The third is the institutional arena, which concerns the responsibilities of religious scholars, religious institutions, developers, platforms, and the state in protecting users from discriminatory or harmful advice. These three arenas are used to formulate a gender-responsive model of religious authority grounded in scholarly competence, source traceability, system transparency, protection of vulnerable parties, women's participation, and human accountability. Against this background, the study aims to analyze how algorithms and generative AI transform the structure of authority in Islamic family-law discourse, explain how gender bias can be simultaneously reproduced and negotiated in digital spaces, and formulate a framework of religious authority responsive to justice and the protection of women. The study is premised on the argument that technology cannot be positioned as an autonomous bearer of moral authority. Artificial intelligence may assist in providing information, but religious validity, social sensitivity, and accountability for the consequences of advice must remain with human actors and

institutions that possess the necessary competence, integrity, and commitment to public welfare.

METHOD

This study employs qualitative library research using normative-conceptual and critical discourse approaches. The normative-conceptual approach is used to identify and formulate principles of religious authority, gender justice, *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah*, *amānah*, public welfare, protection of vulnerable groups, and human accountability in the use of artificial intelligence. Critical discourse analysis is used to examine how narratives concerning husbands' leadership, wives' obedience, polygamy, divorce, women's piety, and the division of domestic roles are produced, circulated, and reinforced through digital media and algorithm-based systems. Combining these approaches enables the study not only to describe developments in technology and Islamic family law but also to critically examine the power relations, knowledge structures, and gender biases operating within them.

The research data were drawn from 35 scholarly journal articles published between 2021 and 2026. The corpus comprised 27 principal articles addressing Islamic family law, digital fatwas, women's agency, polygamy, divorce, mediation, domestic violence, post-divorce rights, legal pluralism, and constructions of piety, as well as eight supplementary articles concerning generative artificial intelligence, transformations in religious authority, Islamic ethics of AI, algorithmic bias, and technology-facilitated violence. The articles were selected from nationally accredited SINTA 1 and SINTA 2 journals and reputable international journals indexed in Scopus. The selection was designed to bring together two bodies of scholarship that have generally developed separately: Islamic family-law studies and critical studies of algorithms and artificial intelligence.

Sources were selected according to several inclusion criteria. First, articles had to have been published within the previous six years to ensure that the data reflected recent developments in family-law, gender, digital-religion, and artificial-intelligence scholarship. Second, each article had to be directly related to at least one of the study themes: digital religious authority, gender relations in Muslim families, women's agency, AI ethics, algorithmic bias, or technology governance. Third, the article had to be peer reviewed and possess verifiable publication details through the journal website, publisher, or DOI. Fourth, the article had to contain findings, concepts, or arguments that could support a comparative analysis between Islamic family-law discourse and the ethical challenges of generative AI. Duplicate articles, substantively irrelevant publications, popular writings, and works lacking adequate bibliographic information were excluded from the analytical corpus.

The units of analysis were not limited to the conclusions of each article but included central concepts, argumentative patterns, normative categories, forms of women's representation, mechanisms of authority production, and governance recommendations developed in the respective studies. The data were subsequently organized into five thematic categories: the transformation of religious authority in digital spaces; the reproduction of bias and patriarchal narratives; forms of women's agency and counter-narratives; Islamic ethical principles for evaluating artificial intelligence; and mechanisms of transparency, protection, and accountability in governing technology-mediated religious knowledge.

Data analysis was conducted in four stages. The first stage involved inventorying and mapping the literature according to its object of study, approach, findings, and conceptual contribution. The second stage consisted of thematic coding to identify patterns of similarity, difference, repetition, and contradiction across sources. The third stage employed critical-comparative analysis by bringing findings on Islamic family-law practices into dialogue with studies of recommendation systems, language models, data bias, and digital authority. At this stage, the study assessed whether technology merely distributes existing patriarchal views or also transforms how such views are produced, personalized, and presented as authoritative. The

fourth stage consisted of normative synthesis to formulate a gender-responsive model of religious authority within algorithmic ecosystems.

Analytical trustworthiness was maintained through conceptual and source triangulation. Conceptual triangulation brought together perspectives from Islamic family law, gender studies, digital religion, technology ethics, and *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah*. Source triangulation involved comparing national and international articles, normative and empirical studies, and research highlighting both the benefits and risks of technology. In addition, the publication details, year of publication, journal title, and DOI of each source were checked to reduce bibliographic errors and ensure reference traceability.

The resulting framework was evaluated using six parameters: scholarly competence, source traceability, system transparency, gender sensitivity, protection of vulnerable groups, and human accountability. Scholarly competence was used to assess the legitimacy of those who produce or verify religious advice. Source traceability and system transparency were used to ensure that users could identify the normative basis and limitations of technological outputs. Gender sensitivity and the protection of vulnerable groups were used to assess the extent to which advice might reinforce subordination or expose users to harm. Human accountability affirms that moral and institutional responsibility for AI outputs cannot be transferred to an algorithm. Through these parameters, the study seeks to develop a governance framework that is not only normatively grounded in Islamic ethics but also operationally applicable to the development of digital fatwas and generative AI.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

1. The Shift in Islamic Family-Law Authority from Religious Figures to a Hybrid Ecosystem

The analysis demonstrates that digitalization has transformed Islamic family-law authority from a structure centered on religious scholars and institutions into a hybrid ecosystem involving digital preachers, social-media users, platform operators, technology developers, and artificial intelligence systems. In conventional structures, religious authority is generally established through mastery of Islamic sources, recognition by scholarly communities, institutional affiliation, and moral responsibility for the fatwas issued. Within digital ecosystems, these sources of legitimacy interact with popularity, follower counts, communication skills, levels of user engagement, and platform recommendation systems (Selby & Sayeed, 2023).

