
RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Conceptual Analysis of Magnifica Humanitas from Immanuel Kant's Ethics: AI among Generation Z

Alice Erni Husein¹ and Elvia Husein²

¹ Universitas Putera Batam, Batam, Indonesia

² Birmingham City University, UK

Corresponding Author: Alice Erni Husein, **E-mail:** alice.husein@puterabatam.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionised numerous facets of human life, particularly for Generation Z, who have been raised in a predominantly digital milieu. Adolescents are progressively impacted by AI (AI) technology in the realms of knowledge construction, decision-making, and learning. Although AI presents several prospects for creativity, education, and productivity, it raises ethical concerns around autonomy, critical thinking, authenticity, responsibility, and human dignity. This conceptual paper examines ethical considerations regarding the employment of AI among Generation Z through Immanuel Kant's philosophical framework. It is recently being enhanced by the viewpoint of Magnifica Humanitas, which underscores the dignity, greatness, and flourishing of the human individual. This article deeply examines Kantian concepts like good will, autonomy, obligation, illumination, the categorical imperative, and the premise of humanity as a goal in itself, which accomplished through a philosophical-conceptual methodology. This study posits that AI is not merely a technological innovation; but rather a social force that impacts human behaviour and cognition. Kantians contend that ethical interaction with AI is not chiefly contingent upon technological progress, instead it hinges on humans' capacity to uphold rational autonomy and moral accountability in their dealings with intelligent systems. The essay contends that educational institutions possess a moral obligation to enhance Generation Z's knowledge of AI by instructing them to utilise AI deliberately and ethically, rather than dissuading their engagement. In addition, Magnifica Humanitas views AI must serve as an instrument for human advancement and should never replace morality, rationality, or human dignity. The research concludes that, in a progressively automated society maintaining humanity's status as the paramount moral being is crucial for the ethical implementation of AI.

KEYWORDS

AI, Generation Z, Immanuel Kant, Magnifica Humanitas, Human Dignity

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 13 September 2026

PUBLISHED: 13 October 2026

DOI: 10.32996/bjpsh.2026.6.2.2x

1. Introduction

The advent of AI has emerged as one of the most revolutionary advancements of the twenty-first century. Progress in machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, and generative AI has permitted machines to execute activities hitherto deemed limited to human intelligence (Russell & Norvig, 2021). AI technology are progressively incorporated into education, healthcare, governance, communication, commerce, and daily social interactions. Consequently, modern society is experiencing both technological evolution and significant alterations in the production, distribution, and use of information.

Generation Z holds a notably prominent place among the several social groups impacted by these events. Generation Z is typically characterised as individuals born between the mid-1990s to the early 2010s, marking the inaugural cohort to be raised wholly in a digitally interconnected environment (Twenge, 2017). In contrast to earlier generations that embraced digital technologies later in life, Generation Z has encountered the internet, smartphones, social media, and algorithmic systems as integral components of their everyday lives. Thus, AI is not simply a technological instrument for this generation but a fundamental element of its educational, social, and cultural milieu.

The extensive accessibility of generative AI systems, including huge language models, has amplified debates over the interplay between technology and human agency. Generation Z are progressively utilising AI to aid in writing projects, research endeavours, language acquisition, and problem-solving exercises. At the same time, AI-driven recommendation systems also

influence entertainment choices, social engagements, and information acquisition. Virtual assistants facilitate daily decision-making, whereas automated systems impact career prospects, educational trajectories, and public dialogue (Floridi & Cows, 2019). These advancements prompt significant enquiries regarding the ethical ramifications of AI on human autonomy, accountability, and cognitive growth. Proponents of AI highlight its capacity to democratise information access, tailor educational experiences, enhance productivity, and promote creativity (Holmes et al., 2022). AI can offer personalised educational assistance, diminish obstacles to information access, and aid learners in traversing more intricate bodies of knowledge. In educational settings, AI-driven systems can customise instructional resources to meet student requirements, deliver prompt feedback, and improve learning efficacy (UNESCO, 2023).

Nonetheless, substantial ethical considerations arise concurrently with these potential. Critics contend that over-reliance on AI may undermine critical thinking abilities, reduce intellectual autonomy, and promote cognitive outsourcing, leading individuals to depend excessively on machine-generated outputs instead of participating in introspective reasoning (Véliz, 2024). The growing dependence on algorithmic systems may obscure the differences between genuine comprehension and automated generation. Moreover, AI systems can replicate biases present in training data, disseminate misinformation, and establish novel kinds of technological dependency that undermine conventional concepts of human agency and accountability (Mittelstadt et al., 2016). These arguments indicate that technological innovation alone cannot ascertain the ethical acceptability of AI utilisation. Enquiries on the appropriate manner in which individuals might engage with intelligent technologies necessitate philosophical contemplation.

In this context, Immanuel Kant's ethical philosophy offers a pertinent framework for analysing modern technical dilemmas. Kant's moral philosophy, formulated in the eighteenth century, underscores rational autonomy, moral duty, and human dignity, providing significant insights for the assessment of developing technology (Kant, 2012). Kant's ethical theory is based on the belief that individuals have inherent value due to their capacity for rationality and autonomy, enabling them to determine their own moral conduct. Kantian ethics emphasises the intents and ideals that govern human activities, in contrast to consequentialist systems that assess actions mainly based on their effects (Wood, 2008). Moral activities are executed out of obligation and directed by principles that can be rationally universalised. Thus, technological advancements should be assessed not solely based on efficiency or value but also regarding their influence on human rationality and dignity. This Kantian issue is becoming very pertinent in dialogues on AI. The primary ethical concern is not just whether AI yields advantageous outcomes, but rather whether its use fosters or detracts from the essential circumstances for human autonomy. If AI pushes individuals to forgo critical reflection and relinquish decision-making to algorithmic systems, it may jeopardise the fundamental faculties that Kant deemed vital to human dignity. If AI functions as a tool that augments human comprehension while maintaining autonomous decision-making, it could positively impact human growth. Alongside Kantian ethics, modern discourse on technology increasingly highlights the necessity for a revitalised humanistic viewpoint that guarantees technical progress is directed towards human wellbeing.

The viewpoint of *Magnifica Humanitas* emphasises the magnificence and dignity of the human individual. Instead of perceiving technical advancement as an ultimate goal, *Magnifica Humanitas* asserts that all technological innovations must ultimately facilitate the cultivation of human excellence, ethical maturity, and significant social connections. The significance of *Magnifica Humanitas* is especially evident in current discussions on AI. As intelligent technologies advance in their ability to execute activities linked to human cognition, there exists a risk that efficiency and automation may overshadow fundamental human values. A humanistic framework emphasises that technology advancement must not lead to the marginalisation of individuals. Technology should remain secondary to the overarching objective of enhancing human welfare.

