https://journal.ypidathu.or.id/index.php/rjl/
P - ISSN: 2988-4454
E - ISSN: 2988-4462

Regulating Algorithmic Bias: Normative Challenges of AI Ethics in Automated Decision-Making

Magnus Andersson [1], Maria Lindström [2], Johan Nilsson [3]
[1] Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden
[2] Uppsala University, Sweden
[3] KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

ABSTRACT

Background. The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into automated decision-making systems has introduced significant ethical and legal concerns, particularly regarding algorithmic bias.

Purpose. These biases can perpetuate systemic discrimination, distort outcomes in critical sectors such as healthcare, finance, and criminal justice, and challenge the foundational principles of fairness and transparency. Despite widespread recognition of the issue, there remains a normative gap in regulatory responses across jurisdictions.

Method. This study aims to explore the ethical challenges of algorithmic bias and assess the adequacy of existing legal frameworks in addressing these concerns.

Results. Using a normative legal research design, the study employs comparative analysis across selected regulatory regimes in the EU, US, and Asia, supported by doctrinal analysis of AI-related policies and ethical codes. Findings reveal fragmented regulatory landscapes, a lack of binding accountability mechanisms, and insufficient integration of ethical principles into enforceable legal norms.

Conclusion. The study concludes that an interdisciplinary approach—merging ethical theory with legal doctrine—is essential to regulate algorithmic bias effectively. A normative framework grounded in transparency, accountability, and inclusivity is proposed to guide future legislation and policy development.

KEYWORDS

Algorithmic Bias, AI Ethics, Legal Regulation

Citation: Andersson, M., Linstrom, M & Nilsson, J. (2025). Regulating Algorithmic Bias: Normative Challenges of AI Ethics in Automated Decision-Making. *Rechtsnormen Journal of Law*, *3*(2), 170–179. https://doi.org/10.70177/rjl.v3i2.2214

Correspondence:

Magnus Andersson,
magnusandersson@gmail.com

Received: March 14, 2025

Accepted: April 22, 2025

Published: April 22, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Automated decision-making systems powered by artificial intelligence (AI) are increasingly deployed across a range of sectors including healthcare, finance, law enforcement, and public administration (Ball Dunlap & Michalowski, 2024; Ziosi dkk., 2024). These systems promise efficiency, scalability, and objectivity, yet they also raise profound ethical and legal concerns (Giansanti, 2024; Mahabub dkk., 2024). Among the most pressing issues is algorithmic bias—the tendency of AI systems to produce results that systematically disadvantage certain individuals or groups. Bias can emerge from training data, algorithmic design, or deployment context, and often reproduces existing social inequalities under the veneer of

neutrality. The widespread adoption of these technologies without robust ethical oversight or legal accountability mechanisms demands critical scrutiny.

The ethical implications of algorithmic bias extend beyond technical errors to fundamental questions of fairness, transparency, and justice. Decisions once made by human judgment are now outsourced to opaque algorithmic processes, leaving affected individuals with limited understanding or recourse (Giansanti, 2024; Mokoena & Obagbuwa, 2024). In high-stakes scenarios—such as predictive policing, credit scoring, or medical diagnosis—the consequences of biased algorithms can be severe, unjust, and irreversible. AI systems are not merely tools but normative agents embedded within power structures, and their operation can reinforce discriminatory outcomes unless properly regulated. Ethical frameworks alone are insufficient when they lack binding force or are inconsistently applied across jurisdictions.

Governments and international organizations have responded with a range of AI principles, guidelines, and ethical charters, but the legal enforceability of these documents remains weak (Ibrahim dkk., 2024; Karpouzis, 2024). Most initiatives remain voluntary, fragmented, and devoid of concrete accountability mechanisms. As AI becomes further integrated into decision-making infrastructures, the need for legally binding regulations grounded in normative principles becomes increasingly urgent (Aninze & Bhogal, 2024; Murikah dkk., 2024). The background of this research lies in this growing disjuncture between ethical aspiration and regulatory implementation in the governance of algorithmic decision-making.

