

Humanistic Philosophy in Pancasila Education: Strengthening Legal Awareness in the Era of Digital Disruption

Bambang Trisno¹, Rusdinal², Junaidi Indrawadi³, Zetty Nurzuliana Rashed⁴

¹*Sjech M. Djamil Djambek State Islamic University, Indonesia. E-mail: bambangtrisno@uinbukittinggi.ac.id*

²*Padang State University, Indonesia. E-mail: rusdinal@fip.unp.ac.id*

³*Padang State University, Indonesia. E-mail: junaidi.indrawadi@fis.unp.ac.id*

⁴*Selangor Islamic University, Malaysia. E-mail: zetty@kuis.edu.my*

Abstract: The rapid growth of digital technology has transformed patterns of human interaction, access to information, and understanding of legal norms, while Indonesian students' literacy levels remain below the OECD average and public legal awareness remains moderate. These conditions highlight the need to strengthen legal consciousness through an educational approach that integrates legal understanding with humanitarian and ethical values. This study aims to examine how Pancasila Education can strengthen humanistic legal consciousness in Indonesia in the context of digital disruption, particularly through the value of "Just and Civilized Humanity." The study employs a qualitative normative-philosophical approach combined with a systematic literature review of academic publications, policy documents, and research reports published between 2015 and 2025. Following systematic screening and evaluation, 32 core sources were selected and analyzed through descriptive systematization, normative evaluation, and critical interpretation. The findings indicate that Pancasila Education can strengthen humanistic legal consciousness by integrating legal knowledge with reflection on human dignity, justice, empathy, responsibility, and social consequences. The study further finds that reflective, participatory, and contextual learning enables students to connect Pancasila values with their digital, social, and cultural experiences, transforming legal awareness from formal compliance into internally grounded moral responsibility. This study argues that Pancasila Education should be reconceptualized as an ethical praxis that positions citizens as moral and rational agents capable of reflecting on legal conduct and exercising responsibility based on humanitarian and social justice values in the digital era.

Keywords: Pancasila Education; Legal Awareness; Humanistic Values; Era of Disruption.

1. Introduction

The development of digital technology has transformed how people communicate, interact, access information, and respond to social issues. The expansion of the internet, social media, and artificial intelligence has increased access to information and created new opportunities for learning, communication, and public participation. At the same time, these developments have altered the social context in which individuals exercise their rights and responsibilities. Digital spaces have introduced new challenges involving misinformation, privacy violations, hate speech, online harassment, and the rapid circulation of potentially harmful content. Sarikakis and Winter (2017) demonstrate that social media users negotiate privacy not only through their knowledge of formal legal rules but also through their everyday experiences, perceptions, and responses to privacy violations. This indicates that legal awareness in digital environments involves more than understanding statutory provisions; it also encompasses how individuals interpret legal rights, negotiate competing interests, and respond to situations in which the boundaries between public and private life are increasingly blurred.

These developments therefore require a broader understanding of legal awareness that accounts for the social and experiential dimensions of law in digital environments. Dylag (2024) and Ewick and Silbey (1998) show that people's experiences and interpretations of law are shaped by their everyday social contexts, including digital interactions. In this context, legal awareness involves not only recognizing or complying with formal legal rules but also considering the consequences of one's actions, respecting the rights and dignity of others, and exercising responsibility when legal and moral boundaries are less visible (Tyler, 2006; Sarikakis & Winter, 2017). UNESCO (2021) similarly emphasizes the importance of critical and ethical digital literacy. The digital environment consequently creates a need for an approach to legal awareness that integrates legal knowledge with ethical reflection, empathy, and social responsibility (Hidayah et al., 2022). From a Pancasila perspective, this broader understanding is particularly relevant because the value of "Just and Civilized Humanity" provides an ethical foundation for encouraging individuals to exercise their rights and responsibilities while respecting human dignity and the interests of others. This humanistic orientation is also consistent with the understanding of Pancasila as a framework grounded in human dignity and the promotion of just and civilized human relations (Karimullah, 2023).

The problem becomes more apparent when educational and social indicators are considered together. The 2022 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) report shows that Indonesian students' performance in mathematics, reading, and science remained below the OECD average. Indonesian students scored 354 in mathematics, and a substantial proportion came from the lowest socioeconomic group (OECD, 2023). UNESCO (2023) highlights continuing inequalities in access to and effective use of educational technology. At the same time, the Global Education Monitoring Report 2023 points to continuing inequality in access to educational technology. Access to digital infrastructure does not necessarily result in equal opportunities to use technology for meaningful learning (Korkmaz et al., 2022). These conditions matter because expanding digital access does not automatically strengthen individuals' ability to use information responsibly or make ethically informed decisions.

The issue is also reflected in legal awareness in Indonesia. A national survey conducted by the *Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional* (BPHN) in cooperation with the *Badan Pusat Statistik* (BPS) in 2021 recorded a national legal awareness index of 63.13 percent, which was categorized as moderate. Citizens reported a priority level of legal issues of 32.07 percent (BPHN, 2021). Although these figures provide an important picture of the national situation, they should not be interpreted as evidence that legal awareness is simply a matter of whether citizens know the law or comply with it. Research involving university students, for example, found that students could demonstrate relatively strong cognitive understanding of civic education, with an average score of 80.60 on a 100-point scale, while this understanding was not always reflected in behavior consistent with legal norms and public ethics (Tjeppy, 2021a). Similarly, Fitri et al. (2024) found a positive relationship between students' understanding of Pancasila values and their legal awareness, but the findings also point to a continuing gap between understanding values and applying them in everyday life, particularly in digital environments.

