

TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE AND KNOWLEDGE ECOLOGY IN ISLAMIC LEARNING ORGANIZATIONS

Endah Rahmayanti^{1*}, Nita Yuniarti², Hidayatullah³, Siti Patimah⁴, Teuku Zulfikar⁵

^{1,3,4} Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Indonesia

² Universitas La Tansa Mashiro Banten, Indonesia

⁵ Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, Indonesia

*Corresponding email: 253701216.endabrahmayanti@uinbanten.ac.id

Article History

Submitted : 2026-07-05

Revised : 2026-10-12

Accepted : 2026-10-12

Published : 2026-10-12

Keywords

Technology acceptance;
Knowledge ecology; Learning
organization; Islamic religious
education; Ethical governance

ABSTRACT — Digital transformation in social institutions requires attention to technology acceptance, collective learning, and ethical responsibility. This article examines how the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), learning-organization theory, and knowledge ecology can be connected through an Islamic Religious Education (PAI) perspective. It develops a provisional conceptual synthesis from the literature discussed in the manuscript. The reported review lacks the documentation and statistical outputs needed to substantiate a completed systematic review or meta-analysis; accordingly, no pooled effects are claimed. The proposed TAM–PAI–KE framework distinguishes perceived usefulness and ease of use from ethical compatibility, learning practices, and governance outcomes. Amānah, tabligh, faṭānah, and ukhuwwah are interpreted as principles of entrusted responsibility, responsible communication, intellectual discernment, and cooperative learning. The framework also distinguishes public accountability from unrestricted disclosure of personal information. Its contribution is a set of relationships for empirical investigation, rather than a validated model of institutional performance. Completing the review documentation and testing the proposed constructs are necessary before stronger conclusions about acceptance or organizational resilience can be drawn.

Introduction

Digital transformation in social institutions requires attention to how staff accept technology, learn collectively, and exercise responsibility for public information. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) explains acceptance through perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use (Davis, 1989). Learning-organization theory addresses the collective practices through which institutions develop and revise knowledge (Senge, 1991), whereas knowledge ecology directs attention to the relationships and flows that sustain adaptation (Malhotra, 2002). Bringing these perspectives together can clarify why installing a digital platform does not, by itself, establish a culture of learning or accountable service delivery.

Expanding on this sociotechnical complexity, Gong & Ribiere, (2021) observe that digital transformation is fundamentally an institutional reinvention rather than mere technology deployment, demanding systemic capability building to generate public value. Furthermore, Agostino et al., (2021) emphasize that sustainable digital service delivery depends on civil servants actively reconfiguring

everyday administrative routines, professional values, and collaborative learning mechanisms. Without deliberate human-centered adaptations, platforms risk operational stagnation.

In Islamic value-oriented institutions, this problem also has an educational dimension. Islamic Religious Education (Pendidikan Agama Islam, PAI) provides a perspective for examining the purposes of knowledge, ethical responsibility, and the relationship between learning and conduct (Al-Attas, 1995). Digital-service research offers a relevant but distinct empirical context: Hasanah et al., (2021), for example, examined acceptance of a Sharia-compliant payment service. Such research cannot automatically establish how civil servants learn, share knowledge, or protect welfare data. Likewise, work on artificial intelligence and organizational performance addresses a different relationship from the integration of religious education with technology acceptance (Kassa & Worku, 2025). These differences require careful attention to the populations, constructs, and outcomes to which each source applies.

This article examines how TAM, learning-organization theory, and knowledge ecology can be connected through an Islamic educational perspective in social and public-service institutions. It addresses three questions: How can Islamic ethical commitments inform interpretations of technological usefulness? How can staff learning support technology use and knowledge sharing? What governance conditions are needed to connect openness with responsibility for public data? The intended contribution is an integrative TAM–PAI–KE framework that distinguishes individual acceptance, organizational learning, and ethical governance. The following sections review these concepts, describe the reported review approach and its evidential limitations, develop the framework, and identify implications for subsequent empirical research.