This shift is evident in the circulation of explanations concerning husbands' leadership, wives' obedience, polygamy, divorce, maintenance, and the division of domestic roles. Fatwas or advice that attract high levels of engagement tend to be recommended more frequently, often without adequate consideration of argumentative depth, source validity, or their effects on vulnerable groups. Falah and Riyanta show that digital fatwas concerning family relations can construct patterns of digital patriarchy when religious authority is produced through narratives that disproportionately emphasize women's obligations. Under these conditions, recommendation systems do not merely transmit knowledge; they also determine which religious views gain visibility and become accepted as dominant discourse (Falah & Riyanta, 2025).

The emergence of generative AI extends this transformation from the distribution to the production of religious knowledge. Unlike search engines, which display existing sources, language models can formulate new responses, combine different forms of information, and present them in a systematic and persuasive manner. Such responses, however, do not arise from competence in Islamic jurisprudence, moral responsibility, social experience, or the process of *ijtihād*. AI responses are generated through statistical patterns in training data and system

instructions ([Tsuria & Tsuria, 2024](#)). Linguistic consistency and argumentative structure therefore cannot automatically be equated with religious legitimacy.

The analysis also identifies a fundamental distinction between scholarly authority and algorithmic authority. Religious scholars can be held accountable for their opinions, explain the method of legal inference they employ, recognize the questioner's context, and consider the social consequences of their advice. Artificial intelligence, by contrast, possesses neither moral consciousness nor legal obligations and cannot be held accountable for the effects of its responses. In cases involving family conflict, domestic violence, or economic inequality, AI may provide normative answers without being able to detect risks to the user's safety. These findings reinforce the view that technology can facilitate access to information but cannot replace human moral and scholarly authority ([Ali et al., 2025](#); [Elmahjub, 2023](#)).

The transformation is therefore not simply a transfer of authority from religious scholars to machines; rather, it involves the formation of hybrid religious authority. Such authority is produced through interactions among scholarly knowledge, digital content, user behavior, training data, platform design, and algorithmic outputs. Consequently, responsibility for family-law knowledge no longer rests solely with preachers or fatwa authors but also extends to religious institutions, AI developers, platform companies, and actors who use these technologies in religious consultation services.

2. Algorithmic Patriarchy and the Expansion of Women's Agency

The second finding indicates that algorithms can reproduce gender inequalities already embedded in society, while digital spaces simultaneously provide new avenues for women to exercise agency. Algorithmic patriarchy is not created entirely by technology. It originates in social inequality, cultural representation, hierarchical religious interpretation, and power relations that are subsequently recorded in data and amplified through digital systems.

In family-law discourse, this pattern appears in the repeated emphasis on wives' obligations to obey, preserve the household, accept polygamy, or remain in marriage, while husbands' responsibilities and the protection of women's rights receive comparatively limited attention. The literature on polygamy shows that the practice may cause psychological, economic, and social harm to women when justice is interpreted only in formal terms ([Armi & Azhari, 2025](#); [Aziz et al., 2025](#); [Yazid, 2023](#)). In divorce cases, women also encounter difficulties in obtaining maintenance, securing a division of marital property, and enforcing court judgments ([Aini & Hidayati, 2025](#)). Inequalities already present in social practices may consequently reappear in AI outputs because training data are derived from texts and discourses produced by society.

Studies of language models demonstrate that artificial intelligence can reproduce stereotypes concerning gender, race, occupation, sexuality, and women's social positions. Palacios Barea identifies a tendency among language models to preserve representations associated with hegemonic masculinity and gendered role divisions ([Palacios Barea et al., 2025](#)). Wyer and Black likewise show that generative-model outputs may associate representations of women with victimization, sexual violence, bodily control, and marriage. In the context of Islamic family law, such biases may be particularly harmful because technological outputs can appear to constitute neutral and authoritative advice ([Wyer & Black, 2025](#)).

Algorithmic patriarchy operates through three mechanisms. The first is repetition, whereby technology reproduces dominant gender narratives contained in its data. The second is amplification, whereby recommendation systems expand the reach of attention-grabbing content even when it is sensational, discriminatory, or reductive of religious teachings. The third is personalization, whereby users repeatedly receive similar narratives based on their search histories and interactions. Together, these mechanisms may create a closed information environment in which a particular view of women and the family appears to be the only legitimate Islamic position.

Nevertheless, the findings do not position women as passive recipients of digital authority. Muslim women use digital spaces to articulate their experiences, question discriminatory views, build solidarity, and offer more contextual interpretations. Such agency may take the form of disseminating knowledge, assisting survivors of violence, educating communities about family rights, and establishing digital communities. Putri and Poerwandari show that women can negotiate constructions of piety in relation to their interests and personal experiences ([Putri & Poerwandari, 2024](#)). Syamsiyatun likewise demonstrates that Muslim women's organizations can develop transformative strategies through dialogue among religious values, social needs, and agendas for justice ([Syamsiyatun, 2023](#)).