This paper aims to examine the ethical ramifications of AI use among Generation Z using the integrated viewpoints of Kantian ethics and *Magnifica Humanitas*. Having said that, the study specifically addresses three key questions. First, in what way may Kantian moral philosophy enhance the comprehension of ethical AI utilisation among Generation Z? Secondly, what obligations do educational institutions and instructors have in directing youth towards appropriate involvement with AI? Third, in what ways does the viewpoint of *Magnifica Humanitas* enhance modern discourse on human dignity in the era of AI? By addressing the above enquiry, this paper seeks to enhance scholarly discourse on AI ethics, digital citizenship, educational accountability, and humanity's future in a progressively technological landscape.

2. Literature review

2.1 AI and contemporary society

AI (AI) has transitioned from a niche domain of computer science to a transformational societal phenomena. Modern AI systems can analyse extensive data sets, identify patterns, provide content, and facilitate intricate decision-making processes (Russell & Norvig, 2021). The swift progression of machine learning and generative AI has considerably broadened the range of tasks that robots can execute. Academics frequently characterise AI as a general-purpose technology akin to electricity or the internet due to its capacity to concurrently revolutionise various sectors (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017).

AI applications currently impact education, healthcare, transportation, finance, entertainment, and public administration. As AI integrates into social institutions, its ethical ramifications transcend technological issues to include considerations of fairness, accountability, transparency, and human dignity. Floridi and Cows (2019) contend that AI ought to be perceived as a socio-

technical system rather than simply a compilation of computational instruments. This viewpoint highlights that AI technology are integrated inside social environments, hence influencing human relationships, institutional practices, and cultural values. Ethical assessment must thus encompass not only technical efficacy, but also wider societal implications. Mittelstadt et al. (2016) also cite many ethical issues linked to algorithmic systems, such as prejudice, opacity, accountability inadequacies, and risks to individual autonomy. These concerns underscore the necessity for ethical frameworks that can effectively handle the intricate relationships between technology and human agency.

2.2 Generation Z in the age of AI

Generation Z occupies a distinctive position within the ongoing digital transformation of contemporary society. Having been raised in an environment characterised by widespread internet access, social networking platforms, and mobile technologies, members of this generation have developed patterns of communication, learning, and identity construction that differ markedly from those of preceding generations (Twenge, 2017). Their everyday experiences are deeply intertwined with digital technologies, making technology an integral rather than peripheral aspect of their social and educational lives. This generation is frequently described as "digital natives" due to its early and continuous exposure to digital technologies (Prensky, 2001).

Nevertheless, contemporary scholarship cautions against equating technological familiarity with genuine digital competence. Proficiency in using digital tools does not automatically entail a critical understanding of their broader ethical, social, cultural, and political implications (Livingstone, 2014). Consequently, the ability to navigate digital environments effectively should not be conflated with the capacity to evaluate critically the assumptions, values, and power structures embedded within those environments. The emergence of generative AI has further transformed the experiences of Generation Z by creating both significant opportunities and substantial challenges.

On the positive side, AI technologies can enhance access to information, facilitate personalised learning experiences, and support various forms of creativity and innovation (Holmes et al., 2022). Nowadays, generation Z are able to obtain immediate assistance with complex academic tasks, engage with a wider range of perspectives, and develop new forms of digital literacy that are increasingly relevant in contemporary educational and professional contexts. At the same time, the growing reliance on AI has generated concerns regarding cognitive dependency, academic integrity, the spread of misinformation, and the potential decline of critical thinking abilities (UNESCO, 2023). Therefore, the capacity of AI systems to provide rapid responses to complex questions may reduce learners' motivation to engage in sustained reflection, analysis, and independent problem-solving. As a result, important questions arise concerning the extent to which AI influences intellectual development and whether increasing dependence on technological systems may undermine the cultivation of human autonomy and critical reasoning. These concerns highlight the need for a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between emerging technologies and the development of independent intellectual judgment.

3. Theoretical framework: Immanuel Kant's ethics

3.1 Kantian ethics and the foundation of moral philosophy

Immanuel Kant is considered one of the most significant moral philosophers in western intellectual history. His ethical theory, known as Deontological Ethics, it posits that morality is defined not chiefly by the outcomes of actions but by the principles and intentions that drive them (Kant, 2012). Kant contends that, in contrast to utilitarian perspectives that evaluate activities based on their consequences, moral value originates from acting out of obligation in alignment with rational moral law. Kant's moral philosophy is fundamentally based on the belief that human beings are rational agents capable of self-governance. Human beings, endowed with reason, may discern moral obligations and autonomously decide to act in accordance with them. This ability for rational self-determination is the foundation of human dignity and differentiates individuals from objects or tools (Wood, 2008).

Kantian ethics is pertinent to modern discourse on AI due to its focus on autonomy, accountability, and the respect for human dignity. As AI increasingly engages in tasks traditionally linked to human cognition, Kant's philosophy offers a framework for assessing whether technological advancements enhance or detract from the moral capacities that characterise humanity. From a Kantian viewpoint, technology is inherently ethically neutral. AI is neither intrinsically beneficial nor intrinsically detrimental. The ethical implications of AI are contingent upon the decisions made by humans about its design, utilisation, and regulation. Thus, the primary ethical inquiry is not the existence of AI, but rather whether its use enhances or undermines the rational autonomy and dignity of individuals.

3.2 Good will and the ethical use of AI

Kant begins the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* with the famous assertion that "nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification, except a good will" (Kant, 2012, p. 9). Intelligence, talent, creativity, power, and technological capability may all be valuable, but their value ultimately depends upon the moral intentions guiding their use. This principle has significant implications for understanding AI. Contemporary discussions often focus on the technical capabilities of AI systems, including their speed, efficiency, and accuracy. However, from a Kantian perspective, technological capability alone does not determine ethical value. An AI system may generate remarkable educational content, but if it is employed for deception, manipulation, or exploitation, its use lacks moral worth. For Generation Z, this distinction is particularly important. AI can be used to support genuine learning, stimulate curiosity, and

facilitate understanding. Alternatively, it can be used to bypass intellectual effort, generate fraudulent academic work, or manipulate public discourse. The ethical evaluation of AI therefore depends not only on technological outcomes but also on the intentions and purposes underlying its use. One that employs AI to explore different perspectives on a philosophical issue while engaging critically with the material demonstrates a morally responsible use of technology.

