

Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Social and Cultural Norms: An Integrative Review of Contemporary Evidence and Future Directions

¹Agnel Ignatius. R, ²Nethan. S, ³Santhosh. S, ⁴Mr. Dr. M. D. Amala Dhaya

1-3 Students, 4 Assistant Professor, Department of Information Technology, Loyola Institute of Technology and Science, Thovalai

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies are no longer confined to technical domains; they have permeated everyday life, reshaping social behaviors, cultural expectations, and normative frameworks at both micro and macro scales. This comprehensive review synthesizes recent theoretical and empirical work on how AI influences social norms, cultural identities, institutional practices, and ethical understandings. Key dynamics include AI's role in generating new communicative conventions, influencing collective expectations, mediating social interactions, and reshaping cultural value systems across diverse contexts. The review spans multidisciplinary perspectives—psychology, sociology, ethics, governance, and technology studies—to offer an integrated framework for understanding AI's normative impacts. Challenges such as the accelerating pace of AI relative to normative adaptation, culturally contingent responses to AI, and emergent forms of AI-mediated social regulation are examined. By synthesizing recent advances and pointing to future research needs, this article provides a roadmap for scholars, policymakers, and technologists seeking to understand and guide the co-evolution of AI and human norms.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, social norms, cultural change, ethical frameworks, human-AI interaction, normative adaptation, sociotechnical systems.

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence systems have moved from being technical curiosities to integral parts of how societies organize, communicate, and coordinate behavior. The adoption of machine learning, large language models (LLMs), and autonomous agents has contributed to fundamental changes in how individuals and communities interpret norms of communication, cooperation, and cultural expression. This review articulates foundational concepts and evolving scholarly insights into the dynamic interplay between AI technologies and socio-cultural norms.

Research on AI's societal impacts is rapidly expanding, capturing ethical, legal, and governance challenges and framing them within broader social change processes [7]. A nuanced understanding of norms—shared expectations about appropriate behavior—is critical to understanding how AI affects cultures and communities.

Beyond adoption rates, scholars increasingly emphasize norm internalization as a critical dimension of AI integration. As AI-mediated systems become routine, users often cease to consciously reflect on their normative implications, embedding algorithmic decision-making into taken-for-granted social practices. This normalization process mirrors earlier technological shifts, such as the rise of mass media and digital platforms, but differs in its scale and speed. The resulting compression of normative adaptation timelines raises questions about societal capacity to deliberate, contest, and revise emerging norms in a democratic manner.

2. Conceptual Foundations

2.1 Defining Social and Cultural Norms

Social norms are informal rules shared by members of a community that guide behavior in social contexts, shaping expectations of cooperation, communication, and reciprocity. Cultural norms extend beyond behaviors into collective beliefs, values, and symbolic systems that characterize groups and societies.

Contemporary norm theory distinguishes between descriptive norms (what people commonly do) and injunctive norms (what people believe ought to be done). AI systems can influence both simultaneously, for example by shaping perceptions of common behavior through recommendation systems while implicitly endorsing certain actions through design defaults. This dual influence complicates normative analysis, as individuals may conform to AI-mediated practices without explicit endorsement.

2.2 AI as a Norm-Shaping Technology

AI influences norms through mediation of information, automation of decision-making, and facilitation of new forms of interaction. Systems like LLMs not only process language but also participate in communicative ecosystems where norms of expression, trust, and interpretation are negotiated. As Baronchelli notes, the rapid integration of AI technologies creates an unprecedented challenge for traditional processes of norm formation due to their faster evolution relative to human societal norms [11], [37].

The increasing deployment of AI in normative gatekeeping roles—such as content moderation, risk assessment, and eligibility screening—further intensifies its norm-shaping capacity. These systems often operationalize abstract social values (e.g., fairness or safety) into computational rules, thereby translating contested norms into enforceable mechanisms. This translation process is itself normative, embedding particular interpretations of social values into technical infrastructures.

3. Mechanisms of Norm Change Under AI Influence

3.1 Emergent Social Conventions in AI Systems

Recent empirical work reveals that collections of AI agents can develop shared communicative conventions akin to human social norms. When LLMs interact in groups, they spontaneously converge on naming conventions and social behaviors without central coordination, modeling patterns similar to human linguistic norm formation. This suggests that AI architectures themselves can generate stable behavioral patterns that may influence human expectations in mixed AI-human systems.