Women's agency also develops through legal and institutional channels. Women use the courts to file for divorce, claim their rights, and obtain protection from harmful relationships. Hanapi demonstrates that divorce petitions submitted by wives should not be understood merely as threats to family integrity but may constitute legal action intended to escape inequality and violence ([Hanapi et al., 2025](#)). Women's participation in mediation further indicates their capacity to perform negotiation and conflict-resolution roles, even while they continue to face restrictive social structures ([Duereh et al., 2026](#); [Yazid, 2023](#)).

Digital spaces therefore contain two simultaneous tendencies. On the one hand, algorithms may reinforce patriarchal narratives through repetition, amplification, and personalization. On the other hand, technology provides women with spaces to construct counter-narratives, document experiences, expand access to knowledge, and challenge monopolies over religious authority. These findings indicate that the impact of technology is not singular; rather, it is shaped by platform design, data structures, user literacy, and the distribution of power in knowledge production.

3. The Formation of a Gender-Responsive Model of Religious Authority in Algorithmic Ecosystems

The third finding is the formulation of a gender-responsive model of religious authority for evaluating the production and dissemination of family-law advice through digital platforms and generative AI. The model synthesizes scholarship on Islamic family law, women's agency, AI ethics, maqāṣid al-sharī'ah, and the principle of amānah. It comprises three layers of governance: the religious-substantive layer, the technological layer, and the institutional layer.

The religious-substantive layer concerns the validity and moral orientation of advice. Every explanation of family law must rest on traceable sources, be formulated through accountable methods of reasoning, and acknowledge the diversity of opinion within the Islamic legal tradition. Advice should not merely state formal obligations; it must also consider public welfare, justice, human dignity, the protection of life, and the consequences for vulnerable parties. Within the framework of maqāṣid al-sharī'ah, the preservation of the family cannot be separated from protecting its members' safety, intellect, honor, lineage, and economic rights ([Cholil et al., 2025](#); [Muchimah et al., 2026](#)).

The technological layer concerns how systems process data and generate outputs. AI used to provide religious information should offer source traceability, explanations of system limitations, and warnings when a matter requires consultation with a religious scholar, legal professional, psychologist, or protection agency. Systems should also include mechanisms for recognizing questions that indicate violence, threats to safety, or exploitation. In such situations, outputs should not merely recommend patience, obedience, or reconciliation but must prioritize the protection of the user.

The institutional layer affirms that responsibility cannot be transferred entirely to machines. Religious institutions, technology developers, platform operators, and digital-service providers must establish verification standards, correction procedures, complaint mechanisms, and human oversight. The principle of amānah requires every party to be accountable for the

design, use, and effects of the systems it develops (Ali et al., 2025). In this framework, AI is positioned as a tool for supporting knowledge rather than as an autonomous mufti or a substitute for institutions possessing religious competence.

These three layers are operationalized through six principles. First, scholarly competence requires the involvement of specialists in Islamic law, gender, technology, and social protection in system development. Second, source traceability enables users to identify the references and argumentative basis of a response. Third, system transparency requires disclosure of data limitations, possible errors, and potential output biases. Fourth, gender sensitivity entails testing whether a system reproduces stereotypes, normalizes subordination, or distributes family responsibilities unequally. Fifth, the protection of vulnerable groups places user safety and dignity at the center of evaluation. Sixth, human accountability identifies the parties responsible for validating, correcting, and addressing the consequences of technology use.

The findings affirm that religious authority within algorithmic ecosystems cannot be assessed solely on the basis of speed, popularity, or the system's ability to produce coherent answers. Legitimate authority must combine competence, responsibility, openness, and a commitment to public welfare. Under this model, technology may be used to broaden access to family-law knowledge without allowing it to assume the functions of moral reasoning, social protection, and human accountability.

Discussion

1. The Hybridization of Religious Authority and Epistemological Change in Islamic Family Law

The first finding demonstrates that digitalization does more than transfer Islamic family-law knowledge from offline to online spaces; it changes the structure and foundations through which religious authority is formed. In traditional patterns, a religious scholar's legitimacy is established through mastery of Islamic sciences, continuity in the transmission of knowledge, recognition by scholarly communities, personal integrity, and responsibility for the consequences of the opinions expressed. Within digital ecosystems, these elements encounter new measures of authority, including popularity, visibility, user interaction, content-production capacity, and the logic of recommendation systems. Selby and Sayeed show that religious authority in digital spaces is increasingly negotiated through relationships among religious figures, followers, and platform mechanisms. Authority is therefore no longer conferred solely on the basis of scholarly competence; it is also shaped by technological processes that determine who is visible, heard, and trusted (Selby & Sayeed, 2023).

This transformation has epistemological implications for Islamic family law. Knowledge concerning marriage, polygamy, divorce, maintenance, marital relations, and domestic violence is increasingly encountered through short video clips, brief posts, or automated answers detached from the methodological complexity of Islamic law. Yet determining family law requires more than quoting texts; it also demands an understanding of context, differences among legal schools, the objectives of the law, the circumstances of the parties, and the social consequences of the advice provided. When such knowledge is compressed into formats designed to maximize user engagement, Islamic law risks being reduced to normative slogans that emphasize formal duties while neglecting justice, protection, and public welfare.

This finding extends Falah and Riyanta's critique of patriarchy in YouTube-based fatwas. The problem lies not only in fatwa content that places women in subordinate positions but also in platform structures that allow particular narratives to be reproduced continuously because they are considered attractive, controversial, or easy to consume. Recommendation systems operate according to predictions of user attention rather than the quality of religious argumentation. Consequently, opinions delivered in a firm, simple, and sensational manner may

reach wider audiences than contextual and nuanced legal explanations. At this point, the platform is no longer a passive channel but an actor that helps shape the ecology of religious knowledge (Falah & Riyanta, 2025).

