AI and Human Dignity

Maku Samuel Ateri*, Sr. Dr. Ukaegbu Chinenyenwa Silver, Nwafor Oluebube Christian

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1306000012

Received: 28 May 2026; Accepted: 03 June 2026; Published: 17 June 2026

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across multiple societal domains presents both remarkable benefits and pressing ethical challenges, particularly regarding human dignity—a foundational ethical principle underscoring the intrinsic worth and respect due to every individual. AI systems today influence areas ranging from privacy and autonomy to healthcare, employment, and social relations, often posing threats to personal dignity. AI-driven surveillance technologies and data analytics are reshaping the boundaries of personal privacy, raising concerns over autonomy, consent, and the right to be free from excessive monitoring. In decision-making processes, algorithms used in legal, hiring, and financial sectors can perpetuate biases, resulting in unfair outcomes that threaten individuals' agency and sense of justice. In healthcare, while AI enhances diagnostic precision and treatment options, it risks depersonalizing patient care, potentially undermining empathy and respect in patient-provider interactions. Furthermore, automation and AI-driven efficiencies in the workforce contribute to job displacement, affecting individuals' social identity and economic stability, challenging their dignity and self-worth. The cultural impact of AI extends to reinforcing stereotypes, particularly within marginalized communities, as algorithmic biases shape societal perceptions. This article explores these critical intersections between AI and human dignity, advocating for the development of ethical frameworks and regulatory policies that prioritize individual rights, fair treatment, and well-being. By rigorously examining AI's transformative effects, this study aims to build a foundation for ensuring that technological progress aligns with the protection of human dignity, proposing pathways for responsible AI development that respects and upholds humanity's fundamental values.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Human Dignity, Privacy, Autonomy, Healthcare, Employment, Ethics, Bias, Algorithmic Decision-Making, Surveillance, Social Justice

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies has transformed numerous aspects of contemporary life, impacting sectors such as healthcare, finance, education, and social services. AI, defined as the simulation of human intelligence processes by machines, including learning, reasoning, and self-correction, has ushered in unprecedented efficiencies and capabilities (Russell & Norvig, 2021). For instance, AI systems are now capable of analyzing vast datasets to identify patterns and make predictions, often exceeding human performance in specific tasks, such as diagnosing diseases or optimizing supply chains (Topol, 2019). However, the widespread deployment of AI raises significant ethical concerns, particularly regarding its implications for human dignity.

Human dignity is a fundamental principle that recognizes the intrinsic worth of every individual, emphasizing respect, autonomy, and moral consideration (Miller, 2001). Rooted in philosophical discourse and enshrined in various human rights frameworks, human dignity serves as a cornerstone of ethical reasoning and social justice (Kant, 1785; Habermas, 2010). As AI systems increasingly influence critical decisions in our lives, such as those related to employment, healthcare, and criminal justice, the potential for these technologies to either enhance or undermine human dignity becomes a pressing issue.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

This paper seeks to explore the intersections of AI and human dignity across several domains, including privacy, healthcare, employment, and decision-making. It aims to critically analyze the ethical challenges posed by AI technologies, such as surveillance, algorithmic bias, and the erosion of personal autonomy. Ultimately, this study advocates for the development of ethical frameworks and policies that prioritize human dignity, ensuring that technological advancements serve to enhance, rather than diminish, individual rights and well-being.

Understanding Human Dignity in the Age of AI

Human dignity is a multifaceted concept that encompasses the intrinsic value of each person, affirming their right to respect, autonomy, and fair treatment. This principle is deeply rooted in philosophical thought, legal frameworks, and human rights discourse, establishing a foundation for ethical interactions in society (Miller, 2001). Immanuel Kant's ethical philosophy serves as a pivotal reference point, asserting that all human beings possess inherent worth due to their capacity for rational thought and moral agency (Kant, 1785). Kant posited that individuals should never be treated merely as means to an end but rather as ends in themselves, emphasizing the necessity of respecting individual autonomy and dignity.

In contemporary society, the importance of human dignity is underscored by its inclusion in various human rights instruments, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which asserts that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights" (United Nations, 1948). This legal recognition reinforces the idea that dignity is a fundamental human characteristic that must be upheld, regardless of an individual's circumstances or societal status.

