### Ilomata International Journal of Social Science

P-ISSN: 2714-898X; E-ISSN: 2714-8998

Volume 6, Issue 1 January 2025

Page No. 310 – 320

### Biological and Social Impacts of Implementing Artificial Intelligence-Based Economic Policies: A Discourse Analysis

# Theodora Pearl De-Veer<sup>1</sup>, George Akwetey Junior<sup>2</sup>, Justa Sentre<sup>3</sup> 123 University at Albany, United State

Correspondent: pde-veer@albany.edu1

Received : October 27, 2024

Accepted : December 28, 2024

Published : January 31, 2025

Citation: De-Veer, T.P., Junior, G.A., & Sentre, J.F. (2025). Biological and Social Impacts of Implementing Artificial Intelligence-Based Economic Policies: A Discourse Analysis. Ilomata International Journal of Social Science, 6(1), 310 – 320.

https://doi.org/10.61194/ijss.v6i1.1457

ABSTRACT: This study investigates the biological and social ramifications of AI-powered economic policies, aiming to elucidate the multifaceted impacts of artificial intelligence on societal structures and health outcomes. The rapid integration of AI technologies into economic frameworks raises critical ethical concerns, including algorithmic bias and accountability, which can exacerbate existing social inequalities. Additionally, the implications for human-AI interaction in healthcare settings necessitate a deeper understanding of how these technologies affect patient outcomes and clinician practices. A discourse analysis was conducted on ten peer-reviewed articles focusing on ethical accountability, human-AI interaction, social equity, and workforce dynamics. The study revealed four primary themes: (1) Ethical and Accountability Challenges, highlighting the necessity for robust frameworks to address algorithmic bias; (2) Human-AI Interaction and Its Biological Implications, emphasizing the need for clinician training and AI literacy; (3) Social Equity and Access Issues, underscoring the risk of exacerbating existing disparities; and (4) Economic Impact and Workforce Dynamics, pointing to the dual-edged nature of AI's integration into economic policies. The findings underscore the imperative for policymakers to develop ethical guidelines and promote AI literacy while implementing strategies for workforce reskilling. By addressing these challenges, society can harness the transformative potential of AI technologies while safeguarding social equity and enhancing health outcomes.

Keywords: AI-Powered Economic Policies, Ethical Implications, Social Equity, Human-AI Interaction, Healthcare Outcomes



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

#### INTRODUCTION

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) has ushered in a transformative era for economic policies with profound social implications. As AI technologies proliferate, they are increasingly integrated into public policy frameworks, reshaping governance and economic strategies across various sectors (Fairclough, 2013). This integration raises critical questions about the implications of AI on societal structures and individual well-being. The discourse surrounding AI-powered economic policies is multifaceted, encompassing ethical considerations, governance challenges, and the

De-Veer, Junior and Sentre

potential for both positive and negative societal impacts (Kofi, 2024; Toll et al., 2020; Malmborg, 2022; Krüger & Wilson, 2022; Ulnicane et al., 2020).

The discourse analysis of AI in economic policy reveals a complex interplay between technological advancement and societal values. While many studies emphasize the benefits of AI, such as increased efficiency and improved service delivery, they often underplay the associated risks and ethical dilemmas (Toll et al., 2020; Krüger & Wilson, 2022; Toll et al., 2019). For instance, the commodification of trust in AI systems has been highlighted as a significant concern, suggesting that reliance on AI may erode public confidence in governance (Krüger & Wilson, 2022; Sigfrids et al., 2023). Furthermore, framing AI policies often reflects broader societal narratives prioritizing innovation over ethical considerations, potentially neglecting marginalized voices in policy-making (Malmborg, 2022; Roche et al., 2022).

Moreover, the biological ramifications of AI-powered economic policies cannot be overlooked. Integrating AI in sectors such as healthcare can enhance patient outcomes through improved diagnostics and personalized treatment plans (Mirbabaie et al., 2021; Wilkens, 2020). However, the reliance on AI also raises ethical questions regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the potential for dehumanization in care delivery (Mirbabaie et al., 2021; Isley, 2022). The discourse surrounding these issues is critical, as it shapes public perception and acceptance of AI technologies in sensitive areas such as health and social services (Kim et al., 2021; Mirbabaie et al., 2021; Ouchchy et al., 2020).

The rationale for this study stems from the urgent need to critically examine the implications of AI-powered economic policies within the context of contemporary societal challenges. As AI technologies become increasingly embedded in financial decision-making processes, there is a growing concern regarding their impact on social equity, individual rights, and community well-being. Despite the potential benefits of AI, such as enhanced efficiency and data-driven insights, the risks associated with algorithmic bias, privacy violations, and the erosion of democratic processes necessitate a thorough investigation (Toll et al., 2020; Malmborg, 2022; Krüger & Wilson, 2022; Ulnicane et al., 2020; Koffi, 2024). Existing literature often highlights the technological advancements and economic efficiencies brought about by AI, yet there remains a significant gap in understanding how these policies affect diverse populations and the broader social fabric (Toll et al., 2019; Sigfrids et al., 2023; Roche et al., 2022).