Generative AI deepens this transformation because it not only selects and circulates content but also produces new responses. Tsuria and Tsuria demonstrate that the religious understanding displayed by generative AI derives from linguistic patterns and moral tendencies within data rather than from theological consciousness or autonomous religious reasoning. This creates an important distinction between the ability to generate religious language and the authority to provide religious judgments. A response may appear systematic, courteous, and convincing while still containing unclear sources, excessive generalization, or disregard for the user's particular circumstances (Tsuria & Tsuria, 2024).

In family-law matters, these limitations become more serious because users' questions are often not abstract. Questions concerning wives' obligations, husbands' rights, divorce, or reconciliation may be connected to violence, economic dependence, psychological pressure, and children's safety. Answers that merely emphasize patience, obedience, or marital preservation without assessing actual circumstances may prolong harmful relationships. Nasyiah demonstrates that psychological violence within the household requires clearer legal and religious recognition because its effects are often not physically visible (Nasyiah, 2024). Cholil likewise emphasizes the importance of women's legal awareness and a *maqāṣid al-usrah* orientation in addressing domestic violence. These findings show that family advice requires a degree of sensitivity that cannot be reduced to the processing of linguistic patterns (Cholil et al., 2025).

The concept of hybrid authority should therefore not be interpreted as placing human beings and machines on an equal moral footing. Hybridity refers to a knowledge-production process involving religious scholars, users, data, platforms, and AI systems, but authority and responsibility must remain clearly differentiated. Through the concept of trusteeship ethics, Ali positions human beings as trustees responsible for the design and use of technology. This perspective rejects the possibility of treating algorithms as moral subjects capable of bearing responsibility for the consequences of their advice. AI may serve as a tool for locating, organizing, and presenting information, but it lacks the capacity to bear sin, legal obligation, or social accountability (Ali et al., 2025).

Accordingly, the legitimacy of family-law knowledge in digital ecosystems cannot be measured merely by linguistic correctness or the number of references displayed. Legitimacy must be determined through source traceability, methods of reasoning, the competence of the verifying parties, sensitivity to context, and willingness to assume responsibility for the consequences of advice. Religious authority must therefore move from a model centered exclusively on individual figures toward collaborative governance involving Islamic legal scholars, gender experts, technology specialists, psychologists, and protection agencies. Such collaboration is not intended to diminish the role of religious scholars but to ensure that religious advice on family matters addresses social complexities and risks that cannot always be discerned from normative texts alone.

2. Algorithmic Patriarchy, Women's Vulnerability, and New Spaces for Agency

The second finding confirms that algorithmic patriarchy is not a form of inequality created entirely by technology. It emerges from the interaction between patriarchal structures already embedded in society and digital systems that learn from social data. Technology records existing linguistic patterns, stereotypes, representations, and preferences and then processes and disseminates them on a larger scale. Algorithmic bias therefore cannot be addressed through technical improvements alone; it also requires critical engagement with the social structures and discourses from which the data are derived.

In Islamic family law, gender inequality frequently arises when the concepts of leadership, obedience, and family preservation are interpreted in a one-sided manner. Women are positioned as the parties responsible for preserving marriage, regulating their emotions, serving their husbands, and accepting family decisions, whereas men's responsibilities for justice, protection, maintenance, and respect for their spouses' dignity are not emphasized to the same extent. Abdul Aziz and Mhd Yazid show that polygamy may generate various forms of *ḍarar* when justice is understood merely as material capacity or procedural formality. Armi and Azhari likewise demonstrate that polygamous practices are continually negotiated among religious norms, cultural expectations, and women's lived experiences ([Aziz et al., 2025](#); [Yazid, 2023](#)).

Technology may magnify these inequalities in three ways. First, it repeats biases embedded in data. When dominant texts position women as subordinate, language models are highly likely to generate similar patterns. Palacios Barea demonstrate that language models can preserve hegemonic masculinity and gender bias embedded in data corpora. Second, recommendation systems amplify content. Material that provokes strong reactions often receives greater reach even when it contains simplification, stigma, or discrimination. Third, personalization continuously exposes users who engage with a particular viewpoint to similar content, causing that viewpoint to appear as the most legitimate and dominant position ([Palacios Barea et al., 2025](#)).

Such personalization may produce an epistemic enclosure, a condition in which users inhabit a narrow information environment continuously reinforced by similar content. Within family-law discourse, users may regard absolute obedience, the justification of symbolic violence, or the prohibition of divorce as the only Islamic position because they lack access to alternative views. Islamic law, however, encompasses diverse methodologies, schools, contexts, and orientations toward public welfare. Muchimah demonstrates that cultural plurality and Islamic legal ethics require contextual interpretation, while Wirdyaningsih shows that Islamic judicial practice in Indonesia frequently brings together multiple legal sources in pursuit of more substantive justice ([Muchimah et al., 2026](#); [Wirdyaningsih et al., 2026](#)).

Algorithmic patriarchy is also associated with representations of violence against women. Wyer and Black demonstrate that generative-model outputs may associate women with victimization, sexual violence, marriage, and control over their bodies ([Wyer & Black, 2025](#)). In digital religious spaces, violence does not always appear as a direct threat; it may take the form of labeling women as impious, imposing moral condemnation, intimidation, or denying women the right to interpret their own experiences. Noor and Abdul Hamid show that religious language may be used to justify bullying and control over women's choices in digital. The regulation of sexual violence from a CEDAW perspective also underscores the importance of a protective framework that goes beyond private morality to guarantee victims' rights and perpetrator accountability ([Jully Wiarti et al., 2025](#)).

