



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, DIGITAL SOCIAL NORMS, AND CREATIVE SUBJECTS IN EDUCATION

(Research Article)

Nguyen Anh Quoc^a 1,

^a University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Received: 02/3/2026

Revised version received: 21.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Abstract

In the digital environment, artificial intelligence and new social norms increasingly shape human cognition, behavior, creative capacity, and responsibility. This study examines the relationship among artificial intelligence, social norms, and creative subjects in digital culture. The research uses an interdisciplinary philosophical approach, combining conceptual analysis, academic literature synthesis, critical methods, and digital cultural approaches to clarify the relationship between technology, norms, and contemporary social life. The data were collected via academic works on social philosophy, artificial intelligence ethics, digital culture, and digital education. The steps of the methodology include conceptual analysis, document synthesis, theoretical comparison, and critique of technocratic mechanisms in digital life. The results of the study show that artificial intelligence both expands people's access to knowledge and information-processing capacity and poses the risk of standardizing cognition, impairing the ability to reflect, and increasing dependence on algorithmic systems. Social norms in the digital environment can support the stability of community life, but they can also become mechanisms of control that reduce individuals' subjectivity and creativity.

Keywords: AI, digital social norms, creative entities, AI ethics, algorithm governance, and education

© 2021 IJETS. Published by *International Journal of Education Technology and Science (IJETS)*. Copyright for this article is granted to the Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In the context of global digital transformation and the rapid development of artificial intelligence, many traditional social structures are undergoing profound transformations. Governance, education, economics, and legal systems increasingly rely on data, algorithms, and

¹Corresponding author: Nguyen Anh Quoc. ORCID ID.: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6387-2653>

E-mail: nguyenanhquoc@hcmussh.edu.vn

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22211080>

quantitative standards to regulate human behavior (Aljehani et al., 2026). These advances expand information processing capacity and improve the efficiency of social organization, but at the same time raise fundamental questions about the place of human beings in increasingly complex technocratic systems. As decision-making processes are automated and standardized, the risk of reducing humans to data units or purely economic agents becomes more pronounced (Ferrara, 2024). In this context, the relationship between social norms, individual creative freedom, and moral responsibility is becoming a central issue of contemporary social philosophy. Norms help maintain order and coordinate action in communities, but when they become rigid or commercialized, they can undermine human creativity and subjectivity (Ergunova et al., 2026). The expansion of artificial intelligence in labor, management, and daily life also raises the question of whether humans will master technology or become dependent on the technical systems they themselves create. In the face of these challenges, it is especially necessary to reconsider the role of creativity, responsibility, and freedom in social life. As digital transformation advances, artificial intelligence increasingly shapes education, communication, creative labor, and social life (Nhung & Quoc, 2025). Digital platforms and algorithmic systems not only change the way we approach knowledge but also directly affect how people form norms, perceptions, and social identities in the digital environment (Hasanein & Al-Romeedy, 2026). This underscores the need to study the relationship between artificial intelligence and social norms.

2. Review of Literature

In recent decades, the relationship among technology, social norms, and people's place within technical systems has become a central theme in contemporary philosophy and the interconnected social sciences: AI ethics, digital culture, standard theory, creative subjects, and the current educational context. In AI ethics, the development of artificial intelligence systems can fundamentally alter power structures and decision-making in modern society, posing profound challenges to human freedom and responsibility (Bostrom, 2014). In the classical sociological tradition, social norms and the division of labor have been analyzed as fundamental factors in the formation of social order and community cohesion (Durkheim, 2014).

Studies of power and social institutions show that modern organizations often use control mechanisms that monitor, classify, and standardize human behavior (Foucault, 1977). From a communication theory perspective, many works emphasize that the rationality of social life depends not only on the effectiveness of tools but also on people's ability to participate in dialogue and reach consensus in social action (Habermas, 1987). Several other studies have analyzed the transformation of the boundary between humans and technology, particularly amid the emergence of hybrid systems at the interface of biology and technology in modern life (Haraway, 1991).

Works in the critical philosophical tradition have also shown that rationalization in industrial and post-industrial societies can lead to the dominance of instrumental reason, gradually dissolving human beings within technical and economic systems (Horkheimer & Adorno, 2002). Some analyses of advanced industrial societies show that modern systems of production and consumption tend to assimilate individuals into standardized structures, thereby weakening human capacity for reflection and creativity (Marcuse, 1964). In the context of globalization and the development of digital technology, many recent studies have highlighted

that artificial intelligence and algorithmic systems are increasingly deeply involved in areas such as labor, governance, and social media (Floridi et al., 2018).

Studies on technological ethics also show that the design and use of AI systems need to be placed within a normative framework to ensure values such as accountability, transparency, and human dignity (Coeckelbergh, 2020). In addition, interdisciplinary studies on the data society highlight that the proliferation of data measurement and analysis systems can reduce humans to information objects within technical governance networks (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). In general, current research has provided many important perspectives on the relationship among social norms, technology, and the place of human beings in modern society. However, it is still necessary to analyze the role of individual creativity and labor freedom as the foundation of social life in the context of artificial intelligence, and further research.