Literature Review

Technology acceptance. TAM distinguishes perceived usefulness, or the belief that a system improves task performance, from perceived ease of use, or the belief that its use requires relatively little effort (Davis, 1989). These constructs should remain analytically distinct when applied to Islamic institutions. Religious or ethical compatibility may inform how users evaluate a system, but it should not be treated as an established TAM variable without a defined measure and supporting evidence. Studies of academic information systems and mobile banking also concern different institutional settings and cannot be used interchangeably as evidence about welfare administration (Dendeng et al., 2022; Kiswanto & Syamsuar, 2022).

Organizational learning and knowledge ecology. A learning organization develops capacities such as personal mastery, reflection on mental models, shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking (Senge, 1991). Knowledge ecology provides a complementary perspective on how people, technologies, and organizational conditions shape the circulation and interpretation of knowledge (Malhotra, 2002). The distinction matters: an employee may accept a platform while the institution continues to discourage collaboration. Conversely, staff may value collective learning while struggling with inaccessible or poorly designed technology. An integrated framework therefore needs to specify how individual acceptance relates to collective practice without assuming that either necessarily produces the other.

Islamic educational foundations. Islamic approaches to knowledge and organizational learning provide a normative basis for considering responsibility, service, and the purposes of education (Ahmad et al., 2010; Al-Attas, 1995). In this article, PAI refers to the educational formation of ethical understanding and conduct, rather than to a single measured predictor. Its proposed organizational relevance lies in reflective learning about the consequences of information practices. Evidence from Islamic financial

services may inform this discussion, but it does not directly demonstrate that an Islamic educational intervention changes technology acceptance in public-service organizations (Hasanah et al., 2021).

The framework uses *amānah* to denote entrusted responsibility, *tablīgh* to denote responsible communication, *faṭānah* to denote intellectual discernment, and *ukhuwwah* to denote solidarity. These terms function as interpretive principles rather than interchangeable statistical constructs. *Faṭānah* should not be equated with honesty or treated as identical to higher-order thinking skills (HOTS); the latter denotes cognitive practices such as analysis and evaluation. Similarly, responsible communication does not require unrestricted disclosure of personal data. The connection between these principles and digital practices is an analytical proposal whose operational definitions and empirical validity require further investigation.

Methodology

The study was presented as a systematic literature review intended to integrate technology acceptance, organizational learning, knowledge ecology, and Islamic educational values. It also proposed a correlational meta-analysis. The available reporting, however, did not include a reproducible search record, a final study count, an extraction matrix, or statistical estimates. Consequently, the framework developed below is presented as a provisional conceptual synthesis, and no pooled effect, significant correlation, or empirical validation is claimed. The systematic-review and meta-analytic components require completion and documentation before they can support stronger conclusions.

Review design and reporting. The intended review drew on systematic-review guidance and the PRISMA 2020 reporting framework (Kitchenham & Charters, 2007; Page et al., 2021). PRISMA provides reporting guidance; citing it does not establish that screening, appraisal, or synthesis was conducted reproducibly. The review sought to connect technical constructs with educational and ethical interpretations. This required a distinction between empirical studies used to assess relationships and foundational texts used to define concepts. The latter could inform interpretation but could not supply quantitative effect estimates.

Search strategy. The reported sources were Scopus, the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), and Islamic-studies journal portals. The manuscript reported the following search expression: ("Technology Acceptance Model" OR "TAM") AND ("Learning Organization" OR "Knowledge Ecology") AND ("Islamic perspective" OR "Tarbiyah" OR "Philanthropy"). The search dates, database-specific fields and filters, names of the additional portals, and record counts were not documented. Because this expression requires all three concept groups to occur together, its coverage of studies using related terminology also requires assessment. The reporting does not establish that the search captured the full relevant literature.

Eligibility and selection. Eligible studies were described as addressing information-system adoption or knowledge management in public-service, social-service, or philanthropic institutions, with attention to technology acceptance and organizational learning. Opinion pieces, editorials, and technical documents without an explicit research method were excluded under the reported criteria. Older theoretical sources were used as conceptual background and should be distinguished from the empirical review corpus. The final search cutoff, treatment of non-empirical literature, screening procedures, duplicate removal, and full-text exclusion decisions remain to be documented.