Nevertheless, discussions of women and technology should not end by portraying women solely as victims. The findings show that women also use digital spaces to expand their agency. In this context, agency does not always take the form of openly rejecting religion or tradition. Women may exercise agency through reinterpretation, negotiation, source selection, the use of legal channels, community formation, and the production of counter-narratives. Putri and Poerwandari demonstrate that piety and agency are not necessarily oppositional. Women may use religious language to defend their interests, dignity, and decision-making space without abandoning their religious identities ([Putri & Poerwandari, 2024](#)).

These findings are consistent with the middle-path feminist strategy discussed in the literature ([Syamsiyatun, 2023](#)). Gender transformation in Muslim societies is not always effectively pursued through a binary confrontation between religion and feminism. Change may occur through textual reinterpretation, the strengthening of women's institutions, education, advocacy, and dialogue with religious structures. Digital spaces provide a new medium for such

strategies. Women can disseminate knowledge of marital rights, discuss experiences of violence, explain divorce procedures, and criticize fatwas that are insensitive to victims' suffering. Women's representation in public leadership likewise shows that women's authority and agency continue to be negotiated within Muslim social and political spaces ([Nugroho et al., 2025](#)).

Agency is also evident in women's use of legal institutions. Hanapi shows that divorce initiated by women may represent legal action taken to escape inequality rather than merely an indication of weakening family values ([Hanapi et al., 2025](#)). Fadil emphasizes the importance of fulfilling women's post-divorce rights, while Aini and Hidayati demonstrate that the division of marital property involves legal rationality, contribution, and justice ([Aini & Hidayati, 2025](#); [Fadil et al., 2024](#)). The autonomy of Islamic courts in addressing marital breakdown further indicates that case resolution requires contextual judgment rather than the application of a single formula ([Farabi, 2025](#)).

Women's participation in mediation also broadens the meaning of agency. Duereh demonstrates that women may serve as mediators within traditional structures, while Mhd Yazid highlights the tension between peace-oriented approaches and demands for gender justice in divorce mediation ([Duereh et al., 2026](#)). Mediation does not necessarily produce justice when its primary objective is merely to preserve marriage. A settlement that disregards inequality and victim safety may instead reproduce violence ([Yazid, 2023](#)). Women's agency in mediation must therefore be understood as the capacity to articulate interests, resist pressure, and obtain outcomes that do not cause further harm.

Technology thus has an ambivalent character. It may reinforce patriarchy through data, design, and recommendation mechanisms, yet it can also be used to challenge the domination of knowledge. Its impact depends greatly on who develops the system, which data are used, whose narratives receive space, and whether women are involved in design and evaluation. Responses to algorithmic patriarchy therefore cannot be limited to individual digital literacy. Institutional transformation is required to ensure women's representation, bias audits, correction mechanisms, and protection against technology-facilitated violence.

3. Formulating Gender-Responsive Religious Authority as a Governance Model

The third finding is a gender-responsive model of religious authority built on three layers: religious substance, technology, and institutions. This model constitutes the study's principal contribution because it connects Islamic family-law scholarship with AI ethics and gender studies. Previous research has generally examined these issues separately. Family-law research has focused on norms, judicial practice, and women's experiences, whereas AI research has concentrated primarily on bias, transparency, and technological accountability. The model developed in this study integrates both areas into the governance of religious knowledge.

At the level of religious substance, the validity of an answer must be determined by both its normative foundations and moral orientation. References to Qur'anic verses, hadith, or scholarly opinions do not in themselves guarantee that an answer is just. Texts may be used selectively and detached from their social contexts. Evaluation must therefore consider the objectives of the law, the consequences of implementation, the conditions of affected parties, and the possibility of harm. A *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* approach enables an assessment of whether advice genuinely protects life, intellect, honor, lineage, and property or instead reinforces harmful relationships.

Within the family context, preserving marriage cannot be placed above the safety and dignity of its members. A relationship that formally remains intact does not necessarily fulfill the purposes of family life when it contains violence, neglect, exploitation, or fear. The *maqāṣid al-usrah* perspective employed by Cholil requires the family to be understood as a space of protection, affection, justice, and shared responsibility. Accordingly, an AI response that merely advises a woman to remain in a marriage without assessing threats to her safety contradicts the substantive objectives of family law ([Cholil et al., 2025](#)).

The technological layer requires that AI systems not be treated as black boxes permitted to generate answers without explanation. Source traceability is essential because users need to know the basis of the responses they receive. Tsuria and Tsuria show that generative AI can produce moral and religious responses that appear consistent while still reflecting tendencies embedded in data. Outputs that fail to identify sources or conceal uncertainty therefore risk creating pseudo-authority ([Tsuria & Tsuria, 2024](#)).

Transparency must also encompass system limitations. Users should be informed that AI possesses no authority to issue fatwas, cannot comprehend the entirety of a user's experience, and may generate errors. Systems should also be designed to recognize indicators of risk, including physical violence, death threats, sexual coercion, economic control, or harm involving children. In such situations, AI should not provide generic responses but should direct users to relevant professional services and protection institutions.