In contrast, submitting AI-generated assignments without reflection or acknowledgment may gain short-term academic benefits but fails to exercise intellectual honesty and responsibility. In Kantian terms, the moral difference lies not merely in the action itself but in the maxim that guides it (Kant, 2012). Consequently, the ethical challenge facing Generation Z is not whether to use AI but how to use it in ways that reflect good will, intellectual integrity, and moral responsibility.

3.3 Duty and moral responsibility in the digital age

A fundamental aspect of Kantian ethics is the notion of duty. Kant posits that morally commendable activities are those executed out of a sense of duty, rather than for the sake of favourable results or personal inclinations (Kant, 2012). This principle underscores the necessity of upholding ethical standards in modern digital contexts, despite technology technologies offering ease or personal gain. AI technologies frequently facilitate users in doing activities with more speed and efficiency. Kantian ethics asserts that convenience cannot supplant moral obligation, notwithstanding the potential advantages of efficiency.

Academic honesty serves as a definitive illustration. The accessibility of generative AI offers creation of essays, reports, and tasks with no exertion. Nonetheless, the capability of AI to execute these tasks does not absolve educational institution interms of responsibilities regarding honesty, authenticity, and intellectual growth. Students are accountable for ensuring that their work appropriately represents their comprehension and effort. Likewise, AI-generated material may occasionally seem credible despite harbouring mistakes or falsehoods. Consequently, users are obligated to authenticate information instead of trusting AI outputs without scrutiny. Moral responsibility cannot be assigned to algorithms, as robots are devoid of the ability for moral discernment. Individuals are responsible for the outcomes of actions guided by AI systems (Floridi & Cows, 2019).

This principle gains significance as AI systems advance in sophistication. As AI advances, the inclination to shift accountability from human agents to technology systems intensifies. Kantian ethics repudiates such delegations of duty, as moral accountability is intrinsically linked to rational agency. Only humans can be moral agents; hence, only humans can assume moral responsibility.

3.4 Autonomy as the foundation of human dignity

Kant's concept of autonomy is one of his most significant contributions. For Kant, autonomy does not signify unbounded liberty to act according to one's whims. Autonomy denotes the ability of rational agents to self-govern in accordance with principles one can rationally affirm as universal laws (Kant, 2012). Autonomy is essential in current discourse on AI as intelligent technologies progressively affect human decision-making. Recommendation systems ascertain the information individuals encounter online. Social media platforms influence communication and attention patterns. AI-driven systems impact consumer behaviour, educational prospects, and political participation. These advances elicit apprehensions about the maintenance of independent judgement. As humans increasingly depend on algorithmic advice without critical analysis, the implementation of autonomy may diminish. The concern lies not in AI's provision of knowledge, but in the potential reduction of possibilities for rational deliberation due to excessive reliance on AI. Generation Z confronts this dilemma more directly than earlier generations due to the pervasive integration of AI technologies in their educational and social experiences. Search engines, recommendation systems, and generative AI tools often facilitate access to information. Although these tools can augment learning, they may also promote passive information consumption in the absence of critical thought. From a Kantian viewpoint, the ethical utilisation of AI necessitates the preservation of independent judgement. AI ought to augment human cognition instead of supplanting it. AI-generated content, interrogate assumptions, juxtapose sources, and participate must be assessed with a reflective analysis. Such techniques maintain autonomy by guaranteeing that technology stays subordinate to human logic instead of supplanting it. In this regard, AI literacy is intrinsically linked to moral autonomy. The objective is not solely technical proficiency but the development of persons who can manage relationships with technology through rationality and ethical discernment.

Kant's essay, "An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment?" provides significant insights for comprehending AI in educational settings. Kant (1996) characterises enlightenment as humanity's transition from self-inflicted immaturity. It mentioned that immaturity arises when individuals permit others to think for them instead of utilising their own reasoning faculties. The renowned motto of enlightenment, *Sapere Aude* ("Dare to think"), urges persons to possess the audacity to employ their own comprehension. Despite Kant's writings occurring in the eighteenth century, this theory retains significant relevance in the era of AI. Primary risk linked to AI is the potential for individuals to become intellectually passive. When AI systems deliver prompt replies, summaries, analyses, and suggestions, users may be inclined to accept these outputs without exercising independent reasoning. This reliance mirrors the state of immaturity that Kant aimed to transcend. From a Kantian point of view, the ethical use of AI necessitates the preservation of intellectual fortitude. As a user, one ought to utilise AI as a tool for exploration rather than as a substitute for critical thinking. Educational methodologies ought to promote **students'** critical examination of AI-generated content, discernment of its limitations, and formulation of independent judgements. AI

can positively enhance enlightenment by broadening access to knowledge and facilitating intellectual exploration. Nonetheless, it diminishes enlightenment by fostering naive reliance on automated processes. The ethical dilemma is hence not the technological but rather in pedagogical as well as philosophical.

The preeminent principle of Kantian ethics is the categorical imperative. Kant articulates it in multiple manners. The initial formulation being: "Act solely in accordance with that principle which you may simultaneously intend to become a universal law" (Kant, 2012, p. 37). This notion necessitates individuals to assess if the rule governing the conduct could be justifiably embraced by all. If the universalisation of a certain action leads to contradiction or jeopardises the potential for social collaboration, that action is deemed morally unacceptable. In this context, the categorical imperative offers a valuable framework for assessing AI utilisation towards human as user, especially among Generation Z. Not only educational assessment would become futile, but also assignments would fail to represent students learning or accomplishment when contemplating the act of presenting AI-generated tasks as creative creations among generation Z. The practice consequently does not meet the criteria of universalisation and is ethically contentious. When humans consistently employ AI to fabricate falsehoods for personal advantage, such behaviour were to become ubiquitous, trust in digital communication would erode, rendering meaningful communication progressively more challenging. The activity once more does not pass the universalisation requirement. In contrast, employing AI as an ancillary educational resource that enhances learning while upholding intellectual integrity may be universally applied without inconsistency. This usage fosters educational advancement while maintaining the integrity of academic institutions. The categorical imperative drives humans to assess AI-related decisions based on standards that honour personal integrity and wider social obligations.

3.5 Humanity as an end in itself

The most crucial Kantian premise for AI ethics is the second formulation of the categorical imperative, ie. "Conduct yourself in a manner that regards humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, simultaneously as an end and never solely as a means" (Kant, 2012, p. 47). This idea affirms the inherent dignity of each individual. Individual hold intrinsic value not because to their utility, productivity, or efficiency, but because one is rational and autonomous moral actors. The principle has significant ramifications for modern AI systems. Numerous digital platforms are engineered to optimise interaction, attention, and data acquisition. In certain instances, human as users may be regarded predominantly as data providers or subjects of behavioural manipulation rather than as independent individuals (Zuboff, 2019).