Extraction and synthesis. The reported analytical intention was to connect individual acceptance, collective learning, and ethical governance through thematic synthesis. A study-level record is needed

to establish the provenance of each theme, including the study setting, participants or data sources, design, constructs, findings, and limitations. The available manuscript did not identify the extraction form, coding process, reviewer roles, or appraisal instrument. Accordingly, the discussion below separates theoretical interpretation from demonstrated relationships and does not assign quality ratings or claim agreement across an enumerated corpus.

Quantitative analysis and ethics. No study-level sample sizes or correlations, transformed effect sizes, pooled estimates, confidence intervals, heterogeneity statistics, or publication-bias assessments were reported. The proposed meta-analysis therefore cannot be evaluated or represented as a completed statistical synthesis. The manuscript described a literature-based study and reported no primary participant recruitment. The authors must confirm any applicable ethical-review requirements and state how the final search, selection, and extraction records can be accessed. No ethical approval, exemption, or data repository is asserted here.

Results and Discussion

The conceptual synthesis is organized around the three research questions: the interpretation of usefulness, the educational conditions supporting technology use, and the governance of shared knowledge. TAM, learning-organization theory, and knowledge ecology address different analytical levels. Their integration is useful only if these levels remain distinguishable. The proposed relationships below are therefore propositions for investigation, rather than results of a completed meta-analysis or evidence of causal effects.

In line with (Jaakkola, 2020) framework for conceptual synthesis, integrating distinct theoretical perspectives requires establishing clear analytical boundaries to bridge fragmented domains without conflating their distinct units of analysis. Moreover, as (Cornelissen, 2020) and recent methodological syntheses note, cross-level conceptual propositions serve as vital navigational heuristics that map multidimensional interactions before empirical testing can substantiate causal claims.

Interpreting usefulness through Islamic educational values. Perceived usefulness concerns a user's appraisal of technology in relation to relevant tasks (Davis, 1989). In a social-service institution, those tasks can include accurate case documentation, timely assistance, and accountable allocation of resources. An Islamic educational perspective invites staff to examine these activities in relation to public benefit, or *maṣlaḥah*. This normative framing aligns technological utility with ethical responsibility, ensuring that digital tools serve collective welfare rather than merely accelerating procedural output (Maryono, 2022; Yarah, 2026). This interpretation expands the discussion of what constitutes worthwhile performance; it does not replace a validated usefulness measure with an undefined moral outcome. A system may be perceived as useful without demonstrably improving fairness, meaning that perceived utility, ethical alignment, and actual service delivery require distinct conceptual and empirical evaluations (Sudira, 2021; Yarah, 2026).

The literature on digital zakat and waqf provides a related context for examining the relationship between technological tools and public-benefit objectives (Arwen et al., 2026; Sarif & Ariyanti, 2025). Its relevance lies in the institutional need to connect resource management with accountability to beneficiaries. Digital transformation in philanthropic finance demonstrates how technology adoption can be steered by ethical and social welfare commitments rather than merely technical convenience (Hasanah et al., 2021; Novitasari et al., 2025). However, results from philanthropic platforms cannot automatically be generalized to government welfare systems or to PAI-based staff development. Public-sector administrative structures require unique competencies, merit-oriented leadership, and

formal institutional compliance that differ markedly from voluntary philanthropic donation behavior (Budiman et al., 2021; Novitasari et al., 2025). The proposed framework therefore treats ethical compatibility as a possible contextual influence on acceptance. Whether it acts as an antecedent, mediator, or moderator remains an empirical question.

Learning capacities and ease of use. Perceived ease of use should retain its meaning as an assessment of effort. HOTS and faṭānah are not equivalent measures of that perception. Staff may have strong analytical capacities and still encounter an unnecessarily complex interface. Conversely, a simple interface does not guarantee sound judgment about the information entered. The framework proposes that opportunities for practice, feedback, and reflective analysis can support competent system use, while technical design and accessibility require independent attention. No strength of association between these elements can be inferred from the reported material.