However, the advent of AI presents both opportunities and challenges to the principle of human dignity. As AI systems become increasingly autonomous, making decisions that significantly impact human lives, concerns arise regarding the potential for dehumanization and the erosion of individual rights (Bostrom, 2014). For example, when individuals are reduced to mere data points in algorithmic processes, their unique identities and experiences may be overlooked, leading to decisions that disregard their dignity.

Moreover, the deployment of AI in various domains—such as healthcare, criminal justice, and employment—can result in systemic biases that disproportionately affect marginalized communities, further challenging the notion of equality and respect inherent in the concept of dignity (Obermeyer et al., 2019). As AI continues to evolve, it is essential to critically examine how these technologies interact with the principle of human dignity, ensuring that the development and implementation of AI align with ethical standards that prioritize individual rights and humanity's inherent value.

Privacy and Surveillance

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in surveillance systems has fundamentally altered the landscape of privacy, raising significant ethical concerns regarding individual rights and human dignity. Surveillance technologies, including facial recognition and data analytics, have been adopted in various sectors, from law enforcement to public safety, promising enhanced security and efficiency (Zuboff, 2019). However, the pervasive nature of these technologies can infringe upon personal privacy, creating environments where individuals are constantly monitored and their actions recorded.

Privacy is a cornerstone of human dignity, as it safeguards individuals' autonomy and control over their personal information (Nissenbaum, 2010). When surveillance systems are deployed without adequate oversight, individuals may feel a diminished sense of agency and freedom. For instance, the use of facial recognition technology in public spaces allows authorities to track individuals without their consent, often leading to feelings of vulnerability and dehumanization (Feldstein, 2019). This constant monitoring can result in self-censorship, where individuals modify their behavior due to the awareness of being observed, ultimately undermining their dignity and sense of self-expression.

Moreover, the implementation of AI-driven surveillance disproportionately impacts marginalized communities, exacerbating existing inequalities and systemic biases (Andrejevic, 2020). For example, data from facial recognition systems have shown higher error rates in identifying individuals from minority groups, leading to misidentifications and unjust consequences (Garvie et al., 2016). This raises critical questions about

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

accountability and fairness in AI technologies, particularly regarding who is surveilled and who has the power to control these technologies.

As governments and corporations continue to leverage AI for surveillance purposes, it is imperative to establish ethical frameworks and policies that prioritize human dignity and privacy rights. This includes implementing regulations that govern data collection, ensuring transparency in surveillance practices, and fostering public discourse on the ethical implications of AI technologies. By emphasizing the protection of individual rights, society can navigate the challenges posed by AI surveillance while upholding the fundamental principle of human dignity.

AI in Healthcare

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing the healthcare sector by enhancing diagnostic capabilities, streamlining administrative processes, and personalizing treatment plans. With the ability to analyze vast amounts of medical data rapidly, AI systems have demonstrated remarkable proficiency in identifying diseases, predicting patient outcomes, and supporting clinical decision-making (Topol, 2019). For instance, AI algorithms have been employed in medical imaging to detect conditions such as cancer at earlier stages, leading to improved patient outcomes and survival rates (Esteva et al., 2017). The integration of AI into healthcare has the potential to enhance efficiency, reduce costs, and improve access to medical services, thereby promoting better health outcomes for populations.

However, the deployment of AI in healthcare raises significant ethical challenges that threaten the principle of human dignity. One primary concern is the potential depersonalization of patient care. As AI systems increasingly assume roles traditionally occupied by healthcare professionals, the risk of reducing the patient experience to a transactional interaction escalates (Verghese, 2018). The essence of medical practice lies in the human connection—empathy, compassion, and understanding—which can be diminished when AI systems are relied upon excessively. This shift may undermine the dignity of patients, as they are viewed not as individuals with unique experiences and emotions but rather as data points within an algorithm.