From a Kantian viewpoint, these practices are ethically contentious as they commodify human beings. Technologies ought to promote human flourishing instead of reducing individuals to mere objects of optimisation. This principle underscores the significance of safeguarding human dignity within digital contexts for human beings, especially among Generation Z. AI ought to function as an instrument that facilitates human advancement, rather than as a system that assesses human value based on criteria of efficiency, productivity, or algorithmic efficacy. The ethical dilemma encompasses not only technology administration but also the safeguarding of humanity itself. AI must remain focused on assisting individuals as ends in themselves. Human beings must never become subservient to the technologies they develop.

4. Emerging AI ethical challenges among Generation Z

4.1 The transformation of human-technology relationships among Generation Z

The connection between Generation Z and AI markedly contrasts from that of other generations. In contrast to previous cohorts that underwent the shift from analogue to digital settings, Generation Z has been immersed in a technology ecosystem defined by constant connectedness, algorithmic mediation, and swift information interchange (Twenge, 2017). AI technologies are progressively integrated into educational platforms, search engines, social media applications, productivity tools, and communication systems. Consequently, AI has evolved from a mere external technology tool to an essential element in the manner young individuals engage with knowledge and society. This shift has created unparalleled opportunities for learning and creativity.

AI-driven solutions can deliver customised educational experiences, aid in language learning, enhance research endeavours, and promote creative expression (Holmes et al., 2022). Consequently, information can be retrieved more efficiently than at any other juncture in human history. Generative AI systems can elucidate intricate concepts, produce instances, and aid learners in traversing challenging academic material. Nonetheless, the incorporation of AI into daily life also presents significant ethical dilemmas. The primary issue is not the utilisation of AI, but rather the manner in which AI is employed without undermining rational autonomy. Kant considers rational autonomy to be the cornerstone of human dignity (Kant, 2012). As AI's proficiency in cognitive tasks expands, the risk escalates that humans may transition into passive recipients of technological outputs instead of engaging actively in intellectual exploration.

From a Kantian viewpoint, technological convenience must not compromise autonomous thought. The ethical dilemma confronting Generation Z is to use the advantages of AI while maintaining the abilities for critical reflection, moral judgement, and autonomous decision-making that characterise humankind. A prevalent issue regarding AI is the potential for cognitive reliance. Cognitive reliance arises when individuals progressively depend on external systems to execute intellectual tasks that were before accomplished via own effort and contemplation (Véliz, 2024). Although technology aid might enhance efficiency, overreliance may undermine the cultivation of critical thinking and analytical reasoning. This issue is especially pertinent in educational environments. Generative AI systems can rapidly generate essays, summarise intricate materials, respond to

enquiries, and resolve difficulties. While these characteristics can facilitate learning, they may also incentivise learners to evade intellectual involvement. Rather than grappling with complex concepts, learners may only solicit answers from AI systems. From a Kantian viewpoint, this dependency jeopardises the pursuit of enlightenment. Kant (1996) contends that intellectual growth necessitates individuals to utilise their own reasoning instead of depending on external authority. Although AI diverges from the conventional authority examined by Kant, the fundamental premise persists. If Generation Z consistently delegates intellectual tasks to AI systems, they risk remaining in a state of intellectual immaturity. Kantian ethics does not necessitate the rejection of AI. Instead, it necessitates employing AI in manners that enhance rather than supplant human understanding. AI ought to serve as an educational tool that fosters inquiry and contemplation. Generation Z learners must critically engage with AI-generated content, assess arguments, validate information, and formulate autonomous opinions. Thus, AI can support intellectual advancement rather than detracting from it. The ethical concern lies not in technology aid itself, but in how such assistance is incorporated into the learning process. Educational activities ought to promote the perception among Generation Z learners that AI serves as an instrument for enhancing cognition rather than replacing it.

The emergence of generative AI has heightened discussions around authenticity and academic integrity. Educational institutions are increasingly faced with instances when students utilise AI to produce assignments, research papers, presentations, and other academic outputs. Although AI might enhance learning, apprehensions arise when AI-generated content is portrayed as wholly unique human creation. From a Kantian viewpoint, academic dishonesty constitutes a breach of moral obligation as it contradicts the values of veracity and respect for others (Kant, 2012). Educational institutions rely on trust. Educators presume that submitted assignments demonstrate students' comprehension, effort, and cognitive growth. When students deliberately portray AI-generated information as their own, they erode confidence and contravene the ethical values that uphold educational communities. The categorical imperative offers a valuable framework for assessing the behaviour of frequently submitted AI-generated work without disclosure; the educational purpose of assignments would disintegrate. Evaluation would cease to gauge learning, and academic qualifications would diminish in credibility. This conduct cannot be logically universalised, so it does not meet Kant's criterion for moral permissibility (Kant, 2012). Kantian ethics posits that the issue lies not with AI itself. The ethical concern is in the motives and actions of individuals. A student who openly employs AI for brainstorming, language enhancement, or initial research while retaining accountability for the final product exhibits a fundamentally distinct ethical perspective compared to a student who attempts to mislead instructors. Therefore, educational institutions should prioritise not only the identification of AI utilisation but also the development of ethical comprehension about suitable AI integration. Students must understand that technology aid does not absolve them of personal accountability. Moral accountability is inherently linked to human agency.

4.2 Cultivation of ethical understanding and human autonomy society among Generation Z

A notable ethical dilemma is to the increasing impact of algorithmic systems on human behaviour. Recommendation algorithms increasingly influence the news items users consume, the videos they see, the products they acquire, and even the social connections they develop (Zuboff, 2019). These technologies are engineered to enhance engagement, frequently by forecasting and influencing user behaviour. Although these systems can enhance ease and personalisation, they also provoke worries about autonomy. Kant's notion of autonomy underscores self-governance via logical deliberation instead of external influence (Kant, 2012). If algorithmic systems gradually shape preferences and judgements without users' awareness, the prerequisites for autonomous choice may be compromised.

Generation Z is especially susceptible to algorithmic impact due to the predominance of digital platforms in their social and informational landscape. Information is progressively curated by recommendation systems that emphasise engagement metrics over rational analysis or educational independence. The ethical issue emerges when individuals lack awareness of the forces influencing their decisions. AI literacy necessitates not only technical proficiency but also a critical understanding of how algorithms shape perception, attention, and behaviour. From a Kantian viewpoint, individuals must retain the ability to contemplate and assess the effects exerted upon them. This reflection maintains autonomy by preventing technological systems from becoming unseen influences on human behaviour.

