

DIGITAL HUMANISM AS AN AXIOLOGICAL PARADIGM OF EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION IN THE CONTEXT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Olgerd Aleksandrovich Filippov,
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophical Sciences,
Navoi branch of «Profi University»,
olgerdphilippow@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines digital humanism as an axiological paradigm of educational transformation through the lens of hermeneutical and post-non-classical philosophy in the context of rapid artificial intelligence implementation. Special attention is paid to the critical analysis of contradictions between technological rationality and humanistic values, identifying risks of algorithmic bias, loss of subjectivity, and increasing educational inequality. Digital humanism is interpreted not as an external ethical superstructure but as an internal regulative for designing educational ecosystems, capable of ensuring balance between innovation and fundamental values - dignity, autonomy, critical thinking, and responsibility. The necessity of integrating value foundations into the architecture of digital platforms and pedagogical practices is emphasized, which allows resisting the technological reduction of pedagogical experience. As an original conclusion, the thesis about digital humanism as a semantic compass orienting educational systems towards the formation of subjectivity in the era of algorithms and big data is substantiated.

Keywords: Digital humanism; artificial intelligence; axiological paradigm; educational transformation; subjectivity; educational ecosystem; algorithmic bias; digitalization ethics; critical thinking; post-non-classical philosophy of education.

Introduction

Examining the problem of educational transformation in the era of artificial intelligence (AI) through the lens of digital humanism, we inevitably face the need to rethink the very axiological paradigm of educational practices. Here, digital humanism acts not simply as a set of ethical standards or pedagogical declarations but as a value framework defining the horizons of educational systems development under conditions of radical technological changes [1, 33]. In a situation where AI not only modifies ways of organizing knowledge but also claims to form new educational rationalities, the question of preserving subjectivity, dignity, capacity for critical reflection, and responsibility becomes central.

It is particularly important to note that digital humanism, as G. Wertner and co-authors point out, is not limited to ethical support of digital modernization but should become the foundation for developing new educational strategies and policies adequate to the challenges of the algorithmic world [2, 117]. In this sense, analyzing digital humanism as an axiological paradigm is not so much a theoretical task as a practical requirement of our time.

This article attempts to investigate digital humanism specifically as a value foundation for educational transformation in AI conditions. The work aims to provide philosophical and methodological justification for digital humanism as a dominant paradigm capable of ensuring balance between technologization and preserving the human dimension of the educational process. Special attention is paid to the necessity of integrating ethical, cultural, and personal components into the architecture of digital education, which allows resisting the risks of algorithmic reductionism and increasing educational inequality [3, 8]. Thus, the subject of analysis becomes the very process of understanding and institutionalizing digital humanism in educational practices - both in its normative-value and functional-applied aspects.

Methodology

In constructing the methodological concept for studying digital humanism as an axiological paradigm of educational transformation in AI conditions, it is necessary to emphasize that the dominant strategy here is a comprehensive analysis of contemporary philosophical and pedagogical literature, with mandatory involvement of interpretative and critical-reflexive theoretical methods. This approach is determined not only by the complexity and multi-layered nature of the research object itself but also by the epistemological challenges generated by the collision of educational practices with artificial intelligence [4, 19].

This work implements a hermeneutical analysis of key texts on digital humanism, AI ethics, and philosophy of education, allowing reconstruction of the semantic horizons of concepts such as «digital humanism», «educational transformation», «algorithmic subjectivity» and «axiological paradigm». Here, it is particularly important to reveal not only explicit but also implicit value foundations that determine the trajectories of educational changes in the digital era [5, 3].

Additionally, the method of critical interpretation of scientific publications is applied, which articulates both opportunities and risks of education digitalization. Special attention is paid to works analyzing the humanitarian consequences of learning technologization, the significance of pedagogical content, and criticism of digital solutionism [6, 43]. Such emphasis allows not only to describe the phenomenon but to uncover contradictions between technological development and humanistic values.