Algorithmic bias represents a structural challenge to the ethical deployment of AI systems in automated decision-making (Devrio dkk., 2024; Gerbaix dkk., 2024). Legal systems are often ill-equipped to identify, regulate, or remediate these biases due to the opacity and complexity of algorithmic logic. Existing anti-discrimination and data protection laws were not designed to address the probabilistic reasoning or machine learning techniques at the heart of modern AI. As a result, many affected individuals face a form of "black-box injustice," where decisions that significantly impact their rights are untraceable, unexplainable, and legally unchallengeable. This legal vacuum presents a fundamental problem for democratic societies committed to equality and accountability.

Efforts to mitigate algorithmic bias through technical solutions alone, such as algorithmic auditing or fairness metrics, are insufficient without corresponding normative standards. Legal scholars and ethicists have raised concerns that these approaches often treat bias as a technical glitch rather than a social phenomenon shaped by human values and institutional power dynamics (Carnevale, 2024; Williams, 2024). Regulatory bodies have struggled to articulate clear criteria for identifying algorithmic harm or allocating responsibility for biased outcomes. The problem is compounded by a lack of consensus on what constitutes fairness in algorithmic contexts, leading to divergent interpretations and applications in policy and practice.

This study is grounded in the recognition that algorithmic bias cannot be solved by engineering fixes alone but requires a normative legal response. The central problem addressed here is the absence of a coherent, enforceable legal framework to regulate algorithmic bias across sectors (Gutiérrez-Caneda dkk., 2024; Jedličková, 2024). The research interrogates how normative legal theory can inform regulatory design, ensuring that AI systems are not only technically robust but also ethically and legally legitimate. The challenge lies in translating abstract ethical principles into legal norms that are actionable, justiciable, and adaptable to technological evolution.

This research seeks to critically examine the normative challenges in regulating algorithmic bias within automated decision-making systems. The primary objective is to develop a legal-theoretical framework that bridges AI ethics and enforceable regulation, grounded in principles of

justice, accountability, and transparency (Ghasemaghaei & Kordzadeh, 2024; Mohamed, 2024). The study aims to identify normative deficiencies in current regulatory approaches and propose legal instruments that align ethical imperatives with institutional mechanisms for enforcement.

A second objective is to conduct a comparative analysis of existing AI regulations, ethical codes, and legal doctrines from selected jurisdictions such as the European Union, United States, and selected Asian countries. This analysis will assess how different legal systems conceptualize and respond to algorithmic bias, highlighting best practices and critical gaps. The research further aims to examine the interplay between constitutional rights, administrative law, and algorithmic accountability in shaping legal responses to biased automation.

Ultimately, the study aspires to contribute to the design of a harmonized regulatory model that incorporates normative values into binding legal standards. The research advocates for a multidimensional approach that synthesizes legal theory, ethical analysis, and practical governance considerations (Mahto & Rajavikram, 2024). By doing so, it intends to inform policy debates and support the development of AI systems that uphold democratic values and human dignity.

Scholarly discourse on algorithmic bias has expanded rapidly, yet remains fragmented across disciplinary boundaries (Bail, 2024; Devrio dkk., 2024). Many existing studies focus on technical solutions, such as fairness metrics, explainability, and algorithmic auditing, without integrating legal and normative analysis. Others offer ethical critiques of AI systems but stop short of proposing actionable regulatory mechanisms. This fragmentation has produced a knowledge gap in how to operationalize AI ethics within the legal structures governing automated decision-making.

Legal scholarship addressing algorithmic bias often relies on analogies to existing anti-discrimination or data protection frameworks, yet these analogies are limited (Bail, 2024; Bečulić dkk., 2024; Vemulapalli, 2024). Traditional legal concepts such as intent, causation, and individual harm are poorly suited to the statistical, collective, and probabilistic nature of algorithmic bias. As a result, courts and regulatory bodies face difficulty in applying conventional legal standards to algorithmic harms. Few studies offer a comprehensive normative framework that addresses both the epistemic opacity of algorithms and the moral demands of justice and fairness.