Additionally, AI systems are susceptible to biases that can lead to inequitable treatment outcomes. Research has shown that algorithms trained on historical data reflecting systemic inequities may perpetuate these biases in medical recommendations (Obermeyer et al., 2019). For instance, algorithms designed to predict healthcare needs have been found to underestimate the medical needs of Black patients compared to their white counterparts, exacerbating existing disparities in healthcare access and treatment (Obermeyer et al., 2019). Such biases not only undermine the principle of equal treatment but also threaten the dignity of individuals from marginalized communities, reinforcing a system where their needs are overlooked.

To address these ethical challenges, it is imperative to develop robust guidelines for the implementation of AI in healthcare that prioritize human dignity and ethical considerations. This includes ensuring transparency in algorithmic decision-making, incorporating diverse data sets to mitigate bias, and fostering collaborative relationships between AI systems and healthcare professionals. By maintaining a focus on the human aspect of healthcare, the integration of AI can enhance patient care while respecting the dignity of all individuals.

AI in Employment

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the workplace is transforming the nature of work across various industries. AI technologies are being utilized to automate repetitive tasks, enhance productivity, and improve decision-making processes. While these advancements promise significant efficiencies and cost savings, they also raise critical concerns about job displacement and the impact on human dignity (Arntz, Gregory, & Zierahn, 2016). As AI systems increasingly take over tasks traditionally performed by humans, workers may face significant challenges in adapting to a rapidly changing labor market.

One of the primary concerns associated with AI in employment is the potential for job loss and economic inequality. According to a report by the McKinsey Global Institute, it is estimated that up to 375 million workers may need to switch occupational categories due to automation (McKinsey Global Institute, 2017). This displacement not only affects individuals' livelihoods but also threatens their sense of purpose and identity, which

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

are often closely tied to their work. The dignity of work—a concept rooted in the idea that meaningful employment is essential to human flourishing—can be compromised when individuals are forced out of jobs or relegated to precarious forms of employment (Sennett, 2006).

Moreover, the implementation of AI in recruitment and performance evaluation processes raises additional ethical concerns. AI-driven hiring algorithms can inadvertently perpetuate existing biases if they are trained on historical data that reflects societal prejudices (O'Neil, 2016). For example, algorithms that prioritize certain educational backgrounds or work experiences may disproportionately disadvantage candidates from marginalized communities, limiting their access to opportunities and perpetuating systemic inequality. This lack of transparency in AI decision-making processes further exacerbates feelings of disenfranchisement and loss of dignity among affected individuals (Pasquale, 2015).

To ensure that the deployment of AI in the workforce upholds human dignity, it is crucial to adopt policies that prioritize retraining and upskilling programs for displaced workers, fostering an environment where individuals can adapt to new roles and industries. Additionally, organizations should implement ethical guidelines for the use of AI in hiring and evaluation processes, ensuring that algorithms are designed to promote fairness and equity. By taking proactive measures, society can navigate the challenges posed by AI in employment while preserving the dignity of all workers.

AI in Decision-Making

The deployment of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in decision-making processes has profound implications for various sectors, including criminal justice, finance, and public policy. AI algorithms are increasingly utilized to inform critical decisions, from predicting criminal behavior to assessing creditworthiness and allocating resources for social services. While these technologies can enhance efficiency and objectivity, they also raise ethical concerns that challenge the principles of human dignity and fairness (Binns, 2018).

In the realm of criminal justice, AI systems are employed for predictive policing, where algorithms analyze historical crime data to forecast potential criminal activity in specific areas (Lum & Isaac, 2016). However, reliance on these algorithms can lead to biased outcomes, particularly when they are trained on data that reflect existing inequalities within the justice system. For instance, if an algorithm is fed data from historically over-policed neighborhoods, it may disproportionately target individuals from marginalized communities, perpetuating cycles of discrimination and undermining their dignity (Angwin et al., 2016). The implications are dire, as such practices can lead to increased surveillance, wrongful arrests, and erosion of trust in law enforcement.

Similarly, in the financial sector, AI-driven algorithms are used to assess loan applications and credit scores, often without transparency regarding the criteria used in these decisions (Kleinberg et al., 2018). This lack of clarity can result in discrimination against individuals from lower socioeconomic backgrounds or minority groups, who may be unfairly deemed high-risk despite their qualifications. The dignity of individuals seeking financial assistance is compromised when decisions are made based on opaque criteria that fail to consider their unique circumstances and potential.