Multi-agent simulations show that once a convention stabilizes among AI agents, deviation becomes costly, mirroring human norm enforcement dynamics. When humans interact with such systems, they may adapt their behavior to align with AI-established conventions, effectively reversing traditional norm transmission pathways.

3.2 AI and Pro-Social Norm Compliance

Experimental research using economic games has shown that AI systems can exhibit pro-social behavior that mirrors prevailing human norms. For example, when information about human generosity is provided, AI exhibits more pro-social allocations in social dilemma tasks, indicating sensitivity to social cues in normative contexts [2]. Such findings blur the line between human-derived and AI-mediated normative compliance.

This phenomenon raises important questions about moral attribution. When AI systems comply with norms, observers may attribute intentionality or moral agency, even when behavior is the result of optimization processes. These attributions can influence expectations about accountability and responsibility in AI-assisted decision-making.

3.3 Norm Formation and Adaptation Processes

The formation of norms in human-AI ecosystems occurs through multiple channels—decentralized social interactions, formal institutional rules, or hybrid processes blending both. Because AI evolves rapidly, traditional normative mechanisms struggle to keep pace, leading to normative vacuums and contested normative spaces [11], [37].

The introduction of generative AI into academic writing illustrates such a vacuum. Initial absence of clear norms produced heterogeneous practices, ranging from outright prohibition to unregulated use. Over time, institutions have begun articulating shared expectations, demonstrating how normative stabilization follows periods of uncertainty.

4. Cultural Variability in AI Norm Responsiveness

4.1 Culturally Dependent AI Perceptions

Cultural values influence how individuals perceive and respond to AI systems. Psychological research indicates national and cultural identity shape attitudes towards AI adoption, reflecting deeper cultural frameworks about human-machine roles [13], [14]. For example, cultures with high power distance or specific gender expectations may evaluate AI differently in terms of delegation and trustworthiness [15].

These cultural differences are not merely attitudinal but also behavioral. Variations in willingness to contest algorithmic outputs, defer to automated authority, or anthropomorphize AI systems have been observed across regions, suggesting that normative alignment strategies must be culturally situated.

4.2 Socio-Cultural Engagement with Generative AI

Studies in educational settings demonstrate that socio-cultural contexts influence how people engage with generative AI tools. Subjective norms, expectations of utility, and cultural perceptions of academic integrity interact in complex ways to shape adoption patterns [1], revealing that normative influence is not monolithic across social groups.

This heterogeneity challenges universalist assumptions in AI ethics and underscores the importance of localized norm assessment when implementing AI systems in socially sensitive domains.

5. Human-AI Relational Norms and Trust

5.1 Relational Expectations in Human-AI Interaction

As AI systems assume roles traditionally filled by humans, people develop new expectations about cooperative norms in human-AI relationships. These expectations vary by relationship context—friend versus colleague versus autonomous agent—and influence norms of trust and reciprocity [3]. Understanding these relational norms is essential for designing AI systems aligned with human social expectations.

Virtual assistants framed as companions evoke expectations of empathy and continuity, whereas decision-support systems in professional settings are evaluated primarily on reliability and transparency.

5.2 Trust and Transdisciplinary Norm Research

Trust lies at the heart of human social order. The integration of AI into daily life necessitates expanded research into trust dynamics, addressing how AI affects societal trust and how trust in AI systems can be cultivated across diverse cultural and institutional settings [10]. Transdisciplinary frameworks are needed to integrate insights from psychology, governance, and technology design to understand the evolving topology of trust relationships under AI influence.

Recent work highlights calibrated trust as a normative goal, emphasizing neither blind reliance nor undue skepticism.

Achieving such calibration requires alignment between system capabilities, communicated limitations, and user expectations.

6. Ethical and Governance Dimensions of Norm Change

6.1 Ethics of Normative AI Designs

AI systems embody normative assumptions through design choices, training data, and regulatory frameworks. Ethical AI research highlights the need for fairness, transparency, and accountability in systems that influence social norms. Addressing bias and governance issues is critical, as AI systems shape perceptions of what is acceptable in social and cultural spaces.

Design-for-values approaches increasingly seek to embed ethical reflection into early development stages, recognizing that post hoc regulation is insufficient to address deeply encoded normative biases.

6.2 Normative Governance Challenges

Efforts to craft governance frameworks for AI often grapple with balancing innovation with social license and normative legitimacy. Global governance discourses portray AI as beneficial for human welfare, yet these narratives risk overlooking local cultural concerns and normative diversity [4]. Effective governance regimes require culturally sensitive approaches to regulation and participation.