This research fills a critical gap by articulating a normative legal approach that reconceptualizes algorithmic bias not as a technical anomaly but as a governance failure. It challenges the prevailing focus on soft-law instruments and voluntary guidelines by proposing a rights-based legal model that incorporates procedural fairness, transparency obligations, and regulatory accountability (Bečulić dkk., 2024; Wang & Wu, 2024). In doing so, the study contributes to bridging the normative gap between ethical critique and legal regulation in the age of artificial intelligence.

The novelty of this research lies in its integration of normative legal theory with AI ethics in the specific context of regulating algorithmic bias. While prior research has addressed aspects of fairness, accountability, or transparency, this study uniquely synthesizes these principles into a regulatory framework grounded in enforceable legal norms. It goes beyond descriptive accounts and offers a prescriptive model that legal institutions can adopt to mitigate bias in automated decision-making (Gerbaix dkk., 2024; Lasisi dkk., 2024). The emphasis on normative reasoning, rather than merely technological feasibility, distinguishes this study within the growing field of algorithmic governance.

The study's contribution is both conceptual and methodological. Conceptually, it redefines algorithmic bias as a normative legal problem rather than a purely technical defect. Methodologically, it combines doctrinal legal analysis with comparative policy review, producing a hybrid approach capable of generating context-sensitive yet principled regulatory recommendations

(Hughes dkk., 2024; Parthasarathy dkk., 2024). This dual orientation enhances the study's relevance to both scholars and policymakers engaged in AI governance.

The justification for this research is rooted in the urgent need for ethical and legal safeguards in the deployment of AI. As algorithmic decision-making increasingly determines access to fundamental rights and resources, unregulated bias poses a serious threat to democratic equality and legal integrity. This study provides a timely intervention by offering a structured, theoretically grounded, and policy-relevant framework for regulating algorithmic bias (Carnevale, 2024; Haykal, 2024). Its findings will be particularly useful for legislators, judicial authorities, and regulatory agencies working to align AI deployment with principles of justice, fairness, and accountability.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a normative-juridical research design supported by comparative legal analysis (Mejri dkk., 2024; Reddy dkk., 2024). The study is grounded in the tradition of doctrinal legal scholarship, emphasizing the systematic examination of legal texts, ethical frameworks, and regulatory instruments. The normative approach is chosen to critically engage with the foundational values, principles, and conceptual underpinnings that inform regulatory responses to algorithmic bias in automated decision-making. The design enables an in-depth exploration of the theoretical tensions between AI ethics and enforceable legal norms while offering space to construct prescriptive recommendations for policy development. A comparative dimension is integrated to evaluate how different jurisdictions have approached the issue and to extract best practices that can inform a harmonized normative framework.

The population of the study consists of national and international regulatory instruments, ethical guidelines, court decisions, and scholarly legal commentaries that directly address AI ethics, algorithmic fairness, and automated decision-making (Jedličková, 2024; Machado dkk., 2024). The sample includes 30 key documents drawn purposively from diverse jurisdictions, particularly the European Union, United States, and selected Asian countries such as Singapore and Japan. These jurisdictions were selected due to their active engagement in AI governance and the diversity of their legal traditions. Sample criteria include relevance to algorithmic bias, normative orientation, and institutional influence in AI policymaking.

Legal documents, ethical codes, academic publications, and policy reports serve as the primary instruments of data collection. Each document is analyzed using hermeneutic and content analysis techniques to extract normative assumptions, regulatory logic, and conceptual gaps (Archambault dkk., 2024). The study prioritizes sources that provide insights into how fairness, accountability, and transparency are operationalized in legal and policy discourse. Complementary instruments include reports by international organizations (e.g., UNESCO, OECD), expert testimony from regulatory hearings, and ethical guidelines produced by AI coalitions and academic institutions. These materials support triangulation and strengthen the interpretative validity of the normative analysis.