This gap between what individuals know and how they act raises a more fundamental question about the meaning of legal awareness itself. If legal awareness is measured primarily through knowledge of regulations or formal compliance, an important part of people's relationship with law may remain unexplained. Legal consciousness research suggests that people understand and experience law through everyday social interactions, even when they do not explicitly invoke legal rules (Ewick & Silbey, 1998; Silbey, 2005).

Law is embedded in everyday social life, where experiences and interactions shape how individuals interpret its meaning and relevance (Ewick & Silbey, 1998). Individuals encounter law not only when they read legislation or face legal sanctions. They experience law through family relationships, educational institutions, workplaces, communities, public institutions, and increasingly through digital platforms. Their understanding of law is therefore shaped by experience, social interaction, and how legal rules are interpreted in particular circumstances.

This broader understanding is consistent with socio-legal scholarship. Ewick and Silbey (1998), in *The Common Place of Law*, demonstrate that people's relationships with law are formed through everyday narratives, experiences, and practices. They identify three forms of legal consciousness: before the law, with the law, and against the law. These categories illustrate that people do not necessarily relate to law in the same way. Law may be perceived as an authoritative system that must be obeyed, as a resource that can be strategically used, or as an exercise of power that can be questioned or resisted. Merry (1990). further shows that social actors can mediate people's understanding of law by translating formal legal concepts into forms meaningful in everyday life. In an educational context, this perspective positions teachers and educational institutions not merely as transmitters of legal knowledge but also as intermediaries through which students learn to interpret the meaning of law in their social lives.

The question of why people obey the law also cannot be separated from their perception of legitimacy. Tyler (2006) argues that obedience depends not only on the possibility of sanctions but also on whether legal authorities and procedures are perceived as legitimate, fair, neutral, and trustworthy. Hough et al.(2013) similarly emphasize the relationship between procedural justice, institutional trust, and legitimacy. Perceptions of procedural justice are positively associated with legitimacy and individuals' felt obligation to obey legal authorities (Alward, 2024). These arguments are relevant to Pancasila education because they suggest that legal education should not stop at explaining what citizens must do. Students also need opportunities to consider why a legal norm deserves respect, how justice is experienced, and what responsibilities arise when legal rules affect other people.

At the same time, the relationship between law, morality, and power is not straightforward. Critical legal scholars have questioned the assumption that legal institutions always represent neutral or universally accepted interests. Kennedy (1997) and Unger (1986) for example, highlight how legal discourse may connect to existing structures of social power. Law is shaped by political and social interests rather than operating as a completely neutral system (Trianto et al., 2023; Furqon et al., 2024). This perspective matters for Pancasila education because it raises a necessary critical question: should education merely encourage students to accept existing legal arrangements, or should it also equip them to examine whether those arrangements align with the values of justice and humanity? Treating Pancasila education only as a mechanism for transmitting official values may limit its potential as a space for critical and ethical reflection. Developing students' critical-thinking abilities can help them engage with Pancasila values more reflectively and connect them with questions of justice, humanity, and social responsibility (Fajriyah et al., 2024).

The digital environment makes this question more complex. Individuals today encounter several forms of normative regulation at the same time. Beyond state law, platform rules, algorithmic systems, and norms developed within online communities also shape their behavior (Engel, 2016). These forms of regulation can shape what people see, what they are encouraged to share, and how they interact with others. Consequently, legal consciousness in a digital society cannot be separated from the conditions under which

digital interaction takes place. Issues such as data privacy, digital citizenship, algorithmic accountability, misinformation, and ethical communication require individuals to make judgments in situations where formal legal rules are only one part of the problem.

Against this background, existing discussions of Pancasila education and legal awareness still face a conceptual limitation. Much of the discussion still associates legal awareness with legal knowledge, attitudes toward compliance, or the internalization of Pancasila values. Such approaches are useful, but they do not fully explain why individuals who understand legal and Pancasila values may nevertheless behave differently in particular social and digital situations. Knowledge and value endorsement do not automatically translate into consistent civic behavior, as their application is influenced by social contexts, pedagogical experiences, and opportunities for meaningful participation (Banks, 2017; UNESCO, 2021). There is therefore a need to examine the conditions that enable or constrain the translation of Pancasila values into everyday conduct. Curriculum rigidity, pedagogical practices, the political use of Pancasila, and the characteristics of contemporary digital environments are among the factors that may shape this process (Fajriyah et al., 2024; UNESCO, 2023).

This study therefore examines the relationship between Pancasila education and legal consciousness from a humanistic and socio-legal perspective. It addresses three questions. First, how is legal consciousness conceptualized within Indonesian legal and educational discourse, and how does this understanding relate to broader socio-legal theories of legal consciousness? Second, what curricular, political, and technological conditions may hinder the internalization of humanistic legal values through Pancasila education? Third, how can Pancasila education be reconceptualized so that legal consciousness includes not only cognitive understanding but also normative, experiential, and critical dimensions?