The methodological apparatus of the research relies on post-non-classical philosophy of education, particularly on the concept of subject-oriented educational ecosystems, where digital humanism acts not as an external addition but as an internal principle of

educational space organization [7, 37]. This enables viewing digitalization not only as a technological shift but also as a challenge for rethinking the very structure of pedagogical interaction, emphasizing the necessity of maintaining learners' subjectivity, autonomy, and dignity [8, 85].

An important element of the methodology is also the analysis of contemporary empirical and theoretical research demonstrating that digital solutions - without pedagogical and humanitarian content - do not lead to genuine education humanization but, conversely, may enhance subject alienation and instrumentalization [9, 54]. Thus, priority is given to works where digital humanism is conceived not simply as ethical supervision but as a deep axiological framework for evaluating and directing educational transformations.

Overall, the synthesis of hermeneutical, critical-reflexive, and subject-oriented analysis allows not only to restore the complex structure of humanistic values in the digital era but also to formulate methodological foundations for developing new principles of educational policy in AI conditions.

Results

The literature analysis, conducted from the perspective of the above-described methodology, revealed several key findings that define the specifics of digital humanism as an axiological paradigm of educational transformation in AI conditions. Here we encounter a series of semantic and value tensions that become defining for contemporary educational discourse.

First and foremost, a tendency has been identified towards institutionalizing digital humanism not so much as an external ethical superstructure but as an internal regulative of educational processes. Modern concepts emphasize that digital humanism should be integrated into the very architecture of digital platforms, forming an ethical framework for decision-making and algorithm design, rather than serving as post-factum control or reaction to violations already committed [10, 305]. This approach fundamentally distinguishes «genuine digital humanism» from formal ethical declarations that often accompany educational digitalization.

Furthermore, the analysis showed that the key substantive element of digital humanism is ensuring learner subjectivity in conditions of algorithmic management, personalization, and automation of educational trajectories. Here, preserving space for critical reflection, autonomy, and value self-determination becomes particularly important - as a counterbalance to tendencies reducing educational experience to a set of manageable parameters [11, 124].

Another significant finding is the revelation of digitalization's ambivalence: on one hand, AI contributes to expanding educational opportunities, inclusivity, and individualization; on the other hand, it increases risks of algorithmic bias and possible shift of emphasis from axiological foundations to technological regulations [12, 63]. This duality requires constant dialogue between technological efficiency and humanistic significance, which is clearly

articulated in critical works on digital solutionism and education technologization.

It is particularly worth noting that the analysis results show: without integrating humanistic values - dignity, responsibility, dialogue, empathy - any digital solutions in education acquire the character of instrumental control rather than personality development. Such reduction not only fails to solve the problem of humanization but, conversely, may enhance alienation and formalization of the educational process.

Finally, in light of the examined theories and empirical research, it becomes evident that digital humanism can function as an axiological «compass» allowing educational systems to maintain balance between innovation and fundamental values. This approach not only prevents the emergence of new forms of digital inequality but also promotes the formation of educational ecosystems oriented towards developing subjectivity, critical thinking, and social responsibility.

Thus, the conducted analysis allows us to conclude that digital humanism is not an abstract ethical framework but a real vector of educational transformation, opening new horizons for rethinking the very essence of pedagogical activity in the era of artificial intelligence.

Discussion

Examining digital humanism as an axiological paradigm of educational transformation in artificial intelligence conditions inevitably leads us to comprehend the irremovable tensions that define the dynamics of modern educational space. Here, it is methodologically justified to turn to hermeneutic optics, allowing us not merely to record the phenomenology of changes but to reveal underlying value and meaning shifts occurring at the foundational level of pedagogical activity.