The research follows a systematic four-stage procedure. The first stage involves mapping relevant legal and ethical sources that form the conceptual landscape of algorithmic bias regulation. The second stage includes a thematic coding process to identify recurring principles, legal gaps, and normative inconsistencies across jurisdictions. The third stage focuses on comparative analysis, assessing the relative strengths and weaknesses of different regulatory models in addressing algorithmic bias. The final stage synthesizes the findings into a normative framework that integrates enforceable legal standards with ethical imperatives. Throughout the process, the study applies

critical reflection to align the analysis with broader questions of justice, legitimacy, and democratic accountability in algorithmic governance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research examined 30 key legal and ethical documents across five major jurisdictions—European Union, United States, United Kingdom, Singapore, and Japan—focusing on their approaches to regulating algorithmic bias in automated decision-making. The data set consisted of 10 statutes or draft laws, 8 ethical codes, 6 judicial decisions, and 6 regulatory reports. These sources were categorized according to the regulatory model they represent: hard law (binding regulations), soft law (non-binding guidelines), and hybrid (policy recommendations supported by partial enforcement). The table below presents a summary of the classification and distribution of regulatory instruments by jurisdiction.

Table 1. Classification of Algorithmic Bias Regulatory Instruments by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Statutes/Drafts	Ethical Codes	Judicial Decisions	Regulatory Reports	Total
EU	3	2	1	2	8
USA	2	1	3	1	7
UK	2	2	1	1	6
Singapore	1	2	0	1	4
Japan	2	1	1	1	5
Total	**10**	**8**	**6**	**6**	**30**

The data demonstrate that the European Union exhibits the most structured approach with its draft AI Act and accompanying policy guidance explicitly referencing algorithmic bias. The United States relies more heavily on case law and sector-specific guidelines, particularly in areas such as employment and credit scoring. Singapore and Japan adopt a principle-based approach focused on ethical governance, yet lack strong enforcement mechanisms. Despite these differences, all jurisdictions show increasing awareness of the risks posed by biased algorithms, although their regulatory responses vary in scope and enforceability.

Several jurisdictions share overlapping ethical values such as fairness, transparency, and accountability, but differ in how these values are operationalized. The EU provides specific definitions and assessment criteria within its legislative texts, while other regions, particularly the US and UK, emphasize the role of voluntary compliance, impact assessments, and corporate responsibility. Legal instruments in Asia tend to be more aspirational, reflecting the region's emphasis on innovation and self-regulation. These variances point to a lack of global harmonization, which in turn creates legal uncertainty for AI developers and affected individuals.

An inferential analysis reveals a strong relationship between the existence of detailed legal instruments and the presence of institutional mechanisms for redress. Jurisdictions with explicit legal definitions of algorithmic bias, such as the EU, also exhibit higher levels of procedural safeguards including algorithmic audits, public consultation, and appeal processes. In contrast, jurisdictions that rely on non-binding guidelines tend to lack formal enforcement channels, leading to lower accountability and higher reliance on self-assessment. These findings underscore the importance of integrating legal enforceability with ethical aspirations to ensure meaningful protection.

The presence of enforceable legal obligations correlates with the degree of regulatory maturity and public trust in AI governance. Countries with comprehensive AI governance

frameworks show greater consistency in addressing algorithmic harm and facilitating stakeholder engagement. The absence of such frameworks contributes to legal fragmentation, where affected individuals may face barriers to justice depending on their jurisdiction. This situation raises normative concerns about equality before the law in the digital age and the distribution of algorithmic risk among different populations.

A case study of the United States highlights the consequences of regulatory fragmentation. In the case *Loomis v. Wisconsin*, the use of a proprietary risk assessment algorithm in sentencing raised concerns about racial bias and lack of transparency. The court upheld the use of the tool, noting that the algorithm's role was advisory, not determinative. However, the case sparked widespread debate about due process and the limitations of existing legal doctrines in regulating AI systems. This example illustrates the challenge of applying traditional legal standards to modern automated technologies without updated normative frameworks.