It contributes to the discussion by bringing these perspectives together rather than treating Pancasila education and legal consciousness as separate issues. Its main argument is that strengthening legal consciousness through Pancasila education requires more than increasing students' knowledge of legal rules or Pancasila principles. It requires an educational process through which students can interpret values, encounter concrete social problems, reflect on their consequences, and critically consider the relationship between law, justice, and human dignity. In this sense, Pancasila education can be understood not only as ideological instruction but also as a space for developing a more reflective and humanistic relationship between citizens and law in the era of digital disruption.

2. Method

This study employs a qualitative normative-philosophical approach combined with a systematic literature review. The normative-philosophical perspective examines law not merely as a set of statutory provisions but as a reflection of moral, justice, and humanitarian values rooted in Pancasila (Marzuki, 2017; Suparman, 2016). The qualitative orientation enables an in-depth interpretation of meanings, values, and socio-cultural contexts underlying the transformation of legal consciousness in the era of digital disruption (Moleong, 2018). Through this approach, the study examines how the philosophical principles of Pancasila are articulated within contemporary legal and educational discourse in Indonesia.

Data were collected through a systematic review of academic publications, policy documents, and research reports published between 2015 and 2025. The inclusion criteria covered peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly books that directly addressed at least one of three themes: Pancasila education, legal awareness or legal consciousness, and digital

disruption in the Indonesian socio-legal context. Sources indexed in reputable databases, including Scopus, Sinta, Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Moraref, were prioritized. Opinion essays, non-academic publications, and sources lacking methodological rigor were excluded. The literature search used combinations of keywords such as “Pancasila education and legal awareness,” “legal consciousness and Indonesia,” “digital disruption and moral education,” and “humanistic legal education.” Following abstract screening and full-text evaluation, 32 core sources were selected for in-depth analysis.

Data analysis consisted of three stages adapted from normative legal research (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2001). First, descriptive systematization was conducted to map and categorize concepts concerning legal consciousness, Pancasila education, and digital disruption. Second, normative evaluation assessed the consistency between Pancasila values and their application within legal and educational discourse, particularly the principles of human dignity, justice, empathy, and social responsibility. Third, critical interpretation examined underlying assumptions, structural constraints, competing perspectives, and tensions between normative ideals and documented realities.

Rather than merely summarizing the literature, the analysis compared and interpreted converging and competing arguments regarding the relationship between legal knowledge, values, experience, and behavior. The findings were subsequently interpreted through humanistic, socio-legal, and critical perspectives to conceptualize legal consciousness as a reflective process involving values, responsibility, justice, and human dignity, thereby positioning Pancasila education as a space for developing reflective and humanistic legal consciousness.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Pancasila Education and the Development of Humanistic Legal Consciousness

The link between Pancasila Education and legal awareness isn't as simple as just telling people to obey the law. Sure, Pancasila sits right at the heart of Indonesia's legal system and helps shape how laws are made and where the country is heading. But the research points to a recurring problem. Knowing the rules, or even being able to recite Pancasila values, doesn't always mean people act ethically. Students may possess legal and technological knowledge while still facing challenges in applying Pancasila-based ethical and legal principles to digital technologies (Rejekiningsih & al Hakimi, 2023).

This gap shows up clearly in everyday life. Take the 2021 national legal awareness index. It gives us a big-picture view of public awareness nationwide. But then you look at studies involving students, and they show something interesting. Even when students have a solid grasp of civic concepts and Pancasila, that knowledge often fails to translate into action (Tjeppy, 2021). Fitri et al. (2024) came to a similar conclusion, finding a positive link between understanding Pancasila values and legal awareness. A gap between students' understanding of legal and civic norms and their actual behavior, particularly in digital environments (Griyawana et al., 2024; Pramesty et al., 2026). Put all these studies side by side, and you get the same message. Knowledge matters, no doubt about it. But it doesn't fully explain how people act when they're staring down a real moral or legal dilemma.

There's a big difference, after all, between knowing something is right, agreeing that it's right, and actually doing it. A student might give a flawless explanation of justice, humanity, or legal responsibility in a classroom setting. But that same student could act completely differently when faced with a hoax, tempted to share someone's private data, dragged into a toxic online argument, or pressured by friends on social media. Ethical behavior requires students to translate knowledge of digital rights, responsibilities, and norms into actual

online conduct (Pramesty et al., 2026). In those moments, legal awareness isn't about reciting rules from memory. It's about weighing the potential fallout of your choices and thinking about how they'll impact other people.

Seen this way, the second principle of Pancasila, Just and Civilized Humanity, and the fifth, Social Justice for All the People of Indonesia, become especially relevant. The second puts human dignity at the center of social relations, while the fifth emphasizes fairness and collective responsibility. These values provide a moral foundation for understanding why legal rules matter, not merely because violations may result in sanctions. Pancasila values can also serve as an ethical foundation for digital citizenship, particularly in addressing misinformation, hate speech, privacy violations, and other challenges in online interactions (Rejeki et al., 2025). The digital environment has further complicated legal awareness because the boundaries between lawful, ethical, and harmful conduct are not always clear. Individuals may need to decide whether to share uncertain information, disclose another person's personal data, participate in online shaming, or circulate content without considering its consequences. Such situations require not only legal knowledge but also ethical judgment, empathy, and digital responsibility (Yusuf et al., 2024; Rejeki et al., 2025).