First and foremost, attention should be focused on the fundamental contradiction between technological acceleration and the necessity of preserving humanistic subjectivity. In conditions where AI acts not so much as a tool but as a new actor in the educational process, there is a risk of reducing the subject to an object of algorithmic control - which, in turn, threatens the loss of capacity for reflection and critical thinking. This challenge manifests particularly acutely through the lens of digital solutionism, which substitutes pedagogical content with technological efficiency, and humanistic mission with automated process management. Here we observe not only functional but also axiological displacement: priority is given not to personality development but to procedure optimization and increased data processing volume.

However, through hermeneutic analysis, it becomes evident: digital humanism cannot be reduced to a set of external ethical instructions accompanying education digitalization post-factum. On the contrary, it must be integrated into educational ecosystem design at the architectural level - that is, ethics and humanistic values are included in all stages of digital platform creation and operation, rather than acting as a reaction to already identified problems. This idea of radical integration of the value dimension into the very fabric of educational technologies opens new horizons for forming genuinely subject-

oriented educational spaces.

Nevertheless, another dilemma emerges here - the dilemma between technological solution universalism and cultural-historical specificity of values. In globalization conditions, where digital platforms replicate standardized learning algorithms, there is a threat of leveling cultural differences, disappearing unique educational traditions, and local forms of subjectivity. This tension between global and local, between universalism and particularity, requires special sensitivity and readiness for constant dialogue - otherwise, risks of digital inequality and alienation only intensify.

It is particularly important to note that the discussion results in identifying the necessity of integrating expert and algorithmic knowledge quality assessment. In a situation where traditional procedures of empirical verification and transparency prove insufficient for evaluating AI-generated results, the task of developing new, hybrid methodologies combining algorithmic precision with human reflection and critical analysis comes to the fore. Here hermeneutics again demonstrates its productivity: it allows viewing educational reality not as a closed system but as a space of open meaning, subject to constant revision in light of new ethical and technological challenges.

Accordingly, discussing digital humanism as an axiological paradigm cannot be reduced to a simple choice between technology and humanity. It's about finding balance, creating educational ecosystems where technological rationality doesn't substitute but supports the development of subjectivity, dignity, and capacity for critical self-determination. Particular importance here is attached to forming digital and ethical competencies in students and teachers - not just as a set of instrumental skills but as a foundation for conscious and responsible navigation in the complex digital world.

Thus, in conditions of educational transformation under AI influence, digital humanism appears not as a static value system but as a dynamic axiological framework capable of flexibly responding to new challenges and integrating them into educational practice. This is a space of open dialogue where each subject - whether human or algorithm - is called to participate in jointly designing the future of education while maintaining dignity, autonomy, and critical sensitivity to the changing world.

It is in this tense but productive field that a new educational reality is born - like a dawn that slowly but inevitably disperses the shadows of former meanings, opening the possibility for truly humanistic renewal of the very nature of education.

Conclusion

In light of the undertaken analysis, it becomes evident: digital humanism today acts not so much as a utopian ideal or set of declarations, but as a necessary axiological vector along which the trajectory of educational transformations in the era of artificial intelligence is built. Here it is important to emphasize that we are dealing with a paradigm capable of simultaneously maintaining the complexities of technological development while not allowing them to overshadow central categories - dignity, subjectivity, capacity for critical

thinking, and responsibility towards the future.

It is particularly significant that, considering the ambivalence of digitalization itself - its potential and risks, its ability to both expand educational opportunities and deepen inequality - digital humanism creates a space for constant dialogue between technological rationality and humanistic significance. Such dialogue is impossible without methodological openness, readiness for critical reflection, and rejection of the temptation to reduce education to a manageable knowledge factory where data substitutes subjectivity, and optimization replaces internal development.

In this context, as contemporary research shows, genuine education humanization requires not so much post-factum ethical correction of digital solutions as their design with integrated value «optics» at all stages - from platform architecture to pedagogical practices. Only in such a paradigm is it possible to form educational ecosystems capable not just of reproducing knowledge, but of supporting the formation of an autonomous, reflective, and responsible personality - a personality ready for life in a complex, constantly changing digital world.

Thus, digital humanism appears not as an external limitation or ethical «supervision», but as an internal semantic compass, allowing educational systems to maintain their human face amid the storms of the algorithmic era. This constitutes its true axiological power - the ability to be not a dogma, but an open horizon, where each new step of educational transformation becomes not only a technological but also an existential choice.

Like dawn breaking through the misty haze of algorithms, digital humanism outlines the contours of future education - education where technology serves humans, rather than humans becoming appendages to technology.

References

1. Шуталева А.В., Керимов А. А., Циплакова Ю. В. Гуманизация образования в цифровую эпоху // ПНиО. 2019. №6 (42). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/gumanizatsiya-obrazovaniya-v-tsifrovuyu-epohu>(дата обращения: 2.04.2025).
2. Werthner, H. (2024). Digital Transformation, Digital Humanism: What Needs to Be Done. In: Werthner, H., et al. Introduction to Digital Humanism. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45304-5_8
3. Chanda, Thelma & Sain, Zohaib & Yusuf, Rd & Shogbesan, Olayinka & Vinandi, Th & Wisdom, Th & Akpan, Wisdom. (2024). Ethical Implications of AI and Machine Learning in Education: A Systematic Analysis. 3. 1-13. 10.15408/ijit.vxix.xxxx.
4. Nida-Rümelin, J., Staudacher, K. (2024). Philosophical Foundations of Digital Humanism. In: Werthner, H., et al. Introduction to Digital Humanism. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45304-5_2
5. Erich Prem, Principles of digital humanism: A critical post-humanist view, Journal of Responsible Technology, Volume 17, 2024, 100075, ISSN 2666-6596, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2024.100075>.

6. И. В. Семушин, Гуманитарные аспекты и цифровой солюционизм в сфере образования, Ученые записки УлГУ. Серия «Математика и информационные технологии», 2021, выпуск 2, 43–62
7. Первичко Е. И., Зинченко, Ю.П. (2012). Постнеклассическая методология в клинической психологии: научная школа Л.С. Выготского – А.Р. Лурия. Вестник Московского университета. Серия 14. Психология, (2), 32-45.
8. Балугева В.Д., Махрина Е.А. Цифровизация и её влияние на образовательное пространство в контексте формирования ключевых компетенций // Universum: психология и образование: электрон. научн. журн. 2021. 7(85). URL: <https://7universum.com/ru/psy/archive/item/12045> (дата обращения: 5.05.2025).
9. Валеева Г. В. ЭТИЧЕСКИЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЦИФРОВИЗАЦИИ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ (АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ОБЗОР СОВРЕМЕННЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ) // Гуманитарные ведомости ТГПУ им. Л. Н. Толстого. 2021. №2 (38). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/eticheskie-problemy-tsifrovizatsii-vysshego-obrazovaniya-analiticheskiy-obzor-sovremennyh-issledovaniy> (дата обращения: 18.04.2025).
10. Ма Чаншань, Гун Нань Формирование идентичности и защита прав цифрового гражданина в цифровом обществе // Вестник СПбГУ. Серия 14. Право. 2024. №2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/formirovanie-identichnosti-i-zaschita-prav-tsifrovogo-grazhdanina-v-tsifrovom-obschestve> (дата обращения: 12.04.2025).
11. Жиркова, З. С. Управление качеством образования [Электронный ресурс]. Учебное пособие для магистрантов высш. учеб. заведений / З. С. Жиркова. – Электрон. текстовые дан. (1,8 Мб). –СПб.: Научное издание, 2022.–137с.
12. Давыдова Г.И., Шлыкова Н.В. Риски и вызовы при внедрении искусственного интеллекта в систему высшего образования [Электронный ресурс]//Вестник практической психологии образования. 2024.Том 21. № 3.С. 62–69. DOI:10.17759/bppre.2024210308