The institutional layer locates responsibility with human beings and organizations. Elmahjub emphasizes the importance of plural ethical benchmarks in AI development, while Raquib highlights the role of virtue and moral character in technology governance ([Elmahjub, 2023](#)). Both approaches demonstrate that ethics cannot be reduced to procedural compliance. Developers, platform operators, religious institutions, and professional users must demonstrate a moral commitment to justice, public welfare, and the prevention of harm ([Raquib et al., 2022](#)).

The principle of amānah developed by Ali strengthens this foundation. Amānah means that human beings are accountable not only for the intended use of technology but also for its design process, data selection, oversight mechanisms, and consequences. Under this framework, developers cannot claim that discrimination is merely a machine error, and religious institutions cannot delegate an entire consultation process to chatbots without verification. Responsibility remains attached to those who possess the authority to design, operate, and disseminate the technology ([Ali et al., 2025](#)).

The six principles identified in this study clarify how the model can be operationalized. Scholarly competence ensures that systems are not designed solely by technology specialists but also involve experts in Islamic law, gender, psychology, and social protection. Source traceability enables users to assess the basis of an argument. System transparency prevents AI outputs from being perceived as certain truth. Gender sensitivity tests whether a system distributes responsibility unequally or reproduces stereotypes. Protection of vulnerable groups places safety at the center of decision-making. Human accountability ensures that identifiable parties can be required to correct errors and answer for harmful consequences.

The model also has implications for fatwa institutions and Islamic education. Religious institutions should develop guidelines for using AI in family-law consultation, standards for verifying responses, and mechanisms for labeling machine-generated content. Islamic higher-education institutions should incorporate AI literacy, algorithmic ethics, and gender into Islamic legal education. Religious scholars and digital preachers also need to understand that platforms are not neutral and that choices of language, titles, and content format can influence how algorithms amplify particular messages.

For technology developers, the model requires periodic audits of both data and outputs. Testing should address not only informational accuracy but also the possibility of discrimination, the justification of violence, or the erasure of women's agency. Women's participation in design and evaluation is essential so that their experiences are not treated merely as data objects but become a substantive basis for system development.

Theoretically, the gender-responsive authority model extends the study of digital Islamic authority. Authority is no longer understood solely as a relationship between religious scholars and followers but as a sociotechnical configuration involving data, devices, platform rules, institutions, and users. This expansion, however, does not eliminate the distinction between technological functions and moral responsibility. Technology can support knowledge processes

but cannot replace human competence, wisdom, empathy, and accountability. The principal challenge of the generative-AI era is therefore not merely whether technology may be used in religious consultation. The more fundamental issue is how to ensure that technology does not expand existing injustice. Governance grounded in *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah*, *amānah*, transparency, and women's participation allows AI to function as a supporting instrument without transforming it into an unaccountable moral authority. Within this framework, the future of Islamic family law in digital spaces must be directed toward strengthening human competence, protecting vulnerable parties, and distributing authority in a more just and inclusive manner.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, it is based on qualitative library research using normative-conceptual and critical discourse approaches; therefore, the proposed arguments are derived from the interpretation and synthesis of existing literature rather than from direct observation of users, religious authorities, digital platforms, or generative artificial intelligence systems. Second, the analytical corpus was limited to 35 peer-reviewed articles published between 2021 and 2026. Although these sources represent recent discussions on Islamic family law, women's agency, digital religious authority, algorithmic bias, and Islamic AI ethics, the corpus may not fully capture the diversity of Muslim societies, jurisprudential traditions, platform architectures, and rapidly evolving generative AI applications. Third, the proposed gender-responsive model of religious authority remains conceptual and has not yet been empirically tested in actual digital-fatwa services, religious chatbots, social media recommendation systems, or institutional consultation platforms. Consequently, the study cannot determine the extent to which the six proposed parameters—scholarly competence, source traceability, system transparency, gender sensitivity, protection of vulnerable groups, and human accountability—can be consistently implemented across different technological and institutional settings.

Future research should empirically examine how generative AI systems respond to sensitive questions concerning marital authority, wives' obedience, polygamy, divorce, post-divorce rights, domestic violence, and women's safety. Comparative prompt-based audits involving multiple AI models, languages, and jurisprudential contexts would be valuable for identifying patterns of gender bias, source fabrication, normative inconsistency, and potentially harmful advice. Qualitative studies should also involve women users, female Muslim scholars, judges, legal practitioners, religious institutions, platform developers, and AI governance specialists to investigate how algorithmic religious advice is interpreted, negotiated, trusted, or resisted in everyday life. Mixed-method and longitudinal studies could further assess the social consequences of repeated exposure to personalized religious content and recommendation systems. In addition, future studies should operationalize and validate the proposed model through expert assessment, case studies, policy analysis, and controlled implementation in digital religious consultation services. Such research would strengthen the model's practical applicability and support the development of transparent, gender-responsive, and institutionally accountable systems in which AI assists access to religious information without replacing qualified human judgment and moral responsibility.

CONCLUSION

The transformation from digital fatwas to generative AI has reconfigured Islamic family-law authority into a hybrid ecosystem involving religious scholars, religious institutions, users, platform operators, technology developers, data, and algorithmic systems. This transformation expands public access to religious knowledge while simultaneously shifting the criteria of authority from scholarly competence and moral responsibility toward popularity, visibility,

speed, and the technological capacity to generate persuasive responses. Because AI lacks moral consciousness, social experience, and the capacity for accountability, its outputs cannot be treated as autonomous fatwas or religious decisions. Technology can function only as a supporting instrument that remains subject to verification by competent human actors and institutions.