These challenges reinforce the view that Pancasila Education should not be limited to transmitting ideological or constitutional knowledge. Its potential lies in helping students connect abstract values with the concrete situations they encounter in everyday life. Several studies emphasize the importance of linking Pancasila values with social practice, citizenship, and ethical responsibility (Nur Rahmawati & Rahma Azzahra, 2022; Tektona, 2022). Digital citizenship education can strengthen students' ethical awareness and decision-making in social media interactions (Alrakhman & Fauzi, 2025), while Pancasila-based learning has been associated with the development of digital ethics and responsible technology use (Sirrul Auvia et al., 2024). This view supports Arifin's (2024) argument that Pancasila continues to shape Indonesia's legal and institutional systems as a living philosophical foundation. Its values therefore encourage respect for human dignity, ethical judgment, and social responsibility in pursuing justice.

Pancasila is not just an ideological label for the state. It is a worldview that should guide citizens to act in ways that are more ethical and focused on humanity. Legal awareness based on Pancasila is not only about following the law, but also about committing to justice and humanity. Pancasila can provide a foundation for digital ethics and responsible citizenship, particularly when its values are connected to contemporary social and technological challenges (Yusuf et al., 2024; Subekti et al., 2026). Learning becomes more meaningful when students aren't just asked to define a principle, but are invited to wrestle with how that principle might help them navigate a real-world problem. First, legal awareness cannot be reduced to knowledge of legal rules or formal compliance, as these elements do not automatically translate into responsible behavior. Second, the humanistic values embedded in Pancasila provide an ethical foundation that connects legal norms with dignity, empathy, fairness, and social responsibility. Third, the complexity of the digital environment makes contextual and reflective learning increasingly important, as citizens must navigate new and often ambiguous situations involving both legal and ethical considerations.

This perspective leads to a more fundamental question: the issue is not simply whether Pancasila Education contributes to the development of legal awareness, but how it is taught and how students experience and apply its values. When Pancasila Education is reduced to memorizing definitions and reproducing textbook answers, the connection between Pancasila values and everyday behavior is likely to remain weak. By contrast, when students are encouraged to engage with concrete problems, consider different perspectives, and

reflect critically on the consequences of their actions, Pancasila Education can contribute to a deeper and more meaningful form of legal consciousness. In this sense, the effectiveness of Pancasila Education depends not only on the transmission of knowledge but also on its capacity to foster ethical reasoning, empathy, critical reflection, and responsible action in everyday social and digital contexts.

Ultimately, Pancasila Education should not be viewed merely as an instrument for promoting legal compliance. It should provide a space in which students can connect legal rules with broader questions of humanity, justice, responsibility, and the consequences of their actions. This broader understanding provides a basis for questioning formalistic approaches and advancing a more critical and reflective model of Pancasila Education.

3.2. Reconstructing Humanistic Legal Consciousness through Pancasila Education in the Digital Era

A gap in existing research on legal awareness concerns how policy and educational frameworks conceptualize and measure legal awareness. In Indonesia, policy-oriented measures, including the legal awareness index developed by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights in cooperation with the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), have largely emphasized indicators related to knowledge of legal rules and compliance with the law. Ewick and Silbey (1998) describe this as a "before the law" approach, where law is viewed as a distant authority that people must follow. While these measures capture some aspects of legal literacy, they overlook the complex ways people actually interpret, negotiate, and experience law in their daily lives, especially online.

The difference between what people know and what they actually do highlights the limits of these formal approaches. Research shows that students may understand Pancasila values well, but this knowledge often does not lead to ethical behavior online (Tjeppy, 2021a). Socio-legal studies suggest that legal consciousness develops through social interaction, not just abstract teaching. Merry (1990), in *Getting Justice and Getting Even*, explains that legal understanding is shaped by "legal intermediaries" such as educators, community leaders, and media, who help translate formal law into everyday practice. When Pancasila education is focused only on passing down ideology instead of encouraging contextual interpretation, it struggles to build meaningful legal consciousness.

Legal consciousness is not uniform across individuals or social groups but is shaped by social experiences, cultural contexts, economic conditions, and interactions with legal institutions. Contemporary socio-legal research emphasizes that individuals do not simply receive law as an external set of rules; rather, they interpret, negotiate, and construct meanings of law through everyday experiences. Hertogh (2023), for example, conceptualizes legal consciousness as the ways in which individuals experience, interpret, engage with, avoid, or resist legal meanings in their everyday lives. This perspective indicates that people's relationships with law may differ according to their social circumstances and experiences. Some students may perceive law as a resource for protecting their rights, others as a framework for guiding their behavior, while some may regard it as an authority that can be questioned or challenged. These differences demonstrate that legal consciousness involves not only knowledge of legal norms but also how individuals understand the relevance, legitimacy, and consequences of law within their particular social contexts.