Moreover, the use of AI in public policy decisions poses additional challenges. Automated systems are increasingly relied upon to allocate resources and design social programs, yet these algorithms can reinforce biases present in historical data (Zou & Schiebinger, 2018). The absence of human oversight in these processes risks overlooking the complex social dynamics that contribute to inequality, ultimately leading to policies that do not adequately serve all segments of the population.

To navigate the ethical implications of AI in decision-making, it is essential to establish frameworks that prioritize accountability, transparency, and fairness. Stakeholders must engage in collaborative efforts to ensure that AI technologies are designed to respect human dignity, integrating diverse perspectives in their development and implementation. By fostering a more equitable approach to AI decision-making, society can harness the potential of these technologies while safeguarding the rights and dignity of all individuals.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

The Role of Regulation and Ethical Guidelines

As the influence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) expands across various sectors, the establishment of regulatory frameworks and ethical guidelines becomes increasingly vital to safeguard human dignity. The rapid development and deployment of AI technologies pose unique challenges, including the potential for discrimination, privacy violations, and dehumanization. Without appropriate oversight, these technologies can reinforce societal inequities and undermine the core principles of respect and autonomy that underpin human dignity (Crawford & Calo, 2016).

Regulatory measures must prioritize transparency and accountability in AI systems. This includes mandating that organizations disclose the algorithms used in decision-making processes and the data sets employed to train these systems. Transparency enables individuals to understand how their data is used and the rationale behind algorithmic decisions, fostering trust and allowing for informed consent (Jobin, Ienca, & Andorno, 2019). Furthermore, accountability mechanisms should be established to address instances of bias or harm resulting from AI technologies. By creating avenues for redress, individuals can assert their rights and dignity in the face of algorithmic injustices.

In addition to regulatory frameworks, the development of ethical guidelines is essential for guiding AI practitioners and organizations in responsible technology design and deployment. Various organizations, including the European Commission, have proposed ethical principles for AI that emphasize human-centered approaches, promoting fairness, accountability, and respect for fundamental rights (European Commission, 2019). These principles advocate for the inclusion of diverse perspectives in AI development, recognizing that marginalized communities often bear the brunt of AI's adverse impacts.

Moreover, interdisciplinary collaboration is crucial in formulating effective regulations and ethical guidelines. Policymakers, technologists, ethicists, and community representatives must engage in dialogue to identify potential risks and establish best practices. By integrating diverse expertise and experiences, regulatory frameworks can be designed to effectively address the complex challenges posed by AI technologies.

Ultimately, the role of regulation and ethical guidelines in AI development cannot be overstated. By prioritizing human dignity and fostering responsible innovation, society can harness the benefits of AI while mitigating its risks. This proactive approach ensures that AI technologies serve as tools for empowerment rather than instruments of oppression, upholding the inherent dignity of all individuals.

Social and Cultural Implications of Artificial Intelligence

As AI systems increasingly integrate into society, they bring about substantial social and cultural implications that affect human identity, values, and norms. These impacts are both transformative and disruptive, influencing the way people interact, perceive each other, and maintain their cultural identities.

Shifts in Human Identity and Social Roles

AI technologies have transformed traditional social roles and even what it means to be human. With AI performing tasks previously exclusive to humans—such as diagnosing illnesses, creating art, or even providing companionship—there is a growing shift in the perception of human uniqueness and expertise (Turkle, 2017). Professions once seen as irreplaceable are now being supplemented or replaced by AI, raising questions about the value of human labor and the skills that define identity. This shift challenges traditional social structures, potentially leading to a re-evaluation of career paths, skill development, and personal value (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014).

Erosion of Privacy and Personal Boundaries

With AI systems embedded in everyday devices and services, privacy concerns are at an all-time high. Social norms around personal space, confidentiality, and control over one's information are changing as people interact

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VI June 2026

with smart devices, digital assistants, and social media algorithms that continuously collect and analyze personal data (Zuboff, 2019). In cultures that highly value privacy, this constant surveillance can be unsettling, and in some societies, it raises ethical concerns about the use of personal data by corporations or governments for surveillance and behavior prediction (Nissenbaum, 2010). This trend influences social norms, as individuals may feel increasingly scrutinized or pressured to conform to specific standards online and offline (Andrejevic, 2020).