Although current research has provided many important perspectives on the relationship among technology, social norms, and the place of humans in modern society, notable theoretical gaps remain to be identified with greater caution. First, most research on artificial intelligence focuses on technical issues, data governance, labor efficiency, or technological ethics. In contrast, the role of creative actors in the digital cultural environment has not been fully analyzed (Aljehani et al., 2026; Ferrara, 2024; Gama & Magistretti, 2025). Humans are often approached as users of technology or as objects affected by algorithms rather than as subjects capable of reflecting on and restructuring social norms through creative activity. Second, many studies on social norms still lean towards a functional approach, emphasizing the role of maintaining social order and stability, but have not clarified the possibility that norms can be transformed into control mechanisms that reduce subjectivity and creative freedom in the digital environment. Some studies on social norms emphasize the role of maintaining order and stability in communities but have not adequately clarified how digital norms can serve as control mechanisms, thereby diminishing subjectivity and creative freedom (Chien et al., 2025). Third, the current educational context, research on digital education and artificial intelligence has mainly focused on technological transformation and digital competencies. In contrast, the relationship among AI, personal creativity, and comprehensive human education has not been systematically studied, as have policy documents related to digital transformation. On that basis, the article identifies its contribution in connecting three dimensions: artificial intelligence, digital social norms, and creative subjects, in order to clarify the implications for the development of humans in the current educational context (Ergunova et al., 2026; Hasanein & Al-Romeedy, 2026; Nhung & Quoc, 2025).

From those gaps, the paper develops a theoretical framework that combines critical social philosophy, creative subject theory, and the study of digital culture. This theoretical framework approaches people as subjects who are both affected by normative structures and capable of reflecting on and creatively restructuring those norms. In this framework, social norms are understood as the system of rules, values and expectations that regulate human behavior in the community; the creative subject is an individual who can reflect, choose, create new values and restructure norms; digital culture is a social environment organized through data, platforms, algorithms, and online interactions; AI is approached not only as a technical tool but also as a power and cognitive structure capable of classifying, forecasting, suggesting, and regulating behavior. On that basis, the study examines how AI and digital social norms impact human subjectivity, creative freedom, and social responsibility in education and modern life. On that

basis, the study examines humans' ability to maintain subjectivity, creative freedom, and social responsibility amid AI's increasingly pervasive influence on education and modern social life.

Table 1. Concept, analytical function and relation to research issues

Concept	Analytical Function	Relation to research issues
Digital Social Norms	Regulate, standardize, and control behavior	Create order, but it can limit creativity
Creative Subjects	Reflection, Choice, Value Creation	Maintaining freedom and accountability in the digital environment
Digital Culture	Data space, platform, and algorithmic interaction	Stipulating conditions for forming perceptions and identities
AI as power structures and perceptions	Categorize, forecast, suggest, automate decisions	Clarifying the risk of algorithm dependence and subjectivity decline

3. Method

3.1. Research design

This study employs an interdisciplinary philosophical research approach to analyze the relationships among human life, social norms, personal creativity, and the development of artificial intelligence in modern life. At the same time, the study takes an interdisciplinary approach, connecting philosophical analysis with practical issues in contemporary society, especially the development of artificial intelligence, big data, and digital technology systems. The combination of critical social philosophy, normative sociology, and technological research helps the paper analyze how humans can maintain their role as creative subjects in a world increasingly shaped by data, algorithms, and technical norms (Floridi et al., 2018; Foucault, 1977; Habermas, 1987).

3.2. Sampling

The selected sources include academic works on AI ethics, digital culture, normative theory, and educational technology, as well as policy documents related to digital transformation and the current educational context. The search strategy focuses on term groups: artificial intelligence, digital social norms, AI ethics, algorithm governance, critical thinking, and comprehensive human development education. The criteria include direct relevance to the research problem, theoretical value, academic credibility, and the ability to clarify the current educational context. The analytical steps include conceptual analysis, document synthesis, theoretical comparison, and critical interpretation. The principle of explanation places people in reality, with specific bodies, needs, creative capacities, and social relations, as the starting point. The method's limitation is that no experimental survey has been conducted, so the conclusions are purely theoretical and oriented toward analysis.

3.3. Data analysis

First, the study uses philosophical analysis to clarify central concepts such as human life, social norms, creativity, responsibility, and freedom. Conceptual analysis helps to identify the content, limitations, and relationships between these concepts in the context of contemporary social life. Through an analysis of conceptual structures, the article clarifies how social norms are formed, how they affect human behavior, and how they can become forces that drive or limit an individual's creativity. At the same time, it employs the synthesis and interpretation of academic documents across social philosophy, ethics, jurisprudence, and artificial intelligence. The synthesis of previous studies helps identify existing approaches to the relationship among social norms, ethical responsibility, and technological development. The paper identifies a research gap in the analysis of the roles of individual creativity and labor freedom in the context of technical systems and artificial intelligence that are increasingly influencing social life.

Second, the study applies a critical approach to assess the limits of social norms as they become rigid or commercialized. The critical approach to assessing the limits of social norms as they become rigid, commercialized, or integrated into algorithmic governance mechanisms. This approach allows the examination of the normative process to shift from regulating social life to controlling behavior, classifying subjects, and orienting human choices. On this basis, the study clarifies the conditions under which social norms can hinder the development of creativity, personal responsibility, and reflective capacity. At the same time, the article takes an interdisciplinary approach, connecting philosophical analysis with practical issues in contemporary society, especially the development of artificial intelligence, big data, and digital technology systems. The combination of critical social philosophy, normative sociology, and technological research helps the paper analyze how humans can maintain their role as creative subjects in a world increasingly shaped by data, algorithms, and technical norms (Floridi et al., 2018; Foucault, 1977; Habermas, 1987).

Third, the study situates theoretical analyses within digital transformation and the current educational context. The study establishes the current educational context by comparing several specific educational policy documents and practices. Based on an analysis of these policies and practices, the article clarifies the challenges to protecting human subjectivity, reflective capacity, and creativity in contemporary digital society.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Human life and the normative foundation of social life

Human life is the fundamental goal of all social developments. Every institution, every organizational system, and every social norm must ultimately return to the fundamental question: do they serve the survival, development, and dignity of the human person? In the context of artificial intelligence and digital culture, this question becomes more urgent because data, algorithms, and quantitative standards directly classify, evaluate, and direct human behavior in education, labor, and communication. Sustainable community development is associated with the ability to "fostering creativity and innovativeness" (Asif & Shahbaz, 2025, p. 11), but creativity is only human when people are not reduced to data profiles,

competency scores, or objects passively adapted to the technical system. Ontologically, we should approach human beings as subjects with bodies, needs, capacities for reflection, social relations, and the ability to create value. Social life cannot function without general principles, as the community always needs "The Code of Ethics and Principles of Professionalism" (Yasmin et al., 2024, p. 290) to maintain social order and responsibility. In terms of social ontology, in the current educational context, the issue is not only applying AI to improve the effectiveness of teaching, management, and assessment, but also protecting learners' ability to think independently, academic responsibility, and creative freedom. Digital social norms should support human development, not control it or degrade subjectivity in algorithmic environments.

Gender differences are therefore not only biological but also tied to social structure and the division of labor. As societies develop, these relationships are increasingly organized within an "innovation ecosystem" (Shavkatov et al., 2024, p. 15) that enables individuals to coordinate their capacities and cultivate new forms of creativity. The birth of a new human being is not only a continuation of biological processes but also the beginning of a mutual educational process between generations. In the modern context, education and social institutions need to "encourage personal growth, and improving decision-making processes" (Eidenmüller et al., 2025, p. 68) to enhance human capacity. Life has always been associated with energy exchange and interaction with the natural environment. When basic biological needs are met, humans begin to develop higher needs, such as cognitive, emotional, and creative needs. In the knowledge economy, "innovation is essential to the expansion of the economy in the modern world" (Kiselakova et al., 2024, p. 307).

The relationship between man and nature is the fundamental condition of life. However, the highest form of human development lies in social interaction, where needs, capacities, responsibilities, and creativity are organized into specific forms of community. Social institutions can only function stably when they ensure "stability and trust" in human relations. Love, happiness, and joy are important values of human life. These values are tied to the goal of "A just and equitable transition exists" (Smith, 2025, p. 119) to ensure the community's sustainable development. In modern social relations, many norms are gradually commercialized and turned into interchangeable standards, like commodities. When market logic governs social relations, human values are easily reduced to productivity, price, status, or competitiveness—a necessary distinction between money as a means of competition and ethics as the goal of sustainability. Therefore, the problem in today's digital culture and education is to design social norms as a means of protecting people, rather than allowing norms, money, or algorithms to become an alternative measure of dignity, creativity, and responsibility.

An increase in social norms can lead to normative inflation. Benchmark inflation can be understood as a situation in which rules, evaluation criteria, and measurement indicators increase beyond the capacity of human life, making norms no longer a means of directing behavior but a control mechanism. When too many standards are established, they can become tools of control rather than creative aids. In the digital environment, this phenomenon is amplified by digital platforms, learning data, ranking algorithms, scoring systems, portfolios, and AI tools that track, classify, forecast, and evaluate people. This reflects social mobilization in the "globalized context, highlighting its continued evolution amid shifting socio-economic landscapes" (Prasopsombat, 2025, p. 9). Under such conditions, individuals are vulnerable to being turned into vehicles for organizational systems' benefit. In the current educational context,

many regulations emerge when educational innovation and digital transformation are reduced to requirements for targets, output standards, digital competencies, management data, and assessment performance, while learners' ability to reflect, create, and exercise academic responsibility is not adequately protected. Digital education policies need to be clearly designed and available, and to reinforce a positive culture and intrinsic motivation rather than relying solely on pressure or fear mechanisms (Badreddine et al., 2026).

4.2. Creativity, reflection, and the formation of interdisciplinary life

People exist through what they create, but creativity is not just about producing new objects, tools, or symbols. Humans exist through what they create, but creativity is not just about producing new objects, tools, or symbols. In the sense of social philosophy, creativity is the ability to transform experiences, knowledge, and needs into values that can be shared, verified, and further developed in community life. Reflection is the intrinsic condition of creativity, because through reflection, people can detach from their instinctive reactions, reconsider the purpose of their actions, assess the limits of their circumstances, and choose how to restructure their relationship with the world. The human world is therefore not only the natural world, but also the world of labor, language, knowledge, institutions, technology, and social products created by humans. The relationship between knowledge and social life has been described as a process "between knowledge production and politics" (Shchytsova & Korablyova, 2024, p. 15), that is, knowledge is always formed under specific conditions of power, values, and social organization. Interdisciplinary life is understood as a space in which philosophy, social sciences, education, technology, and data collaborate to address human problems, rather than treating them as separate fields. In the context of AI, human creativity does not disappear, but is transformed in terms of the conditions of implementation: AI can expand access to information, simulate ideas, support design, and accelerate knowledge processing, and can also standardize the way of thinking, impoverish the reflective experience, and create a dependence on algorithmic suggestions. Values of working life, such as knowledge of the meaning of work, communication, passion, and support, still play a role in driving creative action (Balková et al., 2022), but should be situated within the subject's capacity to master technology.

Each innovative product bears the imprint of a specific individual. From the tools of labor, language, and knowledge to forms of social organization, every human product is the result of creative activity. These products both help the individual maintain life and serve others. It is this process that forms an intersubjective life. In modern society, social behaviors are influenced by beliefs and attitudes, self-efficacy, and social norms (Herath et al., 2020), which guide people's actions in the community. Creativity is not only an auxiliary activity of human life but also a characteristic form of human existence. If social norms help maintain the general order, creativity helps expand new possibilities in life. Sustainable development initiatives are seen as factors that "influence policies and societal direction" (Carroll & Esposito Amideo, 2024, p. 1025), thereby shaping the community's development models.

Creativity always takes place in the tension between two factors: ability and need. Competence is the capacity, knowledge, skills, emotions, and experience that the subject can mobilize; needs are the demands of personal life, community, and the social environment. People are creative when their inner selves are reorganized to meet new needs, while creating value that goes beyond the repetition of habits. At the psychosocial level, action motivation can

be seen as a condition that motivates creativity, as motivational models help explain why individuals choose to participate, sustain efforts, and develop innovative behavior (Chen et al., 2020). When the ability and need to achieve compatibility are present, creativity becomes the driving force for innovation; when they are absent, the subject is prone to passive adaptation or dependence on existing norms. In the digital environment, this risk increases as digital platforms and AI provide response patterns, behavioral suggestions, and repeatable evaluation criteria. Social norms can thus shift toward expanding creative capacities, but they can also impoverish reflection if they encourage only compliance. The balance between ability and need drives innovation. As individuals develop their capacity to meet society's new needs, norms also change. If norms become self-serving agendas, they can become creatively limiting forces. Habitual feedback can create the problem of extrinsic value in online research; in the article's argument, this point should serve only as a methodological warning about evaluating behavior in the digital environment, not as direct evidence for the entire theory of social innovation. When social behavior is mechanically repeated, habitual responding may pose a greater external validity problem (Berinsky et al., 2012), weakening people's ability to adapt.

Because each individual is a creative subject, differences between individuals are normal in social life. These differences in experience, capacity, needs, methods of thinking, and forms of expression are not obstacles to education but a source of abundance, innovation, and development. In the digital environment, this distinction is even more significant, as AI tends to generate response patterns, standardize the approach to knowledge, and make it easier for learners to rely on algorithmic suggestions. Production can transform the physical world, but creativity has a deeper meaning because it transforms the way people understand themselves, understand others, and participate in common life. In that sense, creativity is a process of mutual education between subjects, in which each individual both receives knowledge, examines the limits of knowledge, and creates new value through dialogue, reflection, and practice. For education in the age of AI, the central task is not to make learners iterate faster than existing knowledge patterns, but to develop the ability to ask questions, evaluate information, use technology responsibly, and maintain creative freedom in the digital environment.

In conditions of survival competition, the differences between individuals become more pronounced. As the population grew and resources became limited, humans were forced to develop their abilities to adapt. In an international context, countries also seek to pursue their economic, political, and security interests in the region (Hudson, 2022) in order to maintain a position in the global system. Differences in knowledge and abilities lead to diversity in social life. Some people seek to satisfy their needs through instinctive reflexes, while others seek to create new values. In complex social systems, these processes of transformation often involve broader legal and normative structures. Societal constitutionalism has added to, and enormously enriched, this body of work by extending the scope of analysis to include the constitutional relations generated in the transnational private sphere (Anderson, 2013).

In the context of modern development, science and technology are advancing rapidly, and artificial intelligence expands humans' ability to process information. Technological advances cannot replace the creative capacity of individuals. Changes in social and legal systems are often tied to constitutional change, including who should lead it and work toward a desired future (Dixon, 2025). Even in such complex social structures, human creativity does not disappear. It has always existed as a potential that can break rigid frameworks. Normative systems are

described as structures not only as a closure, but also as an opening (Augsberg, 2018), thereby allowing society to restructure and innovate continually. Social life therefore depends on balancing two factors: norm stability and motivation for creativity. When society respects and nurtures creativity, people can explore new possibilities and shape their future.

4.3. Social norms, moral responsibility, and the crisis of modern life

Social norms are always present as frameworks that guide human behavior in the family, religion, state, and economic activity. Adults in that network learn to assume their roles, duties, and positions through education, communication, and life experience. Normative systems are complex structures of social life, where constitutional norms are not captured in one document or treaty but are embedded in different international, national, and transnational acts (Krajewska, 2015). Compliance with standards does not mean responsibility. An individual can live very well according to the rules but still be irresponsible if every behavior is merely a mechanical repetition of habit or order. Norms are seen as mechanisms that need to be placed in a specific social context, because the source of normative fragmentation lies not in the law but in its social context (Fischer-Lescano & Teubner, 2004).

Behaviors often seen as ethical violations should not be understood merely as violations of an existing rule. In terms of social philosophy, it is necessary to consider them in relation to the legitimacy of the institution, the quality of the norms, and the conditions under which the subjects practice responsibility. When tradition is frozen or power mechanisms lose their ability to justify themselves in front of human life, norms can shift from a means of regulating behavior to a mechanism of imposition and control. The development process of society is always open and uncertain, because progress towards democracy will always be tentative and insecure, and it relies on debate, discussion, and experimentation (Charlesworth, 2017). As society adopts more progressive norms, the responsibility for maintaining, examining, and developing those norms falls on individuals with the capacity for reflection and moral sense. The norm itself does not move on its own; It is through reflection and action that people make the norm the driving force of common life. In the context of globalization and digital societies, international institutions, although limited in their enforcement capacity, still affect people's lives through laws, standards, policies, and transnational governance mechanisms (Bogdandy et al., 2017).

Social life develops thanks to the constant interaction between norms and personal competencies. No one lives outside the norm, but no one is merely a passive product of it. Normative mobilization is described as the process of focusing on a variety of forms of legal and constitutional mobilization, and more specifically, by focusing on political and normative claims made by transnational movements (Blokker, 2018). One of the profound manifestations of the modern social crisis is the fact that money has become a universal measure of value. When the value of life is reduced to a monetary amount, people can gradually be reduced to commodities. Social systems are said to need a multi-level legal framework that respects conventional authority while adhering to overarching sustainability goals (Aldyan et al., 2025).

The conflict between ability and need then becomes an internal crack in personal life when people are not in a position to exercise their abilities or are forced to adapt to norms that are far from their actual needs. When social values no longer reflect human rights, dignity, and conditions for development, social life is prone to imbalance. In this context, social policies need to move towards a more targeted approach to raising awareness of human rights (Adu-

Gallant et al., 2024). In the context, the perception of rights is not only a legal issue but also a condition for the individual to understand his or her position in institutional relations, thereby potentially demanding accountability, fairness, and transparency. A more targeted approach is needed to improve social groups' understanding of rights and their rights-protection mechanisms, which lead many to express a great deal of skepticism over the reliability (Coppock, 2019) of social institutions.

The crisis of social life begins when manipulation and profiteering are no longer seen as morally wrong but gradually become survival strategies. In this context, forms of soft power can also be used as soft weapons that nations can rely on when facing threats (Gallarotti, 2022) in political and social life. To understand that crisis, it is necessary to return to the real person. People who live according to their abilities, work under suitable conditions, and are recognized for the true value of the products they create often have a more stable spiritual life. Social systems are recommended to ensure "the ability to utilize the environment and balance it with social and economic factors" (Dhiaulhaq AR & Heriyanto, 2024, p. 19) in order to maintain long-term stability.

It is in these crises that creativity emerges as a liberating possibility. When the norms have hardened, creativity is the ability to reopen life and create new values. The transformation of normative systems is understood as the process of "knotting and accommodating conflicting policies, values, and trajectories that developed in the pre-modern era (Watt, 2018). Social life, therefore, always moves in the tension between two factors: norms and creativity. Norms keep communities from falling apart; creativity prevents communities from freezing and degrading. Therefore, it is necessary to separate global questions of normative or constitutional validity from more situated (Thornhill, 2017) in order to build normative systems that are suitable for the diversity of modern society. Only when the norm is placed in its proper place as a means of life, and creativity is seen as the individual's responsibility to society, can people develop sustainably and maintain their dignity in modern life.

4.4. Freedom of Creativity, the Right to Real Life, and the Ability to Master Technology

Each individual has the right to live authentically and to exercise their own creative capacity. This right is not a gift given by the institution, nor is it a reward for those who have status, property, or privilege, but a fundamental condition of human existence. Man is only truly himself when he can turn life into a free act, that is, he can choose, take responsibility, and realize himself in relation to others. In the modern context, this right needs to be situated within specific human protection structures, especially when survival and bodily needs vary and are associated with the "distinct needs" (Camelia et al., 2025) of each subject in social life. In this sense, professional freedom is inseparable from the minimum conditions for material development, as many studies show that the stability of personal life is associated with the ability to achieve "financial independence" (Xu et al., 2024), which serves as a foundation for choice and self-determination.

In modern life, one of the greatest manifestations of alienation is identifying freedom with the ability to own, consume, or access technical means. In the age of AI, this concept has become even more one-sided, because having a digital tool does not mean cognitive autonomy, control over data, or the ability to make decisions independently of algorithmic suggestions. The right to a real life should be understood as a person's right to exist as a subject with a body, dignity,

a private life, the capacity for reflection, and the ability to make responsible choices in the digital environment. Freedom is not only the possession of the means, but also the right to be protected from discrimination, bodily infringement, damage to human dignity, and mechanisms of social exclusion. At this level, studies of vulnerable groups show that when bodily and health rights are violated, people are more likely to fall into physical and mental breakdown (Camelia et al., 2025). Therefore, a just society must not only protect the right to work but also expand institutional conditions so everyone can access technology, understand digital rights, and participate in legal and economic initiatives that ensure more equal development opportunities (Chodorowski et al., 2024). The responsibility of education in the age of AI is to shape critical competence, data ethics, a sense of privacy, and the ability to use technology as a means for human development.

Of course, freedom does not exist outside the circumstances. Each individual is limited by residence, education, health, working environment, social relations, and material constraints. However, circumstances are only the initial limit, not an immutable fate. A just society creates conditions for each person to move, choose, and transform their life according to their own capacity. At this depth, freedom must include the protection of the right to reproduce life, such as the requirement to "transitioning from traditional methods to a comprehensive system that maintains reproductive rights" (Pinter & Vogrin, 2025, p. 150) within modern institutions. History shows that freedom always lives in tension with norms. There can be no social life without norms, because norms keep human relations from falling into chaos. However, every standard faces a challenge: either to become a means of life or a seal of life. Forms of social organization need to be situated within a broader vision in which institutional transformations must move towards "a transnational democracy" (Holmes, 2014) as a structure distinct from the traditional closed-democracy model.

The difference between a dominated life and a free life lies not in the presence or absence of rules, but in the ability of man to make rules a means of creation. No one dares to question the stereotypes that dominate their time; no historical turning point has occurred. The norm is only really valuable when it retains its openness and self-transformation, rather than self-closing in its own power. Normative spaces cannot impose their own constitutional thinking (Duval, 2018) because they are only small pieces of social life and always depend on broader structures for survival. In a stratified society, norms often create an artificial scarcity of opportunities and resources. Some positions are elevated to symbols of success, while many forms of essential labor are overlooked. From there, a struggle arises among individuals forced to prove their worth by external norms. To counter this trend, social practices and policies aimed at "guaranteeing stability and trust" (Hameed et al., 2025) are needed in professional relations, education, and civics.

At this point, the issue of AI becomes particularly important. AI is expanding its capacity in information processing, language simulation, labor automation, and the restructuring of many areas, such as academic activities, including document search, text writing, lesson design, learning outcome evaluation, and personalizing learning progress. These capabilities create opportunities to improve educational effectiveness but also pose risks related to algorithmic bias, data privacy, transparency, and system accountability in data-driven educational decision-making. If AI is used only as a tool to support human creativity, it can free up time and increase productivity, and expand access to knowledge; this requires technology systems to be built on

the ability to "use the latest technologies" (Starke et al., 2025), but still puts people in the position of defining moral goals, standards, and limits. This requires technological systems to be built on the competency of "using the latest technologies" (Starke et al., 2025), while still placing people in the position of determining the final norm. The problem is not in the AI itself, but in the level of autonomy of learners, teachers, and educational institutions before the algorithm's suggestions are made. AI is built on data, models, and assumptions established by humans, so social biases, learning inequities, or data limitations can be embedded in the system as hidden structures. Learners who lack critical competence may accept AI-generated results as fact, while teachers can be pushed from educational subjects to technical output testers. In an academic setting, AI also highlights issues of copyright, plagiarism, academic integrity, and author accountability, especially as many tools are now used to offer information about artificial intelligence and copyright (Subagiyo & Wibisono, 2025). Education needs to develop AI capacity, data ethics, critical thinking, and teachers' guiding role to help learners use technology in a transparent, responsible, and creative way.

The future of humans does not depend on how strong AI is, but on whether humans still retain their creative nature. All behaviors can be automated, and many processes can be standardized, but humans cannot be completely replaced as responsible actors. The development of social restoration and governance practices is based on methods that "prioritize ecological restoration and the enhancement of biodiversity" (Saputra et al., 2025, p. 127), because human freedom is inseparable from the environment that sustains it. Freedom and creativity are not just parallel values but two sides of the same process of humanizing life. When freedom becomes the right to live authentically and creatively, labor serves people, and society can develop sustainably. In this context, protecting human dignity requires social systems to avoid reducing life to purely material interests and to recognize the distinction between "altruistic surrogacy and commercial surrogacy" (Heriyanto & Gasimzadeh, 2024, p. 17) as a clear boundary between human value and market logic. Freedom is not the negation of all frameworks but the ability to renew life from within, based on truth, responsibility, and human dignity. When institutions know how to respect individuals' creative rights, protect the body, protect living labor, and orient technology toward people, AI will no longer be a threat but a means of expanding human capacity. In this context, the social order needs to be built around structures that respect conventional authority while adhering to overarching sustainability goals, so freedom is not only a slogan but a real, lived condition for each individual.

In the current educational context practice, national digital transformation policies, AI development and application strategies, and digital transformation in education and training have laid the groundwork for integrating data, digital platforms, and smart technology into schools. The process itself poses a new risk: learners can be narrowed down to data profiles, competency scores, evaluation products, or algorithm-matched objects. Inclusive education in the age of AI must effectively connect technology with data ethics, critical thinking, academic integrity, privacy, and creative freedom, so that learners can not only use AI but also understand, test, and master its social limits.

In many cases, artificial intelligence helps expand access to knowledge and reduce the information gap between social groups. Students can access global learning resources more quickly, teachers can create more flexible lessons, and educational institutions can optimize training management. The problem is not in the technology itself, but in how people use it within

a value system. If education aims only to speed up information processing while neglecting independent thinking, people may gradually lose their ability to criticize and create. One of the great dangers of digital society is the homogenization of knowledge through data. In that environment, many learners tend to accept AI-generated results as complete answers without reflecting on or verifying them.

The first significance of studying the relationship among AI, social norms, and creative subjects lies in the need to restructure educational goals. Education not only trains the workforce to serve the technology market but also aims to develop people who can master technology. In today's context, human value lies less in remembering information and more in creativity, problem-solving, and interdisciplinary thinking.

The second meaning concerns developing educational standards aligned with the digital society. In a traditional educational environment, norms are often established according to a linear model between teachers and learners. With the development of the Internet and AI, learners can now access a vast amount of information outside the classroom. That changes the power structure in education and places new demands on teachers. The role of teachers is no longer to impart knowledge, but increasingly to guide learners' thinking methods, their ability to evaluate information, and their critical ability. In this context, comprehensive education must help learners form the ability to recognize academic dialogues. The curriculum needs to supplement content on AI literacy, data ethics, privacy, copyright, academic integrity, and critical thinking. The assessment also needs to move from a memory test to an assessment of the reasoning process, the ability to explain how AI is used, the level of personal contribution, and the ability to solve problems. Teacher training must include the ability to use AI in lesson design, learning feedback, plagiarism checking, learner data protection, and handling misleading situations generated by algorithms.

The third meaning is protecting human creative freedom in a digital society. Digital platforms are now setting new standards through evaluation systems based on views, likes, and engagement metrics. When quantitative norms become a universal measure of value, people easily get caught up in competitive pressure, the pressure to perform, and the psychology of chasing validation. In such an environment, creativity is easily replaced by repeating models accepted by the masses. Education needs to foster an academic environment that encourages dialogue, debate, and independent thinking rather than merely reproducing existing knowledge. AI can help predict behavior and optimize many social activities, but it cannot fully replace human life experiences, emotions, and moral responsibilities.

5. Conclusions

The paper analyzed the relationship among social norms, creative subjects, and the development of artificial intelligence in modern society, focusing on implications for comprehensive human development in the current educational context. The research's initial contribution is a human-centered analytical framework that views AI not only as a technical tool but also as a cognitive and power structure that can shape behavior, knowledge, and social norms. From a social philosophy perspective, the article argues that norms should be understood as a means of organizing common life rather than an end in themselves. The study's practical significance is that it suggests developing digital education policies, AI training programs, and academic integrity rules; protecting learner data; and strengthening teachers' guiding role. A

limitation of the article is that it relies mainly on theoretical analysis and literature synthesis, which empirical surveys at specific educational institutions have not verified. Further research should expand to sociological surveys of learners, teachers, and AI use policies.

As artificial intelligence increasingly influences labor, management, and daily life, protecting human subjectivity and creative capacity has become especially important. AI can help humans expand their cognitive abilities and improve the effectiveness of social activities, but it cannot fully replace human reflection, moral responsibility, and creativity. In the current educational context, the transformations brought about by artificial intelligence and the digital society create an urgent need to innovate educational thinking to support comprehensive human development. Education cannot focus solely on technical competence or career adaptation; it must cultivate subjects capable of reflection, creativity, and social responsibility in the digital environment.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests and Ethics

The author declares no conflict of interest. Ethical approval was not required because in this study did not involve human participants or animal subjects.

AI Use Statement

The authors utilized the ChatGPT-4o to check the grammatical errors or mistakes, and to improve the linguistic features during the drafting stage of the manuscript.

References

- Adu-Gallant, C., Toelen, J., Sluiter-Post, J., De Coninck, D., & de Winter, P. (2024). Knowledge gaps and bridges: The relationship between the awareness of general patient rights and the awareness of minors' patient rights in the Netherlands. *Children*, 11(1), Article 109. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children11010109>
- Aldyan, A., Aldyan, R. A., Putri, K. A., & Alasttal, A. (2025). Legal pluralism in environmental management: Evidence from Bali, Indonesia. *Journal of Law, Environmental and Justice*, 3(2), 229–267. <https://doi.org/10.62264/jlej.v3i2.131>
- Aljehani, S. B., Abdo, K. W. A., Hidayat-ur-Rehman, I., Badran, D. M. I., & Abdelhady, M. A. (2026). Digital transformation in SMEs: Governance performance mediated by AI-enabled analytics and process integration. *Systems*, 14(3), Article 324. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems14030324>
- Anderson, G. W. (2013). Societal constitutionalism, social movements, and constitutionalism from below. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 20(2), Article 11. <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol20/iss2/11>
- Asif, S., & Shahbaz, M. S. (2025). Project success through organizational climate and work behavior: Systematic literature review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Research*, 10(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.51847/cUhkp6DJ>

- Augsberg, I. (2018). Global law before the state? On canon law as a transnational regime. *Journal of Law and Society*, 45(S1), S270–S286. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12113>
- Badreddine, S., Al Ammari, H., Alwada'n, T., AlAzzam, A., Omari, A., Almogahed, A., Malkawi, G., & Mohammed, A. (2026). Predicting cybersecurity behaviors in higher education institutions: A data-driven analysis of policy, culture, and motivation in the UAE context. *Information*, 17(2), Article 152. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info17020152>
- Balková, M., Lejsková, P., & Ližbetinová, L. (2022). The values supporting the creativity of employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 805153. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.805153>
- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 351–368. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpr057>
- Blokker, P. (2018). Constitutional mobilization and contestation in the transnational sphere. *Journal of Law and Society*, 45(S1), S52–S72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12103>
- Bogdandy, A. V., Goldmann, M., & Venzke, I. (2017). From public international to international public law: Translating world public opinion into international public authority. *European Journal of International Law*, 28(1), 115–145. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chx002>
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Camelia, A. I., Narwati, E., & Ramadani, R. Y. (2025). Threat to successful integration and resettlement for female refugees: Exercising poor rights to health. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, 12(1), 19–42. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2025.012.01.02>
- Carroll, P., & Esposito Amideo, A. (2024). Gender equality: Opportunities and challenges for the OR community. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 75(6), 1011–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01605682.2024.2343343>
- Charlesworth, H. (2017). International legal encounters with democracy. *Global Policy*, 8(1), 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12488>
- Chen, R., Wang, L., Wang, B., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Motivational climate, need satisfaction, self-determined motivation, and physical activity of students in secondary school physical education in China. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), Article 1687. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09750-x>
- Chien, D. V., Minh, N. T., & Quoc, N. A. (2025). Individuals, work, and coercion: A philosophical critique of freedom, creativity, and property in a commodity economy. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(5), 1499–1507. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i5.7183>
- Chodorowski, M., Božilović, J., Adamski, J., Messyas, K., Reksć, M., Milošević, V., & Ilić, A. (2024). Lessons for the future climate migration: A study of relocation and development of new settlements in urban peripheries based on the spatial dispersion of displaced people in Serbia between 1991 and 2021. *Balkanica Posnaniensia. Acta et Studia*, 31, 331–362. <https://doi.org/10.14746/bp.2024.31.16>
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). *AI ethics*. MIT Press.
- Coppock, A. (2019). Generalizing from survey experiments conducted on Mechanical Turk: A replication approach. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 7(3), 613–628. <https://doi.org/10.1017/psrm.2018.10>

- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Dhiaulhaq AR, M. I., & Heriyanto, D. S. N. (2024). Striking a balance between job creation and sustainability: The need to establish a true environmental protection authority in Indonesia. *Jambe Law Journal*, 7(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.22437/home.v7i1.317>
- Dixon, R. (2025). Adjectival constitutionalism. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 73(2), 215–235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcl/avaf028>
- Durkheim, E. (2014). *The division of labor in society* (W. D. Halls, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1893)
- Duval, A. (2018). The Olympic Charter: A transnational constitution without a state? *Journal of Law and Society*, 45(S1), S245–S269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12112>
- Eidenmüller, T., Plavcan, P., Weber, M., Humpert, R. P., Beernink, L., Kampmann, I., & Ajiri, D. (2025). Professional self-reflection in the digital age: Technological tools for managerial development. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Research*, 10(3), 62–72. <https://doi.org/10.51847/8Nc9K5Uzeb>
- Ergunova, O., Mukhanova, G., & Somov, A. (2026). AI-supported student skills profiling: Integrating AI and EdTech into inclusive and adaptive learning. *Social Sciences*, 15(3), Article 209. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci15030209>
- Ferrara, E. (2024). Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies. *Sci*, 6(1), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sci6010003>
- Fischer-Lescano, A., & Teubner, G. (2004). Regime-collisions: The vain search for legal unity in the fragmentation of global law. *Michigan Journal of International Law*, 25(4), 999–1045. <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol25/iss4/12>
- Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Gallarotti, G. M. (2022). Esteem and influence: Soft power in international politics. *Journal of Political Power*, 15(3), 383–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2022.2135303>
- Gama, F., & Magistretti, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence in innovation management: A review of innovation capabilities and a taxonomy of AI applications. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 42(1), 76–111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12698>
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action: Volume 2. Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press.
- Hameed, M., Sutrisno, N., & Duffy, F. A. (2025). The Appellate Body crisis: Challenges and reforms to the World Trade Organization dispute settlement mechanism. *Prophetic Law Review*, 7(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.20885/PLR.vol7.iss1.art1>
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
- Hasanein, A. M., & Al-Romeedy, B. S. (2026). ChatGPT-assisted learning effectiveness and academic achievement: A mechanism-based model in higher education. *Information*, 17(3), Article 303. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info17030303>

- Herath, T. C., Herath, H. S., & D'Arcy, J. (2020). Organizational adoption of information security solutions: An integrative lens based on innovation adoption and the technology-organization-environment framework. *ACM SIGMIS Database*, 51(2), 12–35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400043.3400046>
- Heriyanto, D. S. N., & Gasimzadeh, U. (2024). A prophetic law approach to reconciling Indonesia's uneasy relationship with cross-border surrogacy. *Prophetic Law Review*, 6(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.20885/PLR.vol6.iss1.art1>
- Holmes, P. (2014). The politics of law and the laws of politics. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 21(2), 553–583. <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol21/iss2/6/>
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment: Philosophical fragments* (E. Jephcott, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1944)
- Hudson, V. (2022). The impact of Russian soft power in Kazakhstan: Creating an enabling environment for cooperation between Nur-Sultan and Moscow. *Journal of Political Power*, 15(3), 469–494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2022.2127280>
- Kiselakova, D., Sofrankova, B., Gombar, M., & Matijova, M. (2024). Modeling the impact of innovation performance on digital competitiveness: The key role of innovation and technologies. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 14(4), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.55493/5002.v14i4.5020>
- Krajewska, A. (2015). Bioethics and human rights in the constitutional formation of global health. *Laws*, 4(4), 771–802. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws4040771>
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Beacon Press.
- Nhung, L. T. T., & Quoc, N. A. (2025). Knowledge, freedom, and responsibility: A philosophical approach to education in the age of AI. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(8), 701–710. <https://doi.org/10.55214/2576-8484.v9i8.9398>
- Pinter, B., & Vogrin, V. (2025). Family planning: Legal regulations and practice in Slovenia. *Medicine, Law & Society*, 18(1), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.18690/mls.18.1.133-154.2025>
- Prasopsombat, L. (2025). Transnational heritage and local integration: Exploring the resilience of Teochew Chinese identity in Thailand. *Asian Journal of Arts and Culture*, 25(3), Article e281344. <https://doi.org/10.48048/ajac.2025.281344>
- Saputra, R., Hanum, W. N., & Gunawan, V. A. (2025). Post-mining land use regulations and practices in the United States of America: Lessons for Indonesia. *Journal of Law, Environmental and Justice*, 3(1), 104–133. <https://doi.org/10.62264/jlej.v3i1.118>
- Shavkatov, N., Raimjanova, M., Mamatov, B., Alikulov, M., Khoshimov, S., & Zokirova, F. (2024). Fostering collaborative innovation through public-private partnerships in Uzbekistan: Challenges and opportunities for future growth. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 210(7–8), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V210-02>
- Shchytsova, T., & Korablyova, V. (2024). Decolonizing knowledge production in Belarus and Ukraine. *Topos*, (2), 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.61095/815-0047-2024-2-5-17>
- Smith, A. F. (2025). An analysis of the colonialist roots of William Rees's case for human population decline. *Journal of World Philosophies*, 9(2). <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp/article/view/7031>

- Starke, S., Ludviga, I., & Fröhlich, J. (2025). Ability, motivation, and opportunity to participate in the digital change: A focus group study on new concepts for sustained learning in healthcare organizations. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(3), 61–74. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i3.5114>
- Subagiyo, D. T., & Wibisono, H. (2025). The urgency of regulating artificial intelligence from a joint-authorship perspective on copyright infringement. *Indonesia Private Law Review*, 5(2), 135–156. <https://doi.org/10.25041/iplr.v5i2.3962>
- Thornhill, C. (2017). The sociology of constitutions. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 13, 493–513. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110316-113518>
- Watt, H. M. (2018). When societal constitutionalism encounters private international law: Of pluralism, distribution, and 'chronotopes'. *Journal of Law and Society*, 45(S1), S185–S203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12109>
- Xu, N., Yu, Z., & Chen, L. (2024). News laundering, paywalls, quality reporting, and copyright law in digital China. *Galactica Media: Journal of Media Studies*, 6(4), 478–499. <https://doi.org/10.46539/gmd.v6i4.476>
- Yasmin, M., Haliah, Kusumawati, A., & Darmawati. (2024). The effect of brainstorming, auditor ethics, and whistleblowers on audit opinions of government financial reports: The moderating role of management support. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 14(4), 276–294. <https://doi.org/10.55493/5002.v14i4.5019>