The diversity of legal experiences has become increasingly important in the digital environment. Creutzfeldt (2021) argues that digital justice requires both legal and digital capabilities, as differences in these capabilities influence how people navigate digital legal spaces. This suggests that students' legal consciousness cannot be developed through uniform legal knowledge alone. In Pancasila Education, students should therefore be

encouraged to examine legal norms through concrete social and digital experiences, consider the consequences of their actions, and reflect on the rights and dignity of others. Such an approach can foster a more reflective and humanistic form of legal consciousness that connects legal norms with justice, human dignity, and social responsibility.

The digital world adds even more complexity. The digital environment further complicates legal consciousness because individuals navigate state law alongside platform rules, algorithms, and community norms (Engel, 2016). Digital platforms also shape how individuals access information, interact with others, and exercise their rights and responsibilities. Recent studies indicate that Pancasila-based digital citizenship education can strengthen ethical awareness, critical thinking, and responsible participation in digital environments (Subekti et al., 2026; Damanik et al., 2026). These findings reinforce the need to move beyond legal knowledge toward an understanding of how digital environments shape ethical and social behavior.

Recent research highlights that digital environments have generated ethical challenges, including misinformation, cyberbullying, plagiarism, polarization, and irresponsible online behavior, making Pancasila values increasingly relevant as an ethical reference (Khasri, 2021; Hidayah et al., 2022; Prasetyo, 2023; Firmansyah et al., 2025). Firmansyah et al. (2025) demonstrate that technology-based Pancasila learning can help students apply values such as tolerance and justice in digital contexts, although challenges remain in teacher digital literacy and access to technology. Similarly, Aryono et al. (2025) show that AI-supported civic education can strengthen ethical digital citizenship when combined with critical information evaluation and Pancasila values. Research on digital citizenship further emphasizes the importance of ethical judgment, critical information evaluation, and responsible participation in social media (Fatmawati & Habibah, 2023). Consequently, legal consciousness in the digital era involves more than knowledge of state law; it requires an understanding of how platform rules, technological systems, and digital practices shape individual behavior, rights, and social interaction.

These developments indicate that Pancasila Education must respond more explicitly to the changing conditions of digital citizenship. Conventional approaches centered on legal knowledge and face-to-face learning may be insufficient as students increasingly encounter ethical and legal dilemmas online. Digital-oriented learning that integrates Pancasila values with digital literacy can help students apply ethical principles in online environments, although challenges remain in teacher digital literacy, learning design, and technology access (Rahmat & Suparjana, 2023; Firmansyah et al., 2025). Prasetyo (2023) further emphasizes that Pancasila should function as a moral guide in virtual social realities. Three barriers remain: curriculum and pedagogical limitations, the potential instrumentalization of Pancasila, and the influence of digital capitalism and platform-based environments. Addressing these barriers requires a more reflective, contextual, participatory, and digitally responsive approach to Pancasila Education.

The first barrier is how the curriculum is designed and how teaching is done. While policies often talk about building character, classrooms still mostly use what Freire (1970), in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, called the "banking model" of education. In this model, knowledge is delivered as facts to memorize rather than ideas to think about critically. Research shows that students can repeat explanations of Pancasila values, but they rarely reflect on and internalize them (Silalahi & Yuwono, 2018). The curriculum focuses on covering content, testing memory, and training teachers in subject knowledge rather than teaching methods that help students absorb values. As a result, Pancasila values remain abstract and do not guide ethical behavior. These teaching weaknesses make it hard for

students to develop real legal consciousness. If students do not reflect on values, they are less likely to act in legally and ethically responsible ways.

The second barrier is the political context of Pancasila education. Over time, Pancasila has been understood and used in different ways during various political periods in Indonesia, from the New Order era to current debates about national identity (Bourchier, 2015; Morfit, 1981). Critical legal scholars like Roberto Mangabeira Unger and Duncan Kennedy argue that legal language can support existing power structures (Kennedy, 1997; Unger, 1986). When Pancasila is used mainly for political purposes, it risks becoming empty symbolism instead of a real guide for ethical thinking and democratic discussion.

This kind of instrumentalization can also undermine the perceived legitimacy of legal norms. Research on procedural justice shows that people using Pancasila mainly for political purposes can also weaken how legitimate legal norms seem to people. Research on procedural justice shows that people are more likely to respect the law when they see legal institutions as fair and trustworthy. Tyler (Tyler, 2006), in *Why People Obey the Law*, shows that legitimacy comes from trust and fairness. If Pancasila is seen mostly as a political tool rather than a true ethical guide, it will be less effective at encouraging moral commitment to legal norms. These systems operate within economic models that prioritize attention extraction and behavioral prediction. Shoshana Zuboff (2019) describes this system as "surveillance capitalism," in which human experience is transformed into data for commercial and predictive purposes.

These technological environments encourage rapid, emotionally driven interactions that don't exactly support reflective moral reasoning. Similarly, analyses of digital attention economies show that online environments tend to privilege immediacy and emotional reactivity over deliberation and critical reflection (Williams, 2018). And these conditions directly challenge the internalization of the humanistic values embedded in the second principle of Pancasila. Platform architectures designed to maximize engagement tend to run counter to the patient, empathetic, and reflective engagement that humanistic legal consciousness requires.