The expanding capabilities of AI have raised significant philosophical issues about human dignity. As machines do duties formerly deemed exclusively human, enquiries emerge regarding the essence of human value and identity. Certain critics anticipate that AI may ultimately surpass humans in several cognitive areas, raising worries over human significance in highly automated societies (Bostrom, 2014). Kant's ethical theory provides a robust answer to these issues. Human dignity is not contingent upon relative efficiency, computational capability, or production. Human beings contain inherent value due to their capacity for rationality and morality, enabling self-governance and ethical accountability (Kant, 2012). No technological system, irrespective of its complexity, embodies dignity in the Kantian framework, as machines lack the capacity to act from moral obligation or autonomous rational volition.

This differentiation is especially significant for Generation Z. Modern culture frequently assesses achievement by performance measurements, productivity indicators, and algorithmically derived judgements. Such inclinations threaten to diminish human value to mere functional utility. Kantian ethics refutes this simplification. The worth of a human being cannot be assessed merely by technological performance, as dignity surpasses mere utility. AI should be regarded as a tool for enhancing human welfare rather than as a standard for assessing human beings. Educational systems, workplaces, and societal organisations

must counter narratives that associate technology dominance with human inadequacy. They should prioritise the distinct human abilities of moral judgement, empathy, creativity, and ethical responsibility.

5. Society and moral duty to foster ethical AI literacy among Generation Z

The advent of AI has caused society to view the technology chiefly as a menace to intellectual integrity and human dignity. Consequently, some adults have reacted by limiting or dissuading the usage of AI. Although concerns about misuse are valid, a Kantian viewpoint indicates that restriction alone is neither pedagogically successful nor ethically adequate. Generation Z should not be dissuaded from interacting with AI, since it has become an enduring aspect of modern social reality. Preventing engagement with AI would be akin to dissuading earlier generations from acquiring proficiency in the internet or digital technologies. This strategy jeopardises Generation Z's preparedness for the technological landscapes they will face in professional and civic spheres (UNESCO, 2023).

Kant's philosophy posits that society ought to foster autonomy instead of reliance. The primary objective is not to shield Generation Z from all challenges but to cultivate their ability for rational judgement and moral accountability (Kant, 2007). Generation Z must acquire the ability to critically engage with AI, since ethical participation in modern society increasingly necessitates this skill. Thus, the inquiry is not whether Generation Z need to rely entirely on AI, but rather how they should engage with AI in an ethical, responsible, and knowledgeable manner.

From a Kantian viewpoint, society has a moral obligation to lead Generation Z towards intellectual maturity. Kant regarded society as crucial for the cultivation of autonomous individuals who can exercise reason autonomously (Kant, 2007). This obligation assumes greater significance within the realm of AI. Society ought to educate Generation Z about the capabilities, limitations, opportunities, and threats inherent in AI technologies. They should clarify that AI is essentially a technology intended to aid humans rather than supplant them. Generation Z must recognise that AI can produce knowledge, discern patterns, and assist in problem-solving; but, it lacks the capacity for moral responsibility, ethical judgement, or authentic comprehension. This obligation closely corresponds with Kant's notion of illumination. The objective is to avoid promoting uncritical acceptance of AI or unreasonable apprehension towards it. Cultivation should be guided by informed and critical involvement. Generation Z ought to comprehend the operation of AI systems, the origins of algorithmic biases, and the critical assessment of AI-generated information (UNESCO, 2023). This assists Generation Z in preserving the intellectual autonomy that Kant deemed vital to human dignity.

A fundamental notion must be conveyed that AI exists to help humanity. From a Kantian viewpoint, technological systems serve as tools whose worth is contingent upon their utility in fulfilling human objectives (Wood, 2008). AI should be regarded as a tool for enhancing learning, creativity, and human development. Generation Z ought to be motivated to perceive AI as a partner in cognitive endeavours rather than a substitute for critical thinking. AI can aid in the organization of knowledge, the generation of ideas, and the facilitation of discovery. Nevertheless, ultimate determinations regarding truth, meaning, ethics, and accountability are the prerogatives of humanity. The primary objective of society is not solely technological expertise but the cultivation of reasonable and ethically accountable individuals. Therefore, AI literacy ought to be incorporated into comprehensive curricula on ethical education, critical thinking, and civic responsibility. In Kantian philosophy, technology attains its utmost significance when it fosters the emergence of independent persons who utilise reason for the advancement of humanity. Society thus bears a moral commitment to instruct Generation Z not only in the utilisation of AI but also in the rationale for its existence and its role in upholding human dignity rather than undermining it.

6. Magnifica Humanitas and human flourishing in the age of AI

6.1 Understanding Magnifica Humanitas

The swift progression of AI has rekindled interest in philosophical frameworks that prioritise the human being in ethical contemplation. Although dialogues on AI often emphasise efficiency, creativity, and scientific prowess, there is a growing acknowledgement that technological advancement should ultimately be assessed based on its impact on human wellbeing. The Magnifica Humanitas concept provides a significant foundation for comprehending the interaction between humanity and technology.

The phrase Magnifica Humanitas underscores the grandeur, dignity, perfection, and nobility of the human individual. It is grounded in the expansive humanistic tradition that perceives individuals not solely as biological entities or economic agents, but as intellectual, moral, relational, and meaning-seeking beings. Human existence is defined by the ability for self-reflection, moral accountability, creativity, and transcendence. Thus, technological advancement should not be sought as an ultimate goal but rather as a way to enhance human welfare. This viewpoint aligns closely with Kant's ethical philosophy. Kantian ethics and Magnifica Humanitas both repudiate efforts to diminish human beings to mere instruments, objects, or functional components within broader systems. Both underscore the inherent value of individuals and the necessity of upholding human dignity across all social, political, educational, and technical frameworks (Kant, 2012; Taylor, 1989).

Within the realm of AI, Magnifica Humanitas emphasises that technical advancement must not overshadow the intrinsic worth of people. The definitive gauge of technological advancement is not the intellect of robots, but the degree to which technology fosters the growth of smart, responsible, and thriving individuals.