The study also demonstrates that algorithmic systems may reproduce patriarchy through the repetition, amplification, and personalization of narratives concerning husbands' leadership, wives' obedience, polygamy, divorce, and the division of domestic roles. Biases embedded in social structures may enter training data and reappear as ostensibly neutral responses. Digital spaces, however, do not produce subordination alone. Muslim women also use them to construct counter-narratives, articulate experiences, expand literacy concerning family rights, build solidarity, and pursue justice through legal and institutional channels. The relationship between technology and women's agency is therefore ambivalent and is strongly shaped by system design, the distribution of power, user literacy, and women's involvement in knowledge production.

As its principal contribution, this study formulates a gender-responsive model of religious authority in algorithmic ecosystems through three layers of governance: religious substance, technology, and institutions. The model is operationalized through six principles: scholarly competence, source traceability, system transparency, gender sensitivity, protection of vulnerable groups, and human accountability. This framework affirms that the use of AI in Islamic family-law discourse must be directed toward protecting dignity, safety, justice, and public welfare rather than merely increasing the efficiency of information delivery. Religious institutions, Islamic higher-education institutions, technology developers, and platform operators should establish verification standards, bias audits, correction mechanisms, and guidelines for using AI in family consultation. In this way, technological development can broaden access to Islamic knowledge without displacing human beings as trustees, bearers of moral responsibility, and protectors of vulnerable parties.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The author assumes full responsibility for the entire process of preparing this article, including initiating and formulating the research idea, designing the study and its methodology, collecting field data, analyzing and interpreting the data, developing the theoretical framework and literature review, drafting the initial manuscript, undertaking substantive revisions, editing the language and formatting in accordance with the journal template, checking the completeness of citations and references, conducting final proofreading, and ensuring that the article meets academic standards and the ethical requirements of scholarly publication.

DECLARATION OF AI USE

In preparing this manuscript, the author made limited use of ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, to improve linguistic accuracy, readability, and clarity of presentation. All generated outputs were subsequently reviewed, verified, and revised by the author. The author assumes full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, scholarly integrity, and entire content of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Aini, S., & Hidayati, N. (2025). (Ir)Rationality among Migrant Worker Families in Ponorogo: The Demolition of Joint Property after Divorce. *Al-Ahwal*, 18(2), 275–290.
<https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18206>
- Ali, F., Bouzoubaa, K., Gelli, F., Hamzi, B., & Khan, S. (2025). Islamic Ethics and AI: An Evaluation of Existing Approaches to AI using Trusteeship Ethics. *Philosophy & Technology*, 38(3), 120.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-025-00922-4>

- Aristeus, S., Firdaus, Utami, P. N., Shahrullah, R. S., Baskoro, A., & Saadah, C. (2025). Between Local Belief and International Norms: Gender Inequality among Marapu Women in Sumba. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, 18(1), 139–154.
<https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18108>
- Armi, M. I., & Azhari, S. (2025). The Dialectics of Polygamy in the Matrilineal System of 20th Century Minangkabau. *Al-Ahwal*, 18(2), 291–324.
<https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18207>
- Aziz, N. A., Abdullah, R., Roro, F. S. R., & Hussin, M. N. M. (2025). Harm ‘Darar’ in Polygamous Marriage: Analyzing The Legal Framework in Malaysia and Indonesia. *Ahkam: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah*, 25(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ajis.v25i1.32068>
- Cholil, M., Rouf, A., Rahmatullah, P., & Ni’ami, M. F. (2025). Domestic Violence and Women’s Legal Awareness: The Family Corner Programmes Interventions through the Perspective of Maqāṣid al-Usrah. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar’iah*, 17(2), 649–674.
<https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v17i2.30101>
- Duereh, S., Noipom, T., & Hassama, A. (2026). Agency Within Tradition: How Muslim Women Become Mediators in Thailand’s Southern Border Provinces. *Journal of Islamic Law*, 7(1), 113–141. <https://doi.org/10.24260/jil.v7i1.4998>
- Elmahjub, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Islamic Ethics: Towards Pluralist Ethical Benchmarking for AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, 36(4), 73.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-023-00668-x>
- Fadil, Mazidah, Z., & Mahmudi, Z. (2024). Fulfillment of Women’s Rights After Divorce: Dynamics and Transformation in the Legal Journey. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar’iah*, 16(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v16i1.25713>
- Falah, M. B., & Riyanta, R. (2025). Digital Patriarchy: How Indonesian Islamic Preachers Construct Gender Asymmetry through YouTube Fatwas. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, 18(1), 103–122. <https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18106>
- Farabi, A. (2025). The Autonomy of Indonesian Islamic Court: Inventing and Refining ‘Broken Marriage’ as a Unilateral and No-Fault Divorce Ground. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, 18(2), 155–174. <https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18201>
- Hanapi, A., Husnul, M., Wahyuni, Y. S., & Muqaddas, A. Y. (2025). Addressing Gender Imbalance in Marriage and Wife-Initiated Divorce in Aceh: Rethinking the Role of Premarital Counselling. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar’iah*, 17(2), 479–508.
<https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v17i2.29131>
- Insani, N., Ibrahim, Z. S., Karimullah, S. S., Gönan, Y., & Sulastri. (2024). Empowering Muslim Women: Bridging Islamic Law and Human Rights with Islamic Economics. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar’iah*, 16(1), 88–117. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v16i1.26159>
- Jafar, W. A., Asmara, M., Faizin, M., Octavianne, H., & Kisworo, B. (2024). Philosophical Foundations and Human Rights in the Bajapuk Tradition: Bridging Local Wisdom and Islamic Law in Minangkabau Marriage Practices. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar’iah*, 16(1), 212–233. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v16i1.27681>
- July Wiarti, Wening Udasmoro, & Supriyad. (2025). *Regulation of Criminal Acts of Sexual Violence in Indonesia from the Perspective of CEDAW: Protection of Women’s Human Rights*.
<https://doi.org/10.24042/as-siyasi.v5i2.28587>
- Muchimah, Komalasari, N., Fadhil, R., Milki Aan, & Humaira Ahmad. (2026). Cultural Pluralism and Islamic Legal Ethics: Reimagining Family Law for Interreligious Marriages in Banyumas. *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam*, 11(1), 67–85.
<https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v11i1.14442>
- Nasyiah, I. (2024). Urgency of Fatwa on Domestic Psychological Violence in Indonesia as an Effort to Protect Women’s Rights. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar’iah*, 16(1), 118–140.
<https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v16i1.26403>