These structural factors make it hard to build legal awareness. Even if people hold ethical beliefs based on Pancasila values, digital platforms can push them toward actions that run counter to careful moral judgment. As a result, digital capitalism scatters people's ethical focus, making it harder to maintain steady legal consciousness in both social and digital settings.

3.3. Toward a Critical Reflective Model of Pancasila Education

So how do we address all these challenges? It requires reconceptualizing Pancasila education beyond formalistic instruction. Drawing on insights from critical pedagogy, humanistic philosophy can we respond to these challenges? We need to rethink Pancasila education so it goes beyond formal teaching. Drawing on critical pedagogy, humanistic philosophy, and socio-legal theory, I propose a critical reflective model of Pancasila education that integrates four connected aspects of legal consciousness: cognitive, normative, experiential, and critical. It is constituted, interpreted, and applied within society. This aligns with critical legal theory, which emphasizes understanding law as a dynamic and socially constituted system rather than a fixed set of commands ((Kennedy, 1997; Unger, 1986).

The normative aspect is about helping students connect morally with legal values through discussion and engagement. Research shows that people respect legal norms more when they see them as fair and meaningful (Hough et al., 2013; Tyler, 2006). Education should encourage open dialogue and ethical debate about real social issues so students can

consider the balance between justice, authority, and personal responsibility. The experiential aspect stresses learning through real-life situations. Socio-legal research shows that people develop legal consciousness through experience, not just theory (Ewick & Silbey, 1998; Merry, 1990). Activities like community projects, case studies, and legal simulations help students link legal ideas to real-world issues, including digital citizenship and online ethics. These exercises can be made relevant by focusing on everyday digital challenges, such as dealing with misinformation, responding to hate speech, or understanding data privacy. These are issues everyone faces, regardless of background.

The critical dimension encourages students to examine legal and social systems critically, question established assumptions, and consider alternative pathways toward justice. Recent scholarship on legal pedagogy emphasizes the importance of creating learning environments in which students are exposed to diverse perspectives and encouraged to critically examine how law operates within broader social contexts (Twemlow, 2023). Similarly, critical-contextual approaches to legal education highlight the need to connect doctrinal knowledge with social realities and structural conditions rather than treating law as an isolated body of rules (Shaffer, 2023). Within Pancasila Education, the principles of “Just and Civilized Humanity” and “Social Justice for All the People of Indonesia” can therefore function as normative reference points for critically examining whether existing legal and social arrangements uphold human dignity, equality, and justice. Recent research on Pancasila Education also indicates that participatory discussion, problem-based learning, and contextual learning can strengthen students’ critical-thinking abilities by encouraging them to analyze problems, articulate arguments, and connect Pancasila values with concrete social situations (Muna’iah et al., 2023; Wijiono & Listyaningsih, 2025).

These dimensions are mutually reinforcing and should be integrated within a holistic educational process. Cognitive understanding provides the foundation for legal literacy; normative engagement develops moral commitment; experiential learning connects legal and Pancasila values with real-life situations; and critical reflection enables students to question assumptions, identify injustice, and consider possibilities for social transformation. Research on Pancasila Education similarly suggests that learning becomes more meaningful when students actively participate in discussion, problem solving, and reflection rather than merely receiving and memorizing normative content (Supriyono et al., 2022; Muna’iah et al., 2023). Taken together, these dimensions position Pancasila Education not merely as a means of transmitting ideological or legal knowledge but as an educational space for cultivating ethical judgment, critical reflection, social responsibility, and respect for human dignity. Such an integrated approach is particularly important in the digital era, where citizens increasingly encounter complex legal and ethical problems that require knowledge, experience, empathy, and critical judgment simultaneously.

4. Conclusion

This study affirms that, from a philosophical perspective, Pancasila Education functions as an ethical praxis that integrates the moral idealism of Pancasila with the reflective constructivism of contemporary pedagogy. The findings reinforce that amid the digital disruption reshaping human interaction and legal understanding, Pancasila Education holds a strategic role as the foundational framework for cultivating a humanistic legal consciousness rooted in the values of humanity and social justice. The legal consciousness referred to here is not merely formal compliance with statutory mandates but a moral and social understanding that arises from within the individual, anchored in the

principles of "Just and Civilized Humanity" and "Social Justice for All the People of Indonesia." The novelty of this research lies in the reconceptualization of humanistic legal consciousness in the digital era, which positions human beings as moral and rational agents capable of reflecting on their legal conduct based on humanitarian values rather than solely on legal texts. Pancasila Education must be implemented through reflective, participatory, and contextual approaches that connect Pancasila values with students' digital, social, and cultural realities. The internalization of values should be realized through dialogue, direct experience, and social practice that foster legal and moral responsibility. Furthermore, moral exemplarity among educators and an academic environment that upholds human dignity are essential to ensure that learning does not remain at the normative level but genuinely shapes a living, civilized legal consciousness.