6.2 Human dignity beyond technological performance

A major challenge presented by AI is the inclination to assess individuals based on criteria derived from technological performance. Modern civilisations progressively exalt rapidity, efficacy, production, and optimisation. As AI systems exhibit remarkable proficiency in data processing, content development, and problem-solving, several observers have started to ponder if computers can ultimately exceed human intellect in domains historically linked to cognitive ability (Bostrom, 2014). From the viewpoint of Magnifica Humanitas, such analogies misinterpret the essence of human dignity. The value of humanity is not based on computational ability, information-processing capacity, or productivity efficiency. Human dignity originates from attributes that surpass just utilitarian considerations. Humans have the ability for moral discernment, self-awareness, empathy, accountability, and the pursuit of significance. These attributes cannot be distilled into computational functions or performance indicators. Kant's conception of dignity substantiates this perspective. Kant (2012) asserts that individuals contain inherent worth that cannot be quantified in market terms due to their capacity to act in accordance with moral ideals. Human beings are intrinsic purposes rather than mere means to external objectives. Therefore, no technical system can supplant the ethical importance of human agency.

This idea is especially significant for Generation Z. Adolescents are progressively exposed to social contexts influenced by metrics, rankings, algorithms, and performance indicators. Practical scenarios, like school attainment, social media impact, and career performance, are frequently assessed and quantified using numerical metrics. Although these measurements may fulfil practical functions, they should not provide the foundation for comprehending human worth. The viewpoint of Magnifica Humanitas thus compels modern cultures to reassert the intrinsic dignity of each individual, irrespective of technological proficiency or quantifiable achievement.

6.3 AI and the cultivation of human excellence as the subject of technology

A primary focus of humanistic philosophy is the development of human excellence. Education, culture, and social institutions should focus not only on technical proficiency but also on cultivating well-rounded individuals who can contribute significantly to society (Nussbaum, 2010). Thus, the inquiry emerges: Can AI positively influence the development of human excellence? The response is predominantly contingent upon the manner in which AI is assimilated into human existence.

When utilised judiciously, AI can enhance educational advancement, provide access to information, stimulate innovation, and broaden learning options. Humans can employ AI to investigate unknown subjects, analyse intricate information, and interact with varied viewpoints. Such applications can foster intellectual development and facilitate lifelong education. Nonetheless, AI enhances human perfection solely when it stays submissive to human objectives. If technological convenience supplants intellectual exertion, moral contemplation, or creative involvement, AI could hinder rather than promote human advancement. Human flourishing necessitates active engagement in learning, reflection, and self-development processes. These processes cannot be wholly assigned to machines. Magnifica Humanitas underscores the necessity of preserving equilibrium between technical support and human autonomy.

Technology ought to enable individuals to enhance their abilities instead of fostering inactivity or reliance. The objective is not merely to develop more efficient users but to foster smarter, more contemplative, and more accountable individuals. This viewpoint strongly corresponds with UNESCO's (2023) proposals on AI in education, which stress that technology innovation should enhance human-centered learning and foster the comprehensive development of learners rather than only improving efficiency.

A fundamental tenet of Magnifica Humanitas is that individuals must be the subjects, not the objects, of technology systems. Historically, technology has been developed to fulfil human needs and ambitions. Issues emerge when technological systems start to govern human behaviour instead of facilitating human objectives. This issue is especially pertinent in modern digital contexts. AI-driven platforms progressively influence attention, communication, and decision-making behaviours. Recommendation algorithms shape the information humans get, whereas predictive systems progressively direct economic, educational, and social decisions (Zuboff, 2019). From a humanistic standpoint, technology systems must not compromise human freedom or autonomy. Instead, they ought to be structured and regulated to augment individuals' abilities for self-determination and significant societal engagement.

Kantian ethics underscores this notion by highlighting the importance of autonomy. Humans must retain the ability to critically assess technological impacts and make decisions based on rational principles (Kant, 2012). AI ought to facilitate this process rather than supplant it. Thus, the ethical dilemma lies not merely in technology innovation but in technological governance. Societies must guarantee that AI remains accountable to human values and is subject to human supervision. Humans must persist in defining the objectives for which technical systems are orientated.

7. Synthesizing Kantian ethics and Magnifica Humanitas among Generation Z

The prior study illustrates that Kantian ethics and Magnifica Humanitas offer complementary frameworks for comprehending the ethical ramifications of AI for Generation Z. Despite originating from distinct intellectual traditions, both approaches underscore the importance of human dignity, autonomy, and moral responsibility.

Kantian ethics provides a stringent normative framework based on cognitive autonomy and moral obligation. The ethical validity of AI hinges on its adherence to the prerequisites for human self-governance. Individuals must retain the ability to exercise autonomous judgement instead of relinquishing decision-making to algorithmic algorithms. Educational institutions

possess a moral duty to foster AI literacy that encourages critical thinking, ethical contemplation, and responsible technological interaction. The viewpoint of Magnifica Humanitas broadens this concern by highlighting the overarching objective of human flourishing. Kant emphasises moral autonomy, but Magnifica Humanitas underscores the significance of fostering wisdom, creativity, relationality, and meaningful societal engagement. AI should be assessed not only based on its effect on autonomy but also on its role in the comprehensive development of individuals. Collectively, these viewpoints contest both technological determinism and technological pessimism. Technological determinism posits that technological advancement necessarily governs societal transformation. Technological pessimism, in contrast, perceives technology chiefly as a peril to humanity. Neither stance sufficiently encapsulates the ethical intricacies of AI.

A Kantian-humanistic perspective acknowledges that technology is ultimately a manifestation of human choice and accountability. AI is neither the saviour nor the adversary of humanity. The ethical importance is contingent upon the ideals, goals, and institutions that influence its creation and application. This insight holds significant ramifications for educational policy. Instead than trying to ban AI, educational institutions should concentrate on enhancing students' abilities for critical engagement. Students must comprehend not only the mechanics of AI but also assess its outputs, identify its limitations, and grasp its ethical ramifications. This education fosters autonomy and promotes human development. Furthermore, educators must underscore that AI cannot supplant the distinctively human abilities of moral judgement, ethical responsibility, empathy, and wisdom. Although AI can aid in information processing and problem-solving, it is incapable of discerning what should be valued or how individuals should conduct their lives. These enquiries are intrinsically human, necessitating human contemplation. The ethical dilemma presented by AI fundamentally pertains to humanity itself. The future of AI ethics relies not chiefly on technology advancement but on society's commitment to uphold and nurture the values that characterise human dignity.