- Nugroho, C., Huda, M. C., Wulandari, A., Nastain, M., & Malau, R. M. U. (2025). Sharia, Gender Politics, and Public Discourse: Media Representation of Female Royal Leadership in Yogyakarta. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah*, 17(2), 599–623.
<https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v17i2.33150>
- Palacios Barea, M. A., Boeren, D., & Ferreira Goncalves, J. F. (2025). At the intersection of humanity and technology: a technofeminist intersectional critical discourse analysis of gender and race biases in the natural language processing model GPT-3. *AI & SOCIETY*, 40(2), 461–479. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01804-z>
- Putri, F. D., & Poerwandari, E. K. (2024). Konstruksi Kesalehan, Posisi dan Agensi Perempuan dalam Wacana Keagamaan. *Musāwa Jurnal Studi Gender Dan Islam*, 22(2), 193–209.
<https://doi.org/10.14421/musawa.2023.222.193-209>
- Raquib, A., Channa, B., Zubair, T., & Qadir, J. (2022). Islamic virtue-based ethics for artificial intelligence. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 2(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-022-00028-2>
- Salam, N., Purnomo, A., Saifullah, S., & Ahmad, S. (2024). Interfaith Marriage from the Perspective of Rationality: Theocentrism in Islamic Law and Anthropocentrism in Human Rights Law. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah*, 16(1), 179–196.
<https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v16i1.23989>
- Selby, J. A., & Sayeed, R. (2023). Religious authorities in the digital age: the case of Muslims in Canada. *Contemporary Islam*, 17(3), 467–488. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11562-023-00536-7>
- Syamsiyatun, S. (2023). Rowing Between the Currents: 'Aisyiyah Strategies for Middle Path Feminism. *Musāwa Jurnal Studi Gender Dan Islam*, 22(1), 41–56.
<https://doi.org/10.14421/musawa.2023.2201.41-56>
- Thahir, P. S., & Al-Fatih, S. (2024). Islamic Law View on Protecting the Rights of Housewives at Risk of Contracting HIV/AIDS. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah*, 16(1), 21–36.
<https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v16i1.26499>
- Tsuria, R., & Tsuria, Y. (2024). Artificial Intelligence's Understanding of Religion: Investigating the Moralistic Approaches Presented by Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools. *Religions*, 15(3), 375. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030375>
- Wibowo, S. E., & Fathiyaturrahmah. (2025). Women and the Transmission of the Quran: Marginalization, Legal Strategies, and Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah-Based Resolution. *Ahkam: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah*, 25(1), 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ajis.v25i1.37944>
- Wirdyaningsih, Maryam, R., Ayuni, Q., & Abdullah, R. (2026). Fusion Approach in Indonesia's Islamic Courts: Blending Islamic Principles with Asian Family-Mediation Practices in Divorce Cases. *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam*, 11(1), 86–112.
<https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v11i1.14848>
- Wyer, S., & Black, S. (2025). Algorithmic bias: sexualized violence against women in GPT-3 models. *AI and Ethics*, 5(3), 3293–3310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00641-0>
- Yasmar, R., Nurmala, M., Nurbayan, Y., Erlina, & Atikah, T. (2025). A Rhetorical-Legal Hermeneutic: Representations of Women in the Qur'an through Balaghah and Their Implications for Islamic Law. *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam*, 10(2), 731–760.
<https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v10i2.11132>
- Yazid, M. (2023). NEGLECTING WOMEN'S RIGHTS: Indonesian YouTube Preachers' Legal Opinion on Polygamy. *Al-Ahwal*, 16(1), 69–88.
<https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2023.16104>
- Zakiyah, Z., Muzayanah, U., & Noviani, N. L. (2025). The Life of the Terrorist Convicts' Wives: Unequal Family Dynamics and Islamic Legal Frameworks. *AHKAM : Jurnal Ilmu Syariah*, 25(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ajis.v25i1.38150>
- Zumrotun, S., Muhsin, I., Kuswaya, A., & Ma'mun, S. (2026). Islamic Family Law in Diaspora:

Negotiating Gender and Marital Authority among Indonesian Muslim Immigrants in Sydney. *Journal of Islamic Law*, 7(1), 193–221. <https://doi.org/10.24260/jil.v7i1.5687>