References

- Alward, L. M. (2024). Procedural justice and probation officer legitimacy: Testing the process-based model in community supervision. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 92, 102187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2024.102187>
- Arifin, H. (2024). Politik hukum pembinaan ideologi Pancasila dalam sistem kelembagaan negara. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 4(1), 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v4i1.426>
- Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional. (2021). *Indeks kesadaran hukum masyarakat tahun 2021*. Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia. Retrieved June 25, 2026, from <https://bphn.go.id/>
- Aryono, A., Susanti, W., & Ingsaputro, M. H. (2025). Artificial intelligence-supported civic education: Developing ethical digital citizenship and Pancasila values internalization among university students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 1(3), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.61132/jupancasila.v1i3.332>
- Banks, J. A. (2017). *Failed citizenship and transformative civic education*. Educational Researcher, 46(7), 366–377. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17726741>
- Bourchier, D. (2015). *Illiberal democracy in Indonesia: The ideology of the family state*. Routledge. Retrieved June 25, 2026, from <https://www.routledge.com/Illiberal-Democracy-in-Indonesia-The-Ideology-of-the-Family-State/Bourchier/p/book/9780203379721>
- Creutzfeldt, N. (2021). Towards a digital legal consciousness? *European Journal of Law and Technology*, 12(3). Retrieved June 20, 2026, from <https://ejlt.org/index.php/ejlt/article/view/816>
- Damanik, P. C. I. C., Chaled, M. I., Husaeni, R. A., Uli, A. A., & Jayanti, F. D. (2026). Reconceptualizing Pancasila-based citizenship education in the digital age: Integrating artificial intelligence, digital ethics, and project-based learning. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v11i01.42780>
- Dylag, M. (2024). Using social media as a tool to inform person-centred justice. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 39(3), 490–511. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cls.2024.16>
- Engel, D. M. (2016). *The myth of the litigious society: Why we don't sue*. University of Chicago Press.
- Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. S. (1998). *The common place of law: Stories from everyday life*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226212708.001.0001>
- Fajriyah, K., Wijayanti, A., Kiswoyo, & Nugroho, B. A. (2024). Pengembangan bahan ajar Pendidikan Pancasila berbasis Profil Pelajar Pancasila dimensi bernalar kritis dan

- kreatif. *Edukasi: Jurnal Penelitian dan Artikel Pendidikan*, 16(1), 193–204. <https://doi.org/10.31603/edukasi.v16i1.11392>
- Fatmawati, F., & Habibah, S. M. (2023). Aktualisasi praktik netizenship mahasiswa dalam good digital citizenship Indonesia. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 3(1), 70–85. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v3i1.120>
- Firmansyah, R., Hamzah, S., & Almuntarizi, A. (2025). Etika digital dan Pancasila: Sinergi transformasi pelajar melalui proyek inovasi teknologi digital. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 5(1), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v5i1.673>
- Fitri, N. R., Shaqi, C. N., Budiani, N. P., Dzorif, A., & Siregar, F. M. (2024). Pengaruh pemahaman nilai-nilai Pancasila terhadap kesadaran hukum: Studi pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Moralita: Jurnal Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 5(2), 64–72. <https://doi.org/10.36985/ebhgd069>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. Retrieved June 21, 2026, from <https://archive.org/details/pedagogyofoppre00frei>
- Furqon, E., Karsa, P. L., Oktavianus, A., & Arifianto, R. (2024). Regional government politics in Indonesia: A critical legal studies perspective. *Yustisi Tirtayasa: Jurnal Tugas Akhir*, 4(3).
- Griyawana, I. W. G., Sidaryanti, N. N. A., Yudana, I. M., Diputra, I. P. N., Dewi, D. M. P. N., Dewi, D. N. I. P., & Putra, I. G. B. S. P. (2025). Legal awareness level of Electronic Information and Transaction Law viewed from understanding and legal attitude aspects among students at SMA Negeri 1 Gianyar. *Jurnal Media Komunikasi Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 7(1), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jmpppkn.v7i1.6075>
- Hertogh, M. (2023). Relational legal consciousness in the punitive welfare state: How Dutch welfare officials shape clients' perceptions of law. *Law & Society Review*, 57(3), 293–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12663>
- Hidayah, Y., Simatupang, E., & Belladonna, A. P. (2022). Pembudayaan nilai-nilai Pancasila dalam konsep etika ruang digital di era post-pandemi. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 2(2), 208–215. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v2i2.91>
- Hough, M., Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Myhill, A., & Quinton, P. (2010). Procedural justice, trust, and institutional legitimacy. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 4(3), 203–210. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paq027>
- Karimullah, S. S. (2023). Actualization of Pancasila as an integrative paradigm in forming imagination and creativity. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 3(1), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v3i1.141>
- Kennedy, D. (1997). *A critique of adjudication: Fin de siècle*. Harvard University Press. Retrieved June 23, 2026, from <https://hls.harvard.edu/bibliography/a-critique-of-adjudication-fin-de-siecle/>
- Khasri, M. R. K. (2021). Pancasila dalam praksis sosial: “Manusia Pancasila” menjawab permasalahan masyarakat digital. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 1(1), 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v1i1.5>
- Korkmaz, Ö., Erer, E., & Erer, D. (2022). Internet access and its role on educational inequality during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Telecommunications Policy*, 46(5), 102353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2022.102353>
- Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian Hukum*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Merry, S. E. (1990). *Getting justice and getting even: Legal consciousness among working-class Americans*. University of Chicago Press. Retrieved June 25, 2026, from <https://tallons.law.utexas.edu/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=82361>
- Moleong, L. J. (2018). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