Kantian ethics gives a stringent moral framework for assessing the ethical acceptability of AI, whereas the Magnifica Humanitas approach presents a more expansive anthropological vision that elucidates the ultimate objective of technological advancement. The quick advancement of AI frequently prompts society to concentrate on issues of efficiency, productivity, optimisation, and technological competence. Nonetheless, these concerns, while significant, fail to sufficiently tackle the more essential inquiry regarding the type of individuals contemporary societies aspire to nurture. Technology is not solely a technical occurrence; it is invariably integrated within specific interpretations of humanity, knowledge, and the ideal existence. Thus, ethical contemplation regarding AI must finally revert to the inquiry of the human individual.

According to Magnifica Humanitas, humanity holds a distinctive status within the moral framework due to its abilities in reason, self-reflection, moral accountability, creativity, and transcendence. Human existence cannot be diminished to biological processes, economic output, or computing operations. Human beings are individuals capable of seeking truth, pursuing justice, forming meaningful relationships, and aligning themselves with values that surpass immediate utility (Taylor, 1989; Ricoeur, 1992). The notion of Magnifica Humanitas underscores that the essence of humanity resides not solely in its technological prowess but in its capability to utilise knowledge and power judiciously for the advancement of individuals and communities.

The aforementioned elucidates Kant's idea of human dignity. Kant (2012) posits that rational beings have an inherent value that cannot be quantified by utilitarian or economic criteria. Individuals are ends in themselves due to their capacity for moral self-governance and autonomous agency. The importance of AI must be assessed based on its adherence to and enhancement of the conditions essential for human autonomy and dignity. Technological systems hold instrumental value, whereas human beings embody intrinsic value. The differentiation is vital as modern technical discussions occasionally jeopardise the perception of efficiency as the paramount societal value. When technology performance becomes the primary criterion for assessing social institutions, there is a risk that human beings may be perceived chiefly in terms of production and optimisation.

The viewpoint of Magnifica Humanitas opposes reductionism by asserting that human flourishing includes aspects of existence that surpass technical quantification. Wisdom, empathy, moral discernment, camaraderie, solidarity, love, and the quest for meaning transcend simply data-processing functions. They represent fundamental elements of human existence that cannot be sufficiently encapsulated by algorithmic systems. Therefore, AI ought to be regarded not as a rival to mankind but as an instrument that enhances the cultivation of these distinctly human abilities. The ethical inquiry is not centred on AI's ability to execute specific jobs more effectively than humans, but rather on whether AI fosters the development of individuals capable of leading meaningful, responsible, and flourishing lives. This humanistic perspective is especially pertinent for Generation Z. Generation Z, the inaugural cohort to develop in digitally saturated environments, engages with reality through progressively intricate interactions with algorithmic systems. Educational experiences, social interactions, entertainment selections, and information access are often facilitated by electronic platforms. Although these advancements present considerable benefits, they also elicit apprehensions about identity creation, critical awareness, and moral agency. If adolescents become habituated to instant responses, automated suggestions, and algorithmically tailored experiences, there exists a risk that the practices of contemplation, deliberation, and self-development that define mature adulthood may be diminished.

The ethical dilemma of AI is inherently linked to the educational difficulty of cultivating autonomous individuals. Education must stay dedicated to fostering individuals who can utilise technology without becoming reliant on it. This approach closely

aligns with Kant's notion of enlightenment as humanity's liberation from self-imposed immaturity through the audacious application of reason (Kant, 1996). The Enlightenment in the era of AI necessitates not only technical proficiency but also the cultivation of intellectual values that empower individuals to critically interact with technology systems while upholding accountability for their judgements and acts. In this context, educational institutions hold a distinctly significant role. The objective of education cannot be confined to equipping students for engagement in technologically sophisticated labour markets. Although technical abilities are essential, education must also foster ethical discernment, critical thinking, and humanistic comprehension. Students should understand not just the operational mechanics of AI systems but also the rationale for their existence, the values they represent, and the regulatory frameworks that uphold human dignity. This education guarantees that technical literacy is incorporated with moral literacy instead of supplanting it.

Moreover, Magnifica Humanitas prompts a reevaluation of innovation itself. Modern societies often revere invention as an indisputable virtue. From a humanistic standpoint, innovation gains ethical importance solely when it fosters genuine human progress. The worth of AI should be assessed not merely by technological accomplishments but by its ability to improve education, fortify communities, alleviate suffering, broaden opportunities, and advance the collective welfare. Technological advancement, detached from human well-being, inevitably becomes self-referential and jeopardises the humanity it aims to benefit. In this context, AI might be perceived as a significant manifestation of humanity's creative and intellectual abilities. AI is a manifestation of human creativity, scientific exploration, and the collective knowledge amassed over generations. The presence of AI attests not to the superiority of machines over humans, but to the extraordinary accomplishments of human intelligence. This accomplishment entails associated duties. As humanity's technological capabilities expand, so too does its responsibility to guarantee that this power is consistent with ethical principles and human values (Jonas, 1984).

Thus, the fundamental ethical inquiry is not whether machines will attain greater intelligence. The critical inquiry is whether humanity will possess the requisite wisdom to regulate technology advancement in alignment with human dignity. A society informed by the tenets of Magnifica Humanitas acknowledges that technology systems possess value solely due to their service to humans. Human beings do not exist for the sake of technology; rather, technology exists to serve human beings. The objective of AI is not to supplant human rationality, moral discernment, or accountability, but to facilitate the growth of individuals and societies in achieving their utmost human potential. The integration of Kantian ethics and Magnifica Humanitas establishes a core normative principle for the era of AI: technological innovation is ethically permissible only to the extent that it upholds human dignity, enhances rational autonomy, fosters moral responsibility, and advances human flourishing. AI attains its furthest objective not by emulating mankind, but by facilitating humanity's realisation of its greatest potential. This idea offers a philosophical basis for directing educational policies, technology governance, and ethical contemplation in the future.

8. Conclusion

The advent of AI signifies a significant transition in modern human civilisation, altering the production, access, interpretation, and use of knowledge. For Generation Z, AI is not just a technological advancement but an integral component of daily life, shaping educational experiences, communication methods, decision-making processes, and identity development. As AI becomes more integrated into social and educational contexts, ethical contemplation is necessary to ensure that technological progress aligns with the core values that characterise humanity. This essay contends that the ethical ramifications of AI cannot be comprehensively grasped solely via the lenses of efficiency, productivity, or technological performance. AI should be assessed based on its effects on human autonomy, dignity, moral accountability, and well-being.