International guidelines increasingly emphasize stakeholder engagement, yet implementation varies significantly across political and cultural contexts.

7. AI and Cultural Expression

7.1 Content Creation, Cultural Representation, and AI

Generative AI tools are democratizing cultural production by enabling new forms of creative expression. However, they can also reproduce and amplify dominant cultural narratives, potentially marginalizing less represented voices [12]. AI's role in shaping cultural norms extends beyond individual interactions to influence collective aesthetic and moral sensibilities.

Training data composition plays a central role in determining which cultural forms are rendered visible or invisible, making data governance a key site of cultural norm negotiation.

7.2 Emergence of New Cultural Normative Practices

AI's influence on culture is observable in various domains—media consumption, beauty standards, mental health narratives, and political communication. For instance, AI-generated imagery and algorithmically curated content may reinforce hyper-perfectionist beauty ideals, contributing to shifts in cultural norms around body image and identity.

In political communication, AI-assisted messaging can normalize micro-targeted persuasion, altering expectations about transparency and public deliberation.

8. Organizational and Institutional Norm Shifts

8.1 AI in Workplaces and Institutional Cultures

AI adoption in workplace contexts reshapes organizational norms and cultures, particularly around decision-making, collaboration, and performance evaluation. Organizations integrating AI into core work practices observe shifts in expectations for responsiveness, productivity, and accountability [6].

Algorithmic performance monitoring has redefined norms of availability and pace, often blurring boundaries between work and non-work time.

8.2 Normative Expectations in Education and Research

Academic institutions are updating normative frameworks to govern the use of AI in research, teaching, and assessment. New policies emphasize responsible use while addressing concerns such as plagiarism, integrity, and methodological rigor.

These policies increasingly distinguish between assistive and substitutive uses of AI, reflecting nuanced normative judgments rather than blanket prohibitions.

9. Theoretical Frameworks for Norm Evolution

9.1 Sociology of Knowledge and AI

AI's capacity to reflect and generate knowledge calls for sociological frameworks that account for how information systems influence collective understanding. Sociological critiques emphasize that without accounting for social context and power structures, AI reproduces existing biases rather than transcending them [8].

Knowledge produced through AI systems often carries epistemic authority, reinforcing certain worldviews while marginalizing others.

9.2 Quantum and Computational Models of Norm Genesis

Emerging theoretical work suggests applying computational frameworks, including quantum machine learning paradigms, to model social rule emergence and normative evolution. These approaches highlight the potential for cross-disciplinary methodologies in understanding AI-mediated social dynamics.

Such models offer formal tools for simulating norm stability and transition under varying conditions of uncertainty and interaction density.

10. Normative Risks and Controversies

10.1 Misinformation and Democratic Norms

AI-driven misinformation campaigns, including coordinated bot networks, challenge democratic norms by manipulating public discourse and eroding trust in institutions. These developments underscore the urgency of normative safeguards in information ecosystems.

The scale and speed of AI-generated misinformation exceed traditional fact-checking capacities, necessitating proactive normative and institutional responses.

10.2 Philosophical and Critical Perspectives

Critics argue that many AI claims overstate technological novelty and obscure underlying power dynamics, urging societal skepticism and reflective engagement with AI narratives. Such critical perspectives remind scholars to contextualize AI normative influence within broader socio-political frameworks.

Critical scholarship emphasizes that norm change driven by AI often aligns with existing economic and political interests, rather than emerging organically from societal consensus.

11. Future Research Directions

11.1 Normative Pluralism in AI Governance

Future work should explore frameworks that accommodate normative pluralism, recognizing cultural diversity in AI ethics and regulation across regions and communities.

11.2 Empirical Studies on Norm Adoption

Longitudinal and cross-cultural studies examining how norms around AI use evolve over time are needed. Mixed-methods research can elucidate how people negotiate normative expectations in dialogic engagement with AI.

11.3 Interdisciplinary Mechanisms for Norm Design

Collaborative research across disciplines—computer science, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and law—can generate integrative models of norm adaptation and AI governance that are socially robust and culturally sensitive.

12. Conclusion

The evolution of social and cultural norms under the influence of AI is complex, multifaceted, and contingent on historical, institutional, and cultural contexts. AI does not simply reflect human norms; it participates in normative processes, reshaping expectations, behaviors, and cultural meanings. Understanding this co-evolution requires interdisciplinary scholarship, culturally aware governance frameworks, and reflective design practices that respect human values without stifling innovation.