Impact on Social Inequality

AI has the potential to exacerbate existing social inequalities, often due to biases inherent in training data or algorithmic design. Historically marginalized groups may face further disadvantages, as AI technologies can reinforce stereotypes, misrepresent certain communities, or fail to recognize the nuances of various social contexts (Noble, 2018). For instance, AI applications in hiring, policing, or lending may reflect and amplify biases against racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups (Obermeyer et al., 2019). This can create a cycle where technology reinforces existing inequalities, leaving certain groups disadvantaged and further marginalized by systems that are supposed to serve everyone equitably (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018).

Influence on Cultural Narratives and Expression

The creation of art, music, and literature—traditionally human expressions of culture and individuality—is being influenced by AI's capacity to generate content. AI-produced media blurs the line between human and machine-created art, influencing cultural narratives and challenging ideas of originality and authenticity (Elgammal et al., 2017). For some, this signifies a new frontier in creativity, but for others, it raises concerns about cultural homogenization and the potential loss of unique, culturally rooted artistic traditions (Zhang & Lu, 2020). As AI learns from existing cultural products, it may inadvertently propagate dominant cultural narratives while overlooking or misrepresenting minority voices (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

Safeguarding Human Dignity in the Age of AI

Human dignity is a core ethical principle that underscores the intrinsic worth of each individual. AI technologies, given their power to shape human lives, must be developed and deployed in ways that safeguard this fundamental value.

Ensuring Respect for Autonomy and Consent

AI systems must respect individuals' autonomy by ensuring they have the power to make informed decisions about how technology interacts with them. Safeguarding human dignity means allowing individuals to consent freely and knowingly to the use of AI in areas affecting their lives, such as healthcare, finance, and legal systems (Wachter et al., 2017). Organizations should prioritize transparency in how data is collected and used, ensuring that individuals are fully aware of and agree to the extent and purpose of AI's involvement (Floridi, 2018).

Embedding Fairness and Equality in AI Design

A commitment to human dignity also requires that AI systems treat all individuals with fairness and impartiality. Designers and developers should strive to create algorithms that avoid biased outcomes and are inclusive of diverse demographics, recognizing the value of all individuals regardless of background (Jobin, Ienca, & Vayena, 2019). Ethical AI development involves testing and improving algorithms to reduce biases and making conscious efforts to include underrepresented communities in data and system design processes (Dastin, 2018).

Promoting Transparency and Accountability

For AI to align with human dignity, it must operate transparently, allowing people to understand how decisions affecting them are made. Clear and understandable explanations of AI processes can empower individuals to question, understand, and, if necessary, challenge AI decisions that impact their rights or well-being (Mittelstadt et al., 2016). Additionally, accountability structures must be in place to ensure that when AI harms individuals—whether intentionally or unintentionally—there are clear recourses for seeking redress (Coeckelbergh, 2020).

Fostering Empathy and Compassion in Human-AI Interactions

While AI lacks human emotions, its design and application can be structured to complement human empathy and compassion rather than detract from it. In contexts such as healthcare or customer service, AI should be deployed in ways that support human workers rather than replace them, maintaining the human touch in interactions where empathy is essential (Sharkey & Sharkey, 2012). Prioritizing human dignity involves recognizing the value of empathy and fostering systems that enhance, rather than erode, meaningful human connections (Turkle, 2017).

CONCLUSION

As AI technologies continue to evolve and permeate various aspects of society, they carry significant social, cultural, and ethical implications. From altering human identity and social roles to influencing privacy norms and potentially exacerbating social inequalities, AI challenges traditional values and norms in profound ways. At the same time, AI's transformative potential brings with it an opportunity to reaffirm human dignity, respect for individual autonomy, and fairness across societies.