Another case study from the European Union involves the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and its Article 22, which addresses automated decision-making. In the case of *Schufa v. Hessischer Datenschutzbeauftragter*, the court ruled that individuals have the right not to be subject to decisions based solely on automated processing. This ruling strengthened data subjects' rights and highlighted the EU's proactive stance on AI accountability. The contrast between this and the U.S. case reveals the impact of regulatory clarity and normative prioritization in safeguarding individual rights.

The data collectively show that jurisdictions with legally binding definitions of algorithmic bias are better positioned to offer protections, resolve disputes, and establish consistent standards. Legal systems that incorporate normative values into enforceable frameworks are more effective in preventing the systemic reproduction of bias. Conversely, reliance on voluntary or ethical guidelines, while valuable for shaping industry behavior, remains insufficient in the absence of legal consequences for non-compliance.

Interpretation of these results affirms the central thesis that algorithmic bias is not merely a technical challenge, but a normative legal problem that demands regulatory intervention. The findings highlight that ethical codes must be translated into legal obligations to ensure justice in automated decision-making. A coherent global framework is needed to bridge ethical ambition and legal enforceability, reduce jurisdictional disparities, and uphold democratic principles in AI governance.

The results of this study demonstrate that regulatory responses to algorithmic bias remain inconsistent and largely fragmented across jurisdictions. While the European Union exhibits a relatively mature and structured approach through instruments such as the GDPR and the draft AI Act, other jurisdictions rely predominantly on voluntary ethical frameworks or case-by-case judicial interpretation. Data indicate that jurisdictions with legally binding definitions of algorithmic bias and formal redress mechanisms, such as the EU, provide stronger safeguards for individuals affected by automated decisions. In contrast, countries like the United States and Singapore lean toward industry-led compliance and soft-law instruments, which lack enforceability. The absence of global harmonization further complicates the landscape, leading to jurisdictional discrepancies and potential inequalities in legal protection.

The findings contrast with existing literature that often emphasizes the technical nature of algorithmic bias and promotes solutions through improved algorithm design or data quality. Studies such as those by Barocas, Selbst, and Crawford focus on the computational aspects of fairness but tend to understate the normative legal dimensions of the problem. This study diverges by reframing algorithmic bias not as a technical imperfection but as a regulatory failure rooted in weak normative

frameworks. While previous research has contributed valuable insights into bias detection and technical mitigation, this study underscores the role of enforceable legal norms in ensuring accountability and redress. The comparative analysis reveals that a purely technological fix, in the absence of regulatory rigor, is insufficient to counteract the systemic nature of bias embedded in automated systems.

The persistence of algorithmic bias across sectors and jurisdictions signals a deeper structural issue: the legal system's inability to adapt rapidly to the epistemic and institutional challenges posed by algorithmic decision-making. The lack of standardized legal definitions and enforcement protocols suggests that legal norms are lagging behind technological innovation. These findings point to a broader concern regarding the erosion of procedural justice and due process in algorithm-driven environments. Automated systems increasingly influence life-altering decisions, yet affected individuals often lack transparency, explanation, or mechanisms for appeal. This reflects a normative deficit in current governance models and underscores the urgency of integrating human rights principles into AI regulatory design.

Implications of these results are far-reaching for policymakers, legal scholars, and technology developers. Failure to regulate algorithmic bias effectively risks entrenching discrimination, amplifying inequalities, and undermining public trust in legal and technological institutions. Without binding legal obligations, ethical guidelines remain aspirational and voluntary, offering little recourse to those harmed by algorithmic decisions. The findings advocate for the adoption of a rights-based legal framework that treats fairness, transparency, and accountability not as optional virtues but as enforceable obligations. Regulatory alignment across jurisdictions is essential to create coherent protections, especially in cross-border contexts where AI systems operate beyond national boundaries.