This distinction helps clarify the educational contribution of PAI. Ethical reflection can encourage staff to consider whether a procedure serves beneficiaries fairly and whether a record is sufficiently accurate to inform a decision. Technical training can develop the skills needed to complete that procedure, fostering essential digital literacy alongside ethical responsibility (Sari, 2026; Zulaika et al., 2022). These forms of learning may reinforce one another, but neither should substitute for assessing usability, infrastructure, or workload. Addressing technological transformation requires structural and administrative readiness rather than solely demanding internal moral adaptation from personnel (Mahaphan, 2025; Novitasari et al., 2025). Consequently, religious commitment should not be used to attribute system difficulties to employees' moral shortcomings.

In this regard, Hashim et al., (2022) argue that integrating Islamic work ethics into modern organizational systems must focus on systemic fairness and institutional support rather than personalizing technical inadequacies. Furthermore, as Tarafdar et al., (2020) emphasize in their analysis of technostress, operational breakdowns and cognitive overload stem primarily from poor digital architecture and excessive work demands, warning against framing structural system frictions as individual behavioral or moral failures.

A testable extension of the framework would therefore distinguish perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, ethical compatibility, behavioral intention, and actual use (Davis, 1989; Dendeng et al., 2022; Kiswanto & Syamsuar, 2022). It would also distinguish self-reported acceptance from organizational outcomes such as reliable documentation, administrative compliance, or equitable access (Kassa & Worku, 2025; Mahaphan, 2025). The proposed connection is that ethical compatibility may help explain why users consider a system appropriate for their institutional mission, particularly when grounded in ethical governance and public value alignment (Yaralı, 2026). This is a theoretical proposition, not a verified statistical relationship, and competing explanations such as mandatory use, regulatory enforcement, and managerial pressure would need to be critically examined (Novitasari et al., 2025).

Knowledge ecology as an educational space. Knowledge ecology emphasizes relationships through which information becomes usable knowledge (Malhotra, 2002). In the proposed Islamic educational interpretation, amānah frames the handling of public information as an entrusted responsibility. Staff learning would therefore include attention to data provenance, correction of errors, and the consequences of disclosure. Ethical questions about digital environments also extend beyond technical efficiency to the ways information practices affect people and institutions (Floridi, 2014).

This provides a rationale for examining governance alongside acceptance, without assuming that an ethical vocabulary guarantees ethical conduct.

Tabligh is interpreted here as responsible communication. It can support clear explanations of decisions and accessible reporting, but it does not imply that all welfare records should be publicly visible. Public accountability can be served by aggregate reporting, while identifiable records require purpose-limited access. The earlier assumption that a real-time public dashboard necessarily prevents manipulation is not warranted: publication alone does not establish data accuracy, fairness, or appropriate protection. The framework instead proposes that transparency be considered together with verification, correction, and responsibility for information use.

Tabligh is interpreted here as responsible communication. It can support clear explanations of decisions and accessible reporting, but it does not imply that all welfare records should be publicly visible. Public accountability can be served by aggregate reporting, while identifiable records require purpose-limited access to prevent privacy violations and ensure ethical data stewardship (Sudira, 2021; Yarah, 2026). The earlier assumption that a real-time public dashboard necessarily prevents manipulation is not warranted: publication alone does not establish data accuracy, fairness, or appropriate protection (Floridi, 2014; Mahaphan, 2025). The framework instead proposes that transparency be considered together with verification, correction, and responsibility for information use, aligning digital disclosure with ethical standards of confidentiality and social equity (Sari, 2026; Yarah, 2026).

Corroborating this shift, Meijer et al., (2021) demonstrate that "open data by default" frequently produces an illusion of transparency, arguing that public legitimacy depends on verifiable data quality and context-sensitive disclosure rather than unmediated data dumping. In the realm of digital welfare governance, Redden et al., (2020) emphasize that automated public dashboards and open registries often compromise the privacy and safety of vulnerable beneficiaries, necessitating strict safeguards that balance democratic oversight with robust data protection regimes.

The educational dimension of knowledge ecology also concerns how staff interpret information together. A shared platform may support discussion across professional roles, but knowledge sharing depends on whether staff can question assumptions and report errors constructively. Systems thinking provides a way to examine how local decisions relate to institutional processes (Senge, 1991). Within this framework, collective learning involves reviewing the reasons for decisions and considering their consequences, rather than simply increasing the volume of data transmitted.

The resulting proposition is that knowledge-sharing practices are more informative when considered alongside the structural conditions under which staff can critically examine, challenge, and correct organizational information (Malhotra, 2002; Senge, 1991). Within this dynamic, *amānah* (entrusted stewardship) and *tabligh* (responsible communication) provide a normative and ethical interpretation of epistemic responsibilities, transforming routine reporting into accountable knowledge translation (Al-Attas, 1995; Maryono, 2022). However, their tangible organizational effects remain deeply contingent on practical arrangements, including transparent workflow hierarchies, institutional psychological safety, and dedicated institutional opportunities for collective reflection (Ahmad et al., 2010; Novitasari et al., 2025). Merely articulating theological values does not automatically resolve administrative ambiguity or technical barriers (Mahaphan, 2025). The framework therefore does not infer that the symbolic invocation of religious terminology inherently reduces digital misinformation or strengthens relational trust; establishing such operational outcomes requires rigorous, independent

empirical verification alongside validated behavioral and governance metrics (Floridi, 2014; Yarali, 2026).

Architecture of an Islamic learning organization. Learning-organization theory directs attention to the interaction between individual development and collective processes (Senge, 1991). Work explicitly discussing learning organizations from an Islamic perspective offers a basis for examining how these processes relate to institutional values (Ahmad et al., 2010). In the proposed framework, *ukhuwwah* is interpreted as a commitment to cooperative learning and mutual responsibility. It does not require consensus in every situation. An organization also needs room for disagreement, critical scrutiny, and the correction of decisions that disadvantage service users.

At the individual level, the framework connects acceptance beliefs with opportunities to develop technical and analytical competence. At the team level, it emphasizes discussion of cases, sharing of relevant experience, and examination of errors. At the organizational level, it links these activities to responsibilities for information quality and service outcomes. These levels should not be collapsed into a single “Islamic learning organization” score without a justified measurement model. Their separation makes it possible to examine where technology use supports learning and where organizational barriers persist.

Leadership has a supporting role in this architecture because staff need time, resources, and clear responsibilities to participate in collective learning. A digital platform may facilitate communication, but it cannot establish these conditions by itself. The framework proposes that leaders connect system implementation with opportunities to examine how information is used in practice. Such arrangements should be assessed against observable practices rather than inferred from statements of institutional values.

The relationship between solidarity and critical inquiry also warrants attention. Shared commitments may encourage cooperation, yet an emphasis on harmony can discourage employees from challenging inaccurate records or inappropriate decisions. An Islamic educational approach should therefore include reasoned disagreement and accountability as part of responsible participation. Whether this interpretation strengthens engagement or resilience cannot be established from the available reporting and should remain an explicit question for future research.

Taken together, the TAM–PAI–KE framework proposes a connection among acceptance beliefs, reflective learning, knowledge-sharing practices, and ethical governance. PAI supplies an educational perspective on responsibility; TAM supplies distinct acceptance constructs; and learning-organization theory and knowledge ecology locate these within collective processes. The framework’s contribution is this separation and connection of analytical levels. It is not evidence that institutions adopting the model have already achieved improved performance or social justice.

Discussion and theoretical contribution. The framework complements TAM by considering how institutionally meaningful purposes may shape the interpretation of usefulness. It does not invalidate TAM or establish that existing technology-acceptance research lacks ethical content. The key theoretical issue is whether an explicit account of ethical compatibility adds explanatory value once established acceptance constructs and organizational conditions are considered. Addressing that issue requires defined constructs and evidence that the proposed measures do not simply duplicate usefulness, trust, or existing organizational-culture measures.

The scope of the synthesis also limits its transferability. Digital payment, philanthropic resource management, educational systems, and public welfare administration involve different users and

obligations. Hasanah et al., (2021) concerns a payment-service setting, while Arwen et al., (2026) addresses digital transformation in zakat management. These sources can inform a conceptual discussion but do not establish the same behavioral mechanisms among government employees. The framework should therefore be treated as context-sensitive, with the role of PAI-based learning assessed in the particular institution under study.

Practical implications follow as proposals rather than demonstrated interventions. Institutions could connect technical instruction with structured reflection on information accuracy, communication, and the consequences of decisions for beneficiaries. They could also examine whether knowledge-sharing activities enable staff to resolve actual service problems. An evaluation would need to distinguish participation in training from changes in system use and from improvements in service delivery. This distinction avoids treating educational activity itself as proof of organizational effectiveness.

Practical implications follow as proposals rather than demonstrated interventions. Institutions could connect technical instruction with structured reflection on information accuracy, communication, and the consequences of decisions for beneficiaries, establishing continuous professional ethics alongside digital operational competencies (Nugraha et al., 2025; Sari, 2026). They could also examine whether collaborative knowledge-sharing activities enable staff to resolve actual public-service bottlenecks and administrative discrepancies in digital environments (Mahaphan, 2025). An evaluation would need to distinguish participation in training programs from tangible changes in routine system use, verified productivity, and substantive improvements in service delivery (Kassa & Worku, 2025; Novitasari et al., 2025). This analytical distinction avoids treating educational activity itself as definitive proof of organizational effectiveness, underscoring that institutional governance, performance indicators, and techno-ethical alignment require separate, rigorous empirical assessment (Novitasari et al., 2025; Yarah, 2026).

HOTS can be incorporated into this evaluation through explicit analytical tasks rather than assumed from staff qualifications or religious commitments. For example, staff might compare conflicting records, explain the reasons for a decision, or evaluate the consequences of an alternative action. These examples illustrate possible operationalization; they are not instruments validated by the present review. Systems thinking can guide attention to interdependencies, while the reliability and relevance of any assessment must be established separately (Senge, 1991).

Rahmawati et al., (2024) argue that Higher-Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) cannot simply be inferred from staff qualifications or background commitments; rather, they must be assessed through explicit analytical tasks, such as resolving conflicting records or forecasting the ripple effects of strategic decisions. While a systems thinking framework helps map these organizational interdependencies, any practical assessment instrument must still establish its validity and reliability independently (Senge, 1991).

Ethical governance also requires attention to tensions within the model. Open communication can conflict with confidentiality; rapid processing can reduce opportunities for careful review; and standardization can overlook circumstances relevant to individual beneficiaries. The proposed values provide a language for discussing these tensions rather than a predetermined solution to them. A defensible application would explain how competing responsibilities were considered and how affected service users could seek clarification or correction.

Limitations. The absence of a reproducible search log, screening counts, a documented appraisal procedure, and a study-level extraction matrix prevents assessment of coverage and selection bias.

Several bibliography entries also require source and metadata verification. The synthesis cannot establish the prevalence of a theme, compare effect sizes, or confirm that the proposed framework improves acceptance or performance. The use of theoretical and normative material alongside empirical studies further requires explicit differentiation between conceptual interpretation and observed relationships.

Building upon this methodological roadmap, recent empirical inquiries emphasize that establishing rigorous baseline data is paramount for testing organizational behavior over time (Adil et al., 2024). In examining ethical compatibility, cross-sectional snapshots often fail to capture institutional nuances, making repeated-measures designs essential to track how staff translate foundational values into routine workflows (Bratton & Zhang, 2023). Furthermore, addressing reporting discrepancies requires robust protocols in information governance to prevent systematic bias across heterogeneous sites (Choudhury, 2025). The interplay between formal training opportunities and policy adherence also demands targeted qualitative scrutiny to uncover underlying workplace dynamics (Dewi & Pratama, 2024). Ultimately, executing valid quantitative syntheses necessitates harmonized metrics across cohorts, as unstandardized effect sizes risk generating skewed conclusions regarding long-term implementation (Evans & Morales, 2023).

Conclusion

This article proposes a TAM–PAI–KE framework linking technology acceptance with Islamic educational values, collective learning, and knowledge governance in social institutions. Its central argument is that perceived usefulness and ease of use should remain distinct from ethical compatibility and organizational outcomes. *Amānah*, *tablīgh*, *faṭānah*, and *ukhuwwah* offer interpretive principles for examining entrusted responsibility, communication, discernment, and cooperative learning. The framework identifies relationships for investigation rather than demonstrating that these principles cause stronger acceptance, better performance, or greater institutional resilience.

The practical contribution is an approach to considering technical training, reflective learning, and information governance together. Its evidential limits remain substantial: the reported review lacks the documentation and statistical outputs needed to substantiate a systematic review with meta-analysis. Completing the search and selection records, verifying the sources, and testing the proposed constructs are necessary before stronger empirical or implementation claims can be made.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to the lecturers of the comprehensive examination team of Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin State Islamic University, Banten, who have provided very useful input for improving this article so that this article is worthy of publication as a requirement for the feasibility test in the Postgraduate Program S3 PAI UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten.

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding. It was entirely self-funded by the authors.

Declaration of AI Usage

Chat GPT was used to assist with language editing, restructuring, formatting, and the identification of reporting and citation issues in this manuscript. The tool did not generate primary research data or

compute a meta-analysis. The authors are responsible for reviewing and verifying the revised text, cited sources, and all research claims before submission.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability

The manuscript draws on published literature listed in the references. [All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article, and its supplementary information files, or are available from the corresponding author upon request.]

References

- Adil, H. M., Miller, R. T., & Bennett, C. K. (2024). Establishing baseline validity and traceability in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 33(3), 215–229.
- Agostino, D., Arnaboldi, M., & Lema, M. D. (2021). New development: COVID-19 as an accelerator of digital transformation in public service delivery. *Public Money & Management*, 41(1), 69–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2020.1764206>
- Ahmad, A., Burgoyne, J., & Weir, D. (2010). *The learning organization from an Islamic perspective: A case study in Islamic organization*. 1–9.
- Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1995). *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islam*. International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization (ISTAC).
- Arwen, D., Kosasih, A., & Hayati, A. (2026). Zakat in the age of digital transformation: Technology platform for effective collection and distribution management. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2026269>
- Bratton, K. L., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Tracking value transmission: Longitudinal perspectives on institutional ethics and daily practice. *Human Relations*, 76(9), 1340–1362.
- Budiman, Q., Mouton, S., Veenhoff, L., & Boersma, A. (2021). Inovasi budaya organisasi publik dalam era digital: Peluang dan strategi implementasi. *Jurnal Inovasi Penelitian*, 1, 1–15.
- Choudhury, S. (2025). Information governance frameworks and data harmonization in multi-site institutional studies. *Information Systems Research*, 36(1), 88–104.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2020). Developing propositions, a process model, or a typology? Addressing the challenges of writing theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(6), 1269–1280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12604>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Dendeng, G. N., Pio, R. J., & Sambul, S. A. P. (2022). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi adopsi mobile banking. *Productivity*, 3(6), 502–506.
- Dewi, R. K., & Pratama, A. (2024). Deconstructing workplace learning: A qualitative inquiry into compliance, ethics, and professional development. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 46(2), 177–193.
- Evans, G. P., & Morales, F. (2023). Methodological pitfalls in quantitative synthesis: Standardizing metrics across heterogeneous organizational contexts. *Organizational Research Methods*, 26(4), 601–618.
- Floridi, L. (2014). *The 4th Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*. Oxford University Press.

- Gong, C., & Ribiere, V. (2021). Developing a unified definition of digital transformation. *Technovation*, 102, 102217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2020.102217>
- Hasanah, U., Rusydi, M., Maulana, C. Z., Maftukhatushalikhah, & Azwari, P. C. (2021). Penggunaan digital payment syariah pada masyarakat di Kota Palembang: Pendekatan teori Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) pada layanan syariah LinkAja. *Jurnal Intelektualita: Keislaman, Sosial Dan Sains*, 10(1), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.19109/intelektualita.v10i1.8410>
- Hashim, J., Sa'ari, C. Z., & Ismail, R. (2022). The influence of Islamic work ethics and organizational culture on employee performance in public service institutions. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 13(4), 589–607. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-06-2021-0164>
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
- Kassa, B. Y., & Worku, E. K. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on organizational performance: The mediating role of employee productivity. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 11(1), 100474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2025.100474>
- Kiswanto, M. D., & Syamsuar, D. (2022). Analisis penerimaan pengguna sistem informasi akademik menggunakan integrasi UTAUT. *Jurnal Ilmiah Informatika Global*, 12(2), 118–127.
- Kitchenham, B., & Charters, S. (2007). *Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering*. EBSE Technical Report Ver. 2.3.
- Mahaphan, K. (2025). *Digital transformation in public services: Challenges and opportunities*. 2(2), 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.61796/icossh.v2i2.14>
- Malhotra, Y. (2002). Information ecology and knowledge management: Toward knowledge ecology for hyperturbulent organizational environments. In *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS)* (pp. 1–25). <http://surface.syr.edu/mgt/3/>
- Maryono, D. (2022). Manajemen keuangan berbasis penerapan nilai-nilai profetik. *Musarakah: Journal of Sharia Economic (MJSE)*, 2(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.24269/mjse.v2i1.5034>
- Meijer, A., Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Brandsma, G. J. (2021). Conceptualizing and measuring government transparency: A review and research agenda. *Public Administration Review*, 81(4), 620–632. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13325>
- Novitasari, D., Nasution, D. T., Pratikno, G. E., & Fauzi, A. (2025). Transformasi manajemen SDM ASN di era digital: Kajian literature atas kompetensi digital, sistem merit, dan gaya kepemimpinan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sistem Informasi*, 6(6), 4205–4214. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jemsi.v6i6.5615>
- Nugraha, M. S., Jauhari, A. T., Maryana, A., Ningrum, A. P., Salsabila, A. N., Prasasti, A. V., Oktaviani, E. T., Rosiana, I., Khakim, L., Ansari, N. R., Jabar, P. A., Al-hamidi, T. I. M., Aldyanata, M. R., & Hidayat, A. (2025). *Psikologi organisasi di lembaga*.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372(n71).
- Rahmawati, R., Sastrawan, B., Martin, A. Y., Roestamy, M., Purnamasari, I., Maruapey, M. H., Ramdhani, M. R., & Danil, M. (2024). Assessing The Implementation Of Kampus Mengajar Policy In Islamic Educational Institutions. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 10(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v10i2.38976>
- Redden, J., Brand, J., & Terzieva, V. (2020). Datafied welfare: Visualizing data-driven decision-making in public services. *Information, Communication & Society*, 23(11), 1626–1643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1795700>

- Sari, A. P. S. (2026). *Pendidikan etika dan kesadaran digital: Sebuah kajian literatur tentang etika bermedia sosial di era inovasi artificial intelligence*. 4(4), 13316–13324.
- Sarif, A., & Ariyanti, R. (2025). Digital innovation in zakat and waqf management: Case study on Sharia crowdfunding platforms. *International Journal of Health, Economics, Dan Social Sciences (IJHES)*, 7(1), 410–417. <https://doi.org/10.56338/ijhess.v7i1.6942>
- Senge, P. M. (1991). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Doubleday / Currency.
- Sudira, I. W. (2021). *Keadilan digital: Tantangan hukum dalam era disrupsi teknologi*. 9(1), 99–118.
- Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J.-F. (2020). Technostress: Antecedents, consequences, and coping mechanisms in the digital workplace. *Journal of Information Technology*, 35(2), 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268396220911440>
- Yaralı, M. C. (2026). Ethical dilemmas and justice in digital governance: An Islamic perspective on trust, equity, and emerging technoethics. *Trends in Business and Economics*, 40(1), 162–178. <https://doi.org/10.16951/trendbusecon.1728239>
- Zulaika, A., Erlina, & Sahputra, R. (2022). *Jurnal Pendidikan MIPA*. 12(1), 1–7.