To address these complexities, it is imperative that AI development is guided by ethical principles that prioritize human welfare and dignity. This includes fostering transparency, ensuring accountability, and embedding fairness and empathy into AI design. Safeguarding human dignity in the age of AI requires a commitment to creating technologies that serve humanity as a whole, recognizing each individual's intrinsic value and treating all people with respect and equity.

In sum, while AI has the power to revolutionize society, it also brings with it an ethical duty to handle these changes with care. As we navigate this rapidly advancing landscape, society must work collectively to shape AI's impact so that it enhances, rather than diminishes, the fundamental values that underlie a just and humane world.

REFERENCES

1. Andrejevic, M. (2020). Automating the audience: How the internet and algorithms are reshaping media. University of Chicago Press.
2. Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias. ProPublica. https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing
3. Arntz, M., Gregory, T., & Zierahn, U. (2016). The risk of automation for jobs in OECD countries: A comparative analysis. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 189. OECD Publishing.
4. Benjamin, R. (2019). Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code. Polity Press.
5. Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 149–158).
6. Bostrom, N. (2017). Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies. Oxford University Press.
7. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies. W.W. Norton & Company.
8. Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 81, 77–91.
9. Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). AI ethics. MIT Press.
10. Crawford, K., & Calo, R. (2016). There is a blind spot in AI research. Nature, 538(7625), 311–313.
11. Dastin, J. (2018). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight-idUSKCN1MK08G
12. Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M., & Mazzone, M. (2017). CAN: Creative adversarial networks, generating "art" by learning about styles and deviating from style norms. arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07068.
13. Esteva, A., et al. (2017). Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. Nature, 542(7639), 115–118.
14. European Commission. (2019). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. Retrieved from European Commission website.

15. Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.
16. Feldstein, S. (2019). The rise of digital repression: How technology is reshaping power, politics, and resistance. Oxford University Press.
17. Floridi, L. (2018). The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design. Oxford University Press.
18. Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. Harvard Data Science Review, 1(1).
19. Garvie, C., Bedoya, A., & Frankle, J. (2016). The perpetual line-up: Unregulated police face recognition in America. Georgetown Law Center on Privacy & Technology.
20. Habermas, J. (2010). The concept of human dignity and the realistic utopia of human rights. Metaphilosophy, 41(4), 464–480.
21. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399.
22. Kant, I. (1785). Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals (H. J. Paton, Trans.). Harper & Row.
23. Kleinberg, J., Mullainathan, S., & Raghavan, M. (2018). In AI we trust? In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 1–10).
24. Lum, K., & Isaac, W. (2016). To predict and serve? Significance, 13(5), 14–19.
25. McKinsey Global Institute. (2017). A future that works: Automation, employment, and productivity. McKinsey & Company.
26. Miller, S. (2001). Human rights and human dignity. Cambridge University Press.
27. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2).
28. Nissenbaum, H. (2010). Privacy in context: Technology, policy, and the integrity of social life. Stanford University Press.
29. Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. NYU Press.
30. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science, 366(6464), 447–453.
31. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown Publishing Group.
32. Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Harvard University Press.
33. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence: A modern approach. Pearson.
34. Santoni de Sio, F., & van den Hoven, J. (2018). Meaningful human control over autonomous systems: A philosophical account. Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 5, 15.
35. Sennett, R. (2006). The culture of the new capitalism. Yale University Press.
36. Sharkey, N., & Sharkey, A. (2012). The crying shame of robot nannies: An ethical appraisal. Interaction Studies, 13(3), 297–328.
37. Topol, E. (2019). Deep medicine: How artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again. Basic Books.
38. Turkle, S. (2017). Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other. Basic Books.
39. Verghese, A. (2018). How technology can restore empathy to medicine. The Atlantic.
40. Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the general data protection regulation. International Data Privacy Law, 7(3), 233–242.
41. Westin, A. F. (2003). Privacy and freedom. IG Publishing.
42. Zhang, K., & Lu, X. (2020). Understanding AI-generated art: A cultural perspective. Journal of Cultural Analytics, 5(1), 1–18.
43. Zou, J. Y., & Schiebinger, L. (2018). AI can be sexist and racist — It's time to make it fair. Nature, 559(7714), 324–326.
44. Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs.