

DIGITAL HUMANISM AS A SOCIOCULTURAL PARADIGM OF NATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15477932>

Olgerd A. Filippov

*Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophy,
Navoi Branch of "PROFI UNIVERSITY",
olgerdphilippow@gmail.com*

Abstract. *This article examines the concept of digital humanism as a sociocultural paradigm for the transformation of national higher education in the context of digitalization and artificial intelligence implementation. Digital humanism is considered as a value-oriented approach that enables the integration of technologies into educational systems while preserving fundamental humanistic principles: dignity, autonomy, critical thinking, and cultural identity. Special attention is paid to the role of digital humanism in overcoming the risks of alienation and algorithmic reduction, as well as in developing national educational strategies that harmonize global and local processes. The research demonstrates that digital humanism can serve as an axiological compass, guiding educational systems toward sustainable development and the formation of subjectivity in the era of global digital transformation.*

Keywords: *digital humanism, digitalization, humanistic values, artificial intelligence, educational ecosystems, national educational strategy, cultural identity.*

INTRODUCTION

In the context of rapid technological changes driven by digitalization and the implementation of artificial intelligence (AI), higher education is experiencing not merely an adaptation to new tools but a transformation of its basic sociocultural foundations. This process requires not only technological modernization but also a deep understanding of value orientations, without which the educational system risks losing its humanistic mission [1, 61]. In this context, the concept of digital humanism, which offers value-oriented approaches to integrating technologies into educational practices, becomes particularly relevant. Digital humanism is viewed not so much as a technical solution but as a paradigm aimed at preserving and developing the human dimension of education, ensuring a balance between technological modernization and cultural-value traditions [2, 38].

It is particularly important to emphasize that within national educational systems, where cultural specificity and historical tradition play a key role, digital humanism can serve not only as an ethical framework but also as a strategic foundation for transforming higher education. It enables the integration of technologies in such a way that they do not

destroy but rather strengthen the subjectivity, autonomy, and value self-determination of learners [3, 13].

The purpose of this article is to examine digital humanism as a sociocultural paradigm capable of transforming national higher education in the context of AI expansion. Specifically, the emphasis is placed on identifying key challenges and opportunities that digital humanism opens for preserving cultural identity and strengthening the humanistic foundations of the educational system. Primary attention is given to methodological approaches that allow for harmonizing technological innovations with the values of national education.

Methodology. The methodological foundation of this research is constructed considering the necessity of an interdisciplinary approach, which allows examining digital humanism as a complex phenomenon at the intersection of philosophy, pedagogy, and sociocultural analysis. This methodological framework creates an opportunity to reveal the axiological structure of digital humanism and its integration into national systems of higher education.

First and foremost, the research is based on the hermeneutical method, aimed at interpreting conceptual and theoretical texts related to digital humanism and the transformation of higher education. This approach enables uncovering deep value foundations, as well as identifying contradictions and tensions associated with the implementation of digital technologies in educational processes [4, 14].

Additionally, an axiological approach is applied, emphasizing the key values that digital humanism brings to educational practices. This methodological emphasis helps analyze how such categories as autonomy, dignity, and critical thinking can be integrated into the architecture of national education without violating its cultural identity [5, 62].

The research also draws on post-non-classical philosophy of education, which views the university as an ecosystem of subjective formation. This approach allows analyzing digital humanism not only as a theoretical concept but also as a practical paradigm capable of structuring educational processes in their cultural and historical context [6, 69].

Systemic analysis holds particular significance, enabling the examination of higher education as a complex system where digital humanism acts as an integrative factor. This method helps identify how national educational structures can be transformed in light of digital realities without losing their fundamental value foundations [7, 265].

Thus, the research methodology is based on a combination of hermeneutical, axiological, and systemic approaches, allowing for a comprehensive revelation of digital humanism's potential as a sociocultural paradigm for transforming national higher education.

Results. The analysis conducted using the aforementioned approaches revealed that digital humanism forms a key value foundation for the transformation of national higher education. The central finding is the understanding of digital humanism not as an external element of the educational system, but as an internal axiological framework guiding

digitalization processes [8, 116]. Its values—dignity, autonomy, responsibility, and critical thinking—become integral components in designing educational ecosystems, enabling the preservation of education's humanistic dimension even amid rapid technological changes.

Special attention in the study is given to the university's role as a space for personal development. In the context of digital transformation, where global standards and algorithms begin to dominate, digital humanism contributes to preserving the cultural specificity of national educational systems [9, 52]. It enables the integration of digital technologies in such a way that they do not destroy unique traditions but, conversely, strengthen historically established forms of pedagogical interaction. This makes possible the harmonious coexistence of global technological trends and local cultural characteristics.

An equally important finding is the reconceptualization of digital competencies, which cease to be perceived as a neutral set of technical skills [10, 71]. Within the framework of digital humanism, such competencies are viewed as means of developing critical thinking, ethical reflection, and conscious interaction with technologies. This approach transforms digital literacy into an instrument for developing subjectivity and cultural identity, which is particularly important in the context of national education.

Furthermore, the research demonstrated that digital humanism plays a significant role in overcoming alienation risks often arising in the digitalization process. Technologies, despite their functional orientation, can reduce the educational process to algorithmic management, where the learner is perceived merely as an object of influence [11, 443]. However, digital humanism opens the possibility for restoring educational interaction as a dialogue process based on respect, support, and personal development of learners. Thus, digitalization does not become a factor of alienation but, conversely, supports education's humanistic mission.

Finally, the analysis results indicate that digital humanism can become the foundation for forming national educational strategies. Its integration into the architecture of digital platforms and educational programs allows not only adapting higher education systems to digital challenges but also strengthening their cultural and humanistic foundations. This is especially important in the context of globalization, when the need arises to protect cultural identity and develop national educational systems based on their unique value orientations.

Thus, digital humanism acts not merely as a tool for adaptation to new conditions but as a key factor in educational transformation, ensuring the preservation of its humanistic dimension in an era of rapid digital changes.

Discussion. Examining digital humanism as a sociocultural paradigm for transforming national higher education, it should be emphasized that its significance extends far beyond technological modernization. It forms not only an ethical framework for digitalization but also sets deep axiological guidelines capable of directing the development of educational systems amid global changes. However, this raises a key tension: how exactly can universal

principles of digital humanism be combined with the local specificity of national educational traditions? This contradiction, as the research shows, is not an obstacle but rather serves as a productive foundation for reconsidering approaches to digital transformation.

Of particular interest is the question of universities' role in the digital age. The university, traditionally viewed as a space for forming subjectivity and critical thinking, faces risks of losing this mission in conditions where digital platforms begin to dominate educational processes. As Selwyn notes, there is a danger of universities transforming into "knowledge factories," where subjectivity is replaced by data, and the educational process is reduced to algorithmic management [12, 8]. In this context, digital humanism serves not merely as a barrier to such trends but offers an alternative vision where technologies should enhance rather than destroy subjectivity. This requires conceptualizing digital platforms as spaces not only for learning but also for cultivating autonomy and reflexivity in learners.

Another important aspect is the necessity of integrating humanistic values into the process of teaching digital competencies. If digital literacy remains purely instrumental, this increases the risk of alienation, as many researchers warn. Conversely, digital humanism proposes viewing digital competencies as a means of forming critically thinking and socially responsible individuals. This approach allows connecting technological literacy with cultural identity, which is especially important in national educational systems striving to maintain their uniqueness.

However, discussing digital humanism is impossible without analyzing its potential for equalizing educational inequalities. The implementation of AI and digital technologies often accompanies increasing gaps between regions, universities, and social groups, leading to differentiated access to quality education. Here, digital humanism can play the role of an axiological regulator, setting a strategy for fair resource distribution, overcoming the digital divide, and creating educational ecosystems accessible to all. This requires not only technical solutions but also a deep understanding of the sociocultural contexts in which national educational systems operate.

Finally, the discussion of digital humanism leads us to an important conclusion: its implementation requires not only strategic planning but also consistent rethinking of the roles of educators, students, and educational administrators. In the context of digitalization, the educator becomes not just a knowledge transmitter but a mediator between technology and personality, capable of supporting critical thinking and reflection. Students, in turn, should be perceived not as passive consumers of educational services but as active subjects participating in designing their educational trajectories. This, in turn, opens the way to forming educational ecosystems where digital technologies cease to be management tools, becoming means for developing and supporting human subjectivity.

Thus, digital humanism represents not only a philosophical concept but also a practical paradigm capable of transforming national higher education systems. Its key task

is to ensure harmonization between technological modernization and preservation of fundamental humanistic values, allowing digital humanism to be viewed as an axiological compass orienting educational systems toward sustainable development in the digital era.

Conclusion. Digital humanism, viewed as a sociocultural paradigm for transforming national higher education, represents not only a response to digitalization challenges but also a strategic guideline enabling educational systems to preserve their humanistic dimension. This research leads to the conclusion that digital humanism can become an axiological foundation for technology integration, aimed at maintaining such fundamental values as dignity, autonomy, responsibility, and critical thinking.

It is particularly significant that digital humanism allows overcoming the risks that accompany technological transformation: loss of subjectivity, increased educational inequality, and reduction of pedagogical interaction to technical optimization. In the context of national educational systems, where cultural specificity and historical identity play crucial roles, digital humanism offers a mechanism capable of linking global technological processes with local traditions, creating a foundation for sustainable educational development.

Furthermore, digital humanism forms a value-rich framework for reconceptualizing digital competencies, which cease to be exclusively technical skills and become instruments for conscious interaction with technologies. This opens a perspective for creating educational ecosystems where technologies serve not alienation but the enhancement of personal and cultural dimensions of education. Thus, digital humanism becomes a kind of semantic compass, guiding educational systems toward the formation of responsible and critically thinking citizens.

Finally, digital humanism offers a strategy for developing national educational policies that include not only technological modernization but also strengthening the humanistic foundations of education. It is in this synthesis of technology and values that lies the potential for creating a future where digitalization becomes not a factor of alienation but a means of developing subjectivity and cultural identity.

REFERENCES:

1. Разбеглова Т. П. ЦИФРОВИЗАЦИЯ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЙ СРЕДЫ И СУДЬБЫ ГУМАНИСТИЧЕСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ В XXI ВЕКЕ // Архонт. 2022. №6. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/tsifrovizatsiya-obrazovatelnoy-sredy-i-sudby-gumanisticheskoy-kultury-v-xxi-veke> (дата обращения: 7.03.2025).
2. Перевозчикова Л. С. Гуманистическая образовательная парадигма как аксиологическое основание современного высшего образования // НОМОТΗΤΙΚΑ: Философия. Социология. Право. 2008. №14 (54). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/gumanisticheskaya-obrazovatel'naya-paradigma-kak>

aksiologicheskoe-osnovanie-sovremennogo-vysshego-obrazovaniya (дата обращения: 11.03.2025).

3. Миронов Анатолий Васильевич Приоритетные принципы развития современного российского образования // Социально-гуманитарные знания. 2010. №6. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/prioritetnye-printsipy-razvitiya-sovremennogo-rossiyskogo-obrazovaniya> (дата обращения: 11.03.2025).

4. Сулима Игорь Иванович Герменевтика и гуманизм: социально-онтологический аспект // Вестник ННГУ. 2012. №1-3. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/germenevtika-i-gumanizm-sotsialno-ontologicheskii-aspekt> (дата обращения: 15.03.2025).

5. Медведева Светлана Александровна Реализация аксиологического подхода в системе высшего образования // Высшее образование сегодня. 2013. №11. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/realizatsiya-aksiologicheskogo-podhoda-v-sisteme-vysshego-obrazovaniya> (дата обращения: 15.03.2025).

6. Петрова Г.И. Философия университетского образования: модификация критериев классического университета в обществе знания: Учеб. пособие. – Томск: Изд-во Том. ун-та, 2013. – 172 с. ISBN 978-5-7511-218

7. Сизова, Ю. С. Гуманитаризация высшего образования как направление его гуманизации / Ю. С. Сизова. — Текст: непосредственный // Актуальные вопросы современной педагогики: материалы VIII Междунар. науч. конф. (г. Самара, март 2016 г.). — Самара: ООО "Издательство АСГАРД", 2016. — С. 261-266. — URL: <https://moluch.ru/conf/ped/archive/188/9803/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2025).

8. Ценностные ориентиры современного образования: от теории к практике. Материалы Республиканской научно-практической конференции (с международным участием) 8 февраля 2024 года / под общ. ред. доктора юридических наук, профессора В.В. Проценко. – Тирасполь: ИРОиПК, 2024. – 504 с. (iroipk.idknet.com)

9. Елькина, Е.Е. Цифровая культура в сетевом обществе: социально-философский анализ // Культура и технологии. 2018. Том 3. Вып. 3. С. 47-57. DOI: 10.17586/2587-800X-2018-3-3-47-57

10. Персидская, О.А. (2024). Культурно-историческая теория как методологическая рамка типологизации цифровой идентичности. Социальная психология и общество, 15(4), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.17759/sps.2024150405>

11. Баяева Людмила Владимировна ЦИФРОВОЙ ДИАЛОГ В ОБУЧЕНИИ: КОГНИТИВНЫЕ, СОЦИАЛЬНЫЕ, ЭКЗИСТЕНЦИАЛЬНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ И РИСКИ // Вестник РУДН. Серия: Философия. 2022. №2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/tsifrovoy-dialog-v-obuchenii-kognitivnye-sotsialnye-ekzistentsialnye-osobennosti-i-riski> (дата обращения: 20.03.2025).

12. Selwyn, N., Hillman, T., Bergviken-Rensfeldt, A. et al. Making Sense of the Digital Automation of Education. Postdigit Sci Educ 5, 1–14 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00362-9>