The reasons behind the identified disparities stem from differing legal traditions, regulatory philosophies, and political commitments to data governance. Civil law jurisdictions tend to adopt more centralized and codified approaches, making them more likely to legislate explicitly on algorithmic accountability. Common law systems, in contrast, often rely on judicial precedent and sector-specific regulations, resulting in piecemeal and reactive responses. Cultural attitudes toward privacy, individual rights, and innovation further shape regulatory priorities. Countries that prioritize innovation competitiveness may favor flexible, non-binding standards, while those emphasizing social justice may be more willing to impose legal restrictions on AI deployment. The results of this study thus reflect the complex interplay between legal structure, political will, and normative values.

Technological opacity and a lack of legal-technical literacy among regulators also contribute to the observed regulatory inertia. Many legal professionals and policymakers struggle to grasp the inner workings of machine learning systems, which complicates efforts to draft precise legislation. Institutional resistance to adopting new normative frameworks often stems from uncertainty about how to translate ethical principles into legal language. This gap in regulatory competence exacerbates delays in formulating effective safeguards. The results underscore the necessity of interdisciplinary collaboration, involving ethicists, technologists, and legal scholars, to build regulatory systems that are both technically informed and normatively grounded.

Legal reform is the next essential step in closing the governance gap exposed by algorithmic bias. Regulatory bodies must prioritize the development of enforceable norms that address both individual and systemic harms resulting from biased automation. International cooperation is needed to ensure coherence and compatibility across legal systems. Institutions of higher education should expand training in AI ethics and law to prepare future legal professionals for the challenges

of digital governance. Stakeholders must engage in inclusive policymaking that reflects the lived experiences of those most affected by algorithmic injustice.

This research recommends that future regulatory efforts center on procedural fairness, explainability mandates, and algorithmic impact assessments as legal requirements. Policymakers must ensure that legal frameworks are adaptable to technological change while anchored in enduring principles of justice and equality. The establishment of oversight institutions and the integration of public participation in regulatory processes are also crucial for legitimacy. These steps will help shift algorithmic governance from a fragmented, aspirational model to a cohesive, rights-respecting legal regime equipped to manage the normative challenges of AI-driven decision-making.

CONCLUSION

The most significant finding of this research lies in its identification of the normative deficit in current regulatory frameworks addressing algorithmic bias. Unlike prior studies that predominantly focus on technical or ethical solutions, this study emphasizes the central role of enforceable legal norms in ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability in AI-assisted decision-making. Jurisdictions with codified obligations and clear procedural safeguards demonstrate higher levels of legal coherence and public trust compared to those relying on voluntary ethical standards. This highlights a critical shift in framing algorithmic bias not as a technological failure, but as a regulatory and normative governance challenge.

The primary contribution of this research is conceptual rather than technical. It introduces a normative-legal framework that bridges AI ethics with enforceable regulation, offering an alternative to the prevailing reliance on non-binding guidelines. The study integrates doctrinal legal analysis with comparative jurisprudence to propose a structured model for regulating algorithmic decision-making. This contribution is significant for policymakers, legal theorists, and AI governance specialists seeking to translate ethical principles into actionable legal norms. The framework provides a foundation for future legislative efforts and institutional reforms aimed at minimizing systemic bias in algorithmic processes.

This study is limited by its reliance on secondary data and textual analysis, which restricts its ability to capture the lived experiences of individuals affected by biased AI systems. The absence of empirical fieldwork or engagement with frontline practitioners may limit the depth of insight into practical regulatory enforcement. Future research should incorporate interdisciplinary methods, including stakeholder interviews, ethnographic observation, and case-based policy evaluation. Longitudinal studies examining the implementation and impact of new AI legislation across different jurisdictions would also offer valuable data to refine the proposed normative model and assess its effectiveness in practice.