13. References

- [1] O. F. Ursavas et al., "Rethinking the importance of social norms in generative AI adoption," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 22, Art. no. 38, 2025.
- [2] "Artificial intelligence is a pro-social norm complier," *Econ. Lett.*, vol. 241, 111828, 2024.
- [3] "The need for an empirical research program regarding human-AI relational norms," *AI and Ethics*, vol. 5, pp. 71-80, 2025.
- [4] "Global governance and the normalization of artificial intelligence," *AI & SOCIETY*, vol. 39, pp. 2667-2676, 2024.
- [5] P. R. Brandao, "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Modern Society," *AI2025*, 6(8), 190, 2025.
- [6] O. T. Murire, "Artificial Intelligence and Its Role in Shaping Organizational Culture," *Adm. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 12, 316, 2024.
- [7] "Societal impacts of artificial intelligence: Ethical, legal, and governance issues," *Soc. Impacts*, vol. 3, 100040, 2024.
- [8] "Why artificial intelligence needs sociology of knowledge," *AI & SOCIETY*, vol. 40, pp. 1249-1263, 2025.
- [9] A. Essien et al., "Exploring socio-cultural influences on generative AI engagement," *Smart Learn. Environ.*, vol. 11, 63, 2024.
- [10] "A call for transdisciplinary trust research in the AI era," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.*, 2025.
- [11] A. Baronchelli, "Shaping new norms for AI," *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 379:20230028, 2024.
- [12] M. Ruckenstein, *The Feel of Algorithms*, Univ. of California Press, 2023.
- [13] "AI and culture: Culturally dependent responses," *Curr. Opin. Psychol.*, vol. 58, 101838, 2024.
- [14] "Understanding the impact of culture on teleological evaluation of delegation," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 219, 124247, 2025.
- [15] J. Kornowicz et al., "Would I regret being different? Influence of social norms on attitudes," *arXiv*, 2025.
- [16] S. Shan, "Computational Architects of Society: Quantum Machine Learning," *arXiv*, 2025.
- [17] I. Hipolito et al., "Enactive Artificial Intelligence: Subverting Gender Norms," *arXiv*, 2023.
- [18] "Experts warn of threat to democracy from 'AI bot swarms'," *The Guardian*, 2026.
- [19] "90% of college faculty believe AI is dumbing down," *NY Post*, 2026.
- [20] "Generative AI, psychiatry and the risks," *Le Monde*, 2026.
- [21] L. Floridi et al., "AI4People-An ethical framework for a good AI society," *Minds and Machines*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 689-707, 2018.
- [22] T. Hagendorff, "The ethics of AI ethics: An evaluation of guidelines," *Minds and Machines*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 99-120, 2020.
- [23] S. Jasanoff, *The Ethics of Invention: Technology and the Human Future*, New York, NY, USA: W. W. Norton & Company, 2016.
- [24] M. A. DeVito, "From editors to algorithms: A values-based approach," *Digital Journalism*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 753-773, 2017.
- [25] K. Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*, New Haven, CT, USA: Yale Univ. Press, 2021.
- [26] B. Mittelstadt et al., "The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate," *Big Data & Society*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1-21, 2016.
- [27] J. Van Dijck, T. Poell, and M. De Waal, *The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World*, Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2018.
- [28] R. Benjamin, *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*, Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 2019.
- [29] E. Brynjolfsson and A. McAfee, *The Second Machine Age*, New York, NY, USA: W. W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- [30] UNESCO, "Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence," Paris, France, 2022.
- [31] OECD, "Artificial Intelligence and Society," OECD Publishing, Paris, France, 2021.
- [32] S. Russell, *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*, New York, NY, USA: Viking Press, 2019.
- [33] D. Acemoglu and P. Restrepo, "Artificial intelligence, automation, and work," *J. Econ. Perspect.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 197-220, 2019.
- [34] M. Coeckelbergh, *AI Ethics*, Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2020.

- [35] A. Whittaker et al., "AI governance: A research agenda," Harvard Kennedy School Working Paper, 2018.
- [36] P. Dignum, Responsible Artificial Intelligence, Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2019.
- [37] A. Baronchelli and M. Loreto, "The dynamics of social conventions," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, vol. 113, no. 3, pp. 1-6, 2016.