This study, grounded in Immanuel Kant's moral philosophy, has illustrated that the primary ethical concern of AI lies not in the technology itself, but in the ways humans elect to interact with it. Kant's notions of good will, duty, autonomy, illumination, and the categorical imperative establish a normative framework for assessing AI utilisation within Generation Z. From a Kantian viewpoint, AI holds instrumental value rather than intrinsic worth. The ethical importance is contingent upon its contribution to the cultivation of rational and autonomous individuals capable of exercising independent moral judgement. AI can serve as a significant educational and intellectual asset when it facilitates learning, creativity, and critical analysis. Nonetheless, it raises ethical concerns when technology promotes intellectual complacency, undermines personal accountability, or replaces human reasoning with technological outputs. Thus, the ethical dilemma presented by AI mainly pertains to the safeguarding of human autonomy in a progressively mechanised environment.

The investigation has revealed that Generation Z holds a distinctive role within this ethical framework. Generation Z, the inaugural cohort to develop in environments inundated with algorithmic systems and advanced technologies, faces opportunities and challenges unprecedented by other generations. AI offers unparalleled access to information and educational resources; but, it concurrently engenders hazards of cognitive dependency, reduced critical thinking, and an overreliance on machine-generated knowledge. Kant's concept of enlightenment retains significant relevance in this setting. The objective of education in the era of AI is not solely to impart technological skills but to foster the bravery and ability to think autonomously. Ethical interaction with AI necessitates that youth actively engage in investigation, thought, and judgement, rather than merely consuming algorithmically produced content passively.

It argues that educational institutions and instructors have a moral obligation to instruct Generation Z students in the ethical utilisation of AI. From a Kantian viewpoint, dissuading Generation Z from interacting with AI would contradict the overarching

educational objective of promoting rational autonomy. As AI increasingly permeates modern culture, Generation Z must acquire the skills to engage with it responsibly rather than be insulated from it. Educational institutions should thus transcend methodologies focused exclusively on limitation and regulation. They should foster AI literacy based on critical thinking, ethical contemplation, intellectual integrity, and personal accountability. Educators are obligated to instruct Generation Z about the functionality of AI while also elucidating its purpose, limitations, and ethical ramifications. AI ought to be implemented as an instrument aimed at enhancing human learning and problem-solving, while remaining subject to human judgement and ethical responsibility. In this regard, AI education constitutes a fundamental aspect of moral education.

The viewpoint of Magnifica Humanitas enhances and broadens the Kantian framework by underscoring the overarching objective of human flourishing. Kant offers a stringent analysis of moral autonomy and dignity, whereas Magnifica Humanitas emphasises the excellence of humanity manifested via rationality, creativity, responsibility, relationality, and the quest for meaning. This viewpoint emphasises that the primary aim of technological innovation is not merely technological progress, but the cultivation of fully realised human beings. Human dignity cannot be quantified by metrics of efficiency, computational capability, or productivity. Human beings possess inherent worth that surpasses all forms of instrumental assessment. AI should be perceived not as a rival to mankind but as a manifestation of humanity's creative and intellectual abilities.

The integration of Kantian ethics with Magnifica Humanitas establishes a core normative concept for the era of AI: technology should serve as a means to human flourishing, not as an end in itself. Human beings must remain the subjects of technological advancement rather than its objects. AI ought to fortify, not undermine, rational autonomy; elevate, not erode, human dignity; and uphold, not supplant, moral duty. Educational institutions, politicians, technology developers, and civil society together bear the responsibility to guarantee that AI promotes the common good while honouring the inherent dignity of each individual.

The future of AI is inextricably linked to the future of humans. The genuine criterion for success in the era of AI will reside not in the complexity of algorithms or the capabilities of computing systems, but in the degree to which technological advancement fosters the development of autonomous, ethical, and thriving individuals. Consistent with Kantian ethics and the essence of Magnifica Humanitas, the paramount objective of AI is not to supplant mankind, but to aid humanity in achieving its fullest potential.

Funding: Funding information was not supplied in the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: A conflict-of-interest declaration was not supplied in the manuscript.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *The business of AI*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Buber, M. (2002). *I and Thou*. Continuum.
- Cath, C. (2018). Governing AI: Ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 376(2133), 1–13.
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). *AI ethics*. MIT Press
- Driyarkara, N. (2006). Karya lengkap Driyarkara: Esai-esai filsafat pemikir yang terlibat penuh dalam perjuangan bangsanya. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.
- Floridi, L., & Cows, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1), 1–15.
- Frankl, V. E. (2006). *Man's search for meaning*. Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. MIT Press.
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *AI in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- Holmes, W., Persson, J., Chounta, I. A., Wasson, B., & Dimitrova, V. (2022). AI and education: A critical view through the lens of human rights, democracy and the rule of law. *Council of Europe Publishing*.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399.
- Jonas, H. (1984). *The imperative of responsibility*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kant, I. (1996). *An answer to the question: What is enlightenment?* In M. J. Gregor (Ed.), *Practical philosophy* (pp. 11–22). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1784)
- Kant, I. (2007). *Lectures on pedagogy* (A. Churton, Trans.). Dover Publications. (Original work published 1803)
- Kant, I. (2012). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor & J. Timmermann, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785)

- Kant, I. (2015). *Critique of practical reason* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1788)
- Livingstone, S. (2014). Developing social media literacy: How children learn to interpret risky opportunities on social network sites. *Communications*, 39(3), 283–303.
- Luckin, R. (2018). *Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century*. UCL Institute of Education Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue* (3rd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.
- Magnis-Suseno, F. (1997). *13 tokoh etika: Sejak zaman Yunani sampai abad ke-19*. Kanisius.
- Magnis-Suseno, F. (2018). *Etika dasar: Masalah-masalah pokok filsafat moral*. Kanisius.
- Mittelstadt, B. D. (2019). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(11), 501–507.
- Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 1–21.
- Moor, J. H. (2006). The nature, importance, and difficulty of machine ethics. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 21(4), 18–21.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- O'Neill, O. (2013). *Acting on principle: An essay on Kantian ethics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6.
- Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as another*. University of Chicago Press.
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *AI: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.
- Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of the modern identity*. Harvard University Press.
- Turkle, S. (2017). *Reclaiming conversation: The power of talk in a digital age*. Penguin Books.
- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood*. Atria Books.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of AI*. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Vallor, S. (2016). *Technology and the virtues: A philosophical guide to a future worth wanting*. Oxford University Press.
- Verbeek, P.-P. (2011). *Moralizing technology: Understanding and designing the morality of things*. University of Chicago Press.
- Véliz, C. (2024). *The AI mirror: How to reclaim our humanity in an age of machine thinking*. Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 223–235.
- Winner, L. (1986). *The whale and the reactor: A search for limits in an age of high technology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Wood, A. W. (2008). *Kantian ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on AI applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(39), 1–27.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. PublicAffairs.