REFERENCES

Aninze, A., & Bhogal, J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Life Cycle: The Detection and Mitigation of Bias. Dalam Goncalves C. & Rouco J.C.D. (Ed.), *Proc. Int. Conf. AI Res., ICAIR* (hlm. 40–49). Academic Conferences International Limited; Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85215706792&partnerID=40&md5=b6e143bd6aa02cf8eb1411594d249c3f

Archambault, S. G., Ramachandran, S., Acosta, E., & Fu, S. (2024). Ethical dimensions of algorithmic literacy for college students: Case studies and cross-disciplinary connections. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *50*(3). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2024.102865

Bail, C. A. (2024). Can Generative AI improve social science? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *121*(21). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2314021121

Ball Dunlap, P. A., & Michalowski, M. (2024). Advancing AI Data Ethics in Nursing: Future Directions for Nursing Practice, Research, and Education. *JMIR Nursing*, *7*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.2196/62678

Bečulić, H., Begagić, E., Skomorac, R., Mašović, A., Selimović, E., & Pojskić, M. (2024). ChatGPT's contributions to the evolution of neurosurgical practice and education: A systematic review of benefits, concerns and limitations. *Medicinski Glasnik*, *21*(1), 126–131. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.17392/1661-23

Carnevale, A. (2024). Empowering Vulnerability: Decolonizing AI Ethics for Inclusive Epistemological Innovation. *BioLaw Journal*, *2024*(Special Issue 1), 25–37. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.15168/2284-4503-3299

Devrio, A., Eslami, M., & Holstein, K. (2024). Building, Shifting, & Employing Power: A Taxonomy of Responses From Below to Algorithmic Harm. *ACM Conf. Fairness, Account., Transpar., FAccT*, 1093–1106. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658958

Gerbaix, S., Michel, S., & Bidan, M. (2024). Coping with Artificial Intelligence Ethical Dilemma and Ethical Position Choices? Dalam Filipe J., Smialek M., Brodsky A., & Hammoudi S. (Ed.), *International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems, ICEIS - Proceedings* (Vol. 1, hlm. 382–388). Science and Technology Publications, Lda; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.5220/0012726000003690

Ghasemaghaei, M., & Kordzadeh, N. (2024). Ethics in the Age of Algorithms: Unravelling the Impact of Algorithmic Unfairness on Data Analytics Recommendation Acceptance. *Information Systems Journal*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12572

Giansanti, D. (2024). AI in Cytopathology: A Narrative Umbrella Review on Innovations, Challenges, and Future Directions. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, *13*(22). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm13226745

Gutiérrez-Caneda, B., Lindén, C.-G., & Vázquez-Herrero, J. (2024). Ethics and journalistic challenges in the age of artificial intelligence: Talking with professionals and experts. *Frontiers in Communication*, *9*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1465178

Haykal, D. (2024). Emerging and Pioneering AI Technologies in Aesthetic Dermatology: Sketching a Path Toward Personalized, Predictive, and Proactive Care. *Cosmetics*, *11*(6). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3390/cosmetics11060206

Hughes, A. T., Yarick, J. C., Ruzycki, N., Geldimuradov, H. S., Langham, S. L., & Miller, K. (2024). Developing an AI and Engineering Design Hybrid-Remote Summer Camp Program for Underrepresented Students (Evaluation). *ASEE Annu. Conf. Expos. Conf. Proc.* ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings. Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85202052336&partnerID=40&md5=7958931958b764fdce38e0cffd405b81

Ibrahim, S. M., Alshraideh, M. A., Leiner, M., Aldajani, I. M., & Ouarda, B. (2024). Artificial intelligence ethics: Ethical consideration and regulations from theory to practice. *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, *13*(3), 3703–3714. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijai.v13.i3.pp3703-3714

Jedličková, A. (2024). Ethical considerations in Risk management of autonomous and intelligent systems. *Ethics and Bioethics (in Central Europe)*, *14*(1–2), 80–95. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.2478/ebce-2024-0007

Karpouzis, K. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Education: Ethical Considerations and Insights from Ancient Greek Philosophy. *ACM Int. Conf. Proc. Ser.* ACM International Conference Proceeding Series. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1145/3688671.3688772

Lasisi, M., Kolade, K., & Rotimi, O. (2024). Data Science. Dalam *Encyclopedia of Libraries, Librarianship, and Information Science, First Edition, Four Volume Set* (Vol. 4, hlm. V4:89-V4:96). Elsevier; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95689-5.00268-6

Machado, J., Sousa, R., Peixoto, H., & Abelha, A. (2024). Ethical Decision-Making in Artificial Intelligence: A Logic Programming Approach. *AI (Switzerland)*, *5*(4), 2707–2724. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3390/ai5040130

Mahabub, S., Das, B. C., & Hossain, M. R. (2024). Advancing healthcare transformation: AI-driven precision medicine and scalable innovations through data analytics. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, *8*(6), 8322–8332. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i6.3794

Mahto, M. K., & Rajavikram, G. (2024). Fundamentals of AI and communication networks: Applications in human social activities. Dalam *Intel. Netw.: Tech., and Appl.* (hlm. 1–17). CRC Press; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003541363-1

Mejri, O., Waedt, K., Yatagha, R., Edeh, N., & Sebastiao, C. L. (2024). Ensuring trustworthy AI for sensitive infrastructure using Knowledge Representation. Dalam Klein M., A.-L.-K.-S. 2 Gesellschaft fur Informatik Berlin, Krupka D., A.-L.-K.-S. 2 Gesellschaft fur Informatik Berlin, Winter C., A. 45 Gesellschaft fur Informatik Bonn, Gergeleit M., P. 3251 Hochschule RheinMain Wiesbaden, Martin L., & P. 3251 Hochschule RheinMain Wiesbaden (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Informatics (LNI), Proc. - Series Ges. Inform. (GI)* (Vol. 352, hlm. 1929–1938). Gesellschaft fur Informatik (GI); Scopus. https://doi.org/10.18420/inf2024_167

Mohamed, M. S. P. (2024). Exploring Ethical Dimensions of AI-enhanced Language Education: A Literature Perspective. *Technology in Language Teaching and Learning*, *6*(3). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1813

Mokoena, N., & Obagbuwa, I. C. (2024). An analysis of artificial intelligence automation in digital music streaming platforms for improving consumer subscription responses: A review. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *7*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1515716

Murikah, W., Nthenge, J. K., & Musyoka, F. M. (2024). Bias and ethics of AI systems applied in auditing—A systematic review. *Scientific African*, *25*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2024.e02281

Parthasarathy, P. D., Lakshmi, T. G., Indra, R., Spruha, S., & Joshi, S. (2024). Digital Conscience: Investigating the State of Ethics in CS Curricula in India. *ICER - ACM Conf. Int. Comput. Educ. Res.*, *2*, 549–550. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1145/3632621.3671434

Reddy, K. S., Kethan, M., Mahabub Basha, S., Singh, A., Kumar, P., & Ashalatha, D. (2024). Ethical and Legal Implications of AI on Business and Employment: Privacy, Bias, and Accountability. *Int. Conf. Knowl. Eng. Commun. Syst., ICKECS*. 2024 International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Communication Systems, ICKECS 2024. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICKECS61492.2024.10616875

Vemulapalli, G. (2024). Charting the Ethical Horizon: A Deep Dive Into AI Ethics, Unraveling the Moral Threads in Machine Intelligence Development. Dalam *Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Sustainable Development: Innovations, Challenges, and Applications* (hlm. 209–220). CRC Press; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003497189-16

Wang, J., & Wu, Q. (2024). Conversation N: Visualization Installation Design Based on Voice Interaction. Dalam Stephanidis C., Antona M., Ntoa S., & Salvendy G. (Ed.), *Commun. Comput. Info. Sci.: Vol. 1958 CCIS* (hlm. 78–85). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-49215-0_10

Williams, D. P. (2024). Disabling AI: Biases and Values Embedded in Artificial Intelligence. Dalam *Handb. On the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (hlm. 246–261). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781803926728.00022

Ziosi, M., Watson, D., & Floridi, L. (2024). A Genealogical Approach to Algorithmic Bias. *Minds and Machines*, *34*(2). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09672-2