- Morfit, M. (1981). Pancasila: The Indonesian state ideology according to the New Order government. *Asian Survey*, 21(8), 838–851. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2643886>
- Muna'iah, M., Ardilansari, A., Winata, A., Rejeki, S., Maemunah, M., & Muttaqien, Z. (2023). Pengaruh nilai Pancasila dan implementasi pembelajaran berbasis proyek pendidikan dalam meningkatkan kemampuan berpikir kritis siswa. *Seminar Nasional Paedagoria*, 3, 520–526. Retrieved May 2, 2026, from <https://journal.ummat.ac.id/index.php/fkip/article/view/16427>
- OECD (2023). *PISA 2022 results (Volume I and II): Country notes—Malaysia*. OECD Publishing. Retrieved June 25, 2026, from https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/malaysia_1dbe2061-en.html
- Pramesty, A. B., Mulyono, B., Murdiono, M., & Yumanda, D. (2026). Digital citizenship understanding as a predictor of students' ethical behavior on TikTok: Evidence from Indonesian madrasah students. *Sosioedukasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan dan Sosial*, 15(2), 2384–2395. <https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/article/view/6800>
- Prasetyo, D. E. (2023). Pancasila sebagai pengembangan moral virtual dalam perspektif living ideology. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 3(2), 125–133. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v3i2.151>
- Rahmat, A. S., & Suparjana, S. (2023). Penerapan kartu kendali literasi digital sebagai penguatan profil Pelajar Pancasila berorientasi literasi di sekolah dasar. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, 3(1), 22–32. <https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v3i1.110>
- Rahmawati, H. N., & Azzahra, N. R. (2022). Meningkatkan penegakan hukum di Indonesia melalui peran pendidikan Pancasila dan kewarganegaraan. *Indigenous Knowledge*, 1(1), 1–5. Retrieved June 25, 2026, from <https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/indigenous/article/view/73625>
- Rejekiingsih, T., & al Hakimi, H. (2023). Exploring the integration of ideological values with artificial intelligence technology: A legal awareness perspective. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v20i2.64132>
- Sarikakis, K., & Winter, L. (2017). Social media users' legal consciousness about privacy. *Social Media + Society*, 3(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117695325>
- Shaffer, C. R. (2023). Context at the periphery: The rise of the critical-contextual legal education reform movement. *Cardozo Journal of Equal Rights & Social Justice*, 30(1), 55–136. Retrieved June 24, 2026, from <https://larc.cardozo.yu.edu/cardozoersj/vol30/iss1/4/>
- Silalahi, R. M., & Yuwono, U. (2018). The sustainability of Pancasila in Indonesian education system: A critical discourse analysis of legal texts on education. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 3(2), 58–78. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.03.02.4>
- Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2001). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Suparman, H. A. (2015). Pendidikan hukum humanistik. *Jurnal Wawasan Yuridika*, 32(1), 52–57. <https://doi.org/10.25072/jwy.v32i1.89>
- Supriyono, S., Nugraha, D. M., Supriatna, A., & Adha, M. M. (2022). Pemahaman mahasiswa terkait materi mata kuliah Pendidikan Pancasila dalam menghadapi era Society 5.0. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 7(3), 617–627. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um019v7i3p617-627>
- Tektona, R. I. (2022). Kebijakan pendidikan kewarganegaraan dalam era disrupsi globalisasi. *Waskita: Jurnal Pendidikan Nilai dan Pembangunan Karakter*, 6(1), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.waskita.2022.006.01.6>
- Tjeppy, T. (2021). Learning civic education on students' legal awareness. *Jurnal Civics:*

- Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 18(1), 97–108.
<https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v18i1.38602>
- Trianto, A., Rosida, N., & Wijaya, E. (2023). Critical legal studies: Understanding the relationship between business interests, government and law. *Mendapo: Journal of Administrative Law*, 4(2), 134–151. <https://doi.org/10.22437/mendapo.v4i2.24794>
- Twemlow, J. (2023). Let me introduce my friend, law: A pedagogical tool for supporting diversity and critical thinking in the legal classroom. *The Law Teacher*, 57(3), 239–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2023.2200712>
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400828609>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Media and information literate citizens: Think critically, click wisely*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377068>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO. Retrieved May 2, 2026, from <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/technology>
- Unger, R. M. (1986). *The critical legal studies movement*. Harvard University Press. Retrieved June 2, 2026, from https://openlibrary.org/books/OL2718667M/The_critical_legal_studies_movement
- Wijiono, A., & Listyaningsih. (2025). The effect of problem-based learning with digital media on critical thinking skills in Pancasila Education lessons of Class VIII MTsN 1 Trenggalek. *Kajian Moral dan Kewarganegaraan*, 13(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.26740/kmkn.v13n1.p49-61>
- Williams, J. (2018). *Stand out of our light: Freedom and resistance in the attention economy*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108453004>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs. Retrieved June 25, 2026, from <https://www.hachettebookgroup.com/titles/shoshana-zuboff/the-age-of-surveillance-capitalism/9781610395694/>