Furthermore, the intersection of AI and economic policy is not merely a technical issue; it is deeply intertwined with ethical considerations and societal values. For instance, the commodification of trust in AI systems raises questions about accountability and transparency in governance Mirbabaie et al., 2021; Koffi, 2024; Wilkens, 2020). This study addresses these gaps by employing a discourse analysis framework to unpack the narratives surrounding AI-powered economic policies and their biological and social ramifications. By doing so, it seeks to illuminate the complexities of AI integration in public policy and advocate for a more inclusive approach that prioritizes ethical considerations and social justice (Isley, 2022; Kim et al., 2021; Ouchchy et al., 2020). Ultimately, this research aspires to contribute to the ongoing discourse on AI governance, providing insights that can inform policymakers, practitioners, and scholars alike in navigating the challenges and opportunities presented by AI in economic contexts.

De-Veer, Junior and Sentre

#### **METHOD**

This study employs a critical discourse analysis (CDA) framework to investigate biological and social ramifications of AI-powered economic policies. CDA is particularly suited for this research as it examines how language and discourse are shaped by social power dynamics and ideologies within policy contexts (Fairclough, 2013). The methodological approach is informed by Fairclough's model of CDA, which emphasizes the interplay between discourse, social practices, and power structures (Fairclough, 2013). This framework facilitates a nuanced understanding of how economic policies are articulated and their implications for various stakeholders, particularly regarding social equity and health outcomes. A systematic search strategy was employed to identify relevant peer-reviewed articles from multiple comprehensive databases. PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore, and Google Scholar were selected as the primary databases due to their extensive coverage of interdisciplinary research, particularly in economics, artificial intelligence, healthcare, and social sciences. These databases were systematically searched using carefully chosen keywords, including "AI economic policies," "artificial intelligence decision-making," "social implications of AI," "AI in healthcare," and "AI ethics." Boolean operators (AND, OR) were strategically employed to refine the search results and ensure optimal coverage of relevant literature. The selection process was guided by three essential inclusion criteria established to maintain the academic rigor and relevance of the analysis. First, only peer-reviewed articles published in reputable journals were considered, ensuring the quality and reliability of the research findings. Second, articles were required to focus specifically on the intersection of AI technologies and economic policies, including their implications on society and biology, maintaining the targeted scope of the analysis. Third, studies needed to provide either empirical data or theoretical frameworks relevant to the discourse on AI's impact, ensuring substantive contributions to understanding the topic. In the end, 10 articles were included in the analysis. This comprehensive search and selection strategy ensured the analysis captured the full spectrum of relevant research on biological and social ramifications of AI-powered economic policies.

The research methodology adopts Fairclough's (1992) comprehensive three-dimensional framework for discourse analysis. This model integrates three distinct but interconnected analytical levels to understand the content thoroughly. At the first level, the investigation delves into textual elements, scrutinizing specific language choices, grammatical patterns, and organizational structures within the documents. The second dimension explores the dynamic processes surrounding these texts, examining how they are created, circulated throughout various channels, and interpreted by different audiences. The third analytical component extends beyond the immediate textual and procedural aspects to evaluate the broader societal framework that shapes and is shaped by these discourses. This multifaceted approach ensures that the analysis considers the surface-level linguistic features, their practical application, and broader societal implications, creating a holistic understanding of the discourse's role and impact within its larger social context.

The coding process adhered to the thematic analysis steps outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), aligning well with the CDA approach. Initial codes were generated inductively based on the data, after which recurring themes and patterns were identified. These themes were subsequently reviewed and refined through team discussions and consistent comparison with the data.

De-Veer, Junior and Sentre

To ensure methodological rigor, we employed several strategies. We used data triangulation by including diverse texts from various sources (Carter et al., 2014) We engaged in researcher triangulation, with multiple researchers independently coding and analyzing the texts to enhance the reliability of our findings (Archibald, 2016). We also maintained a reflexive stance throughout the analysis, acknowledging our positionality and potential biases (Berger, 2015).

#### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1. Summary of Findings Table

Source	Brief Summary
Smith (2016)	Idealizations of Uncertainty and Lessons from Artificial Intelligence explores how AI models incorporate uncertainties in economic decision-making. Smith discusses the role of idealizations in AI and offers insights into improving decision-making frameworks using AI.
Hah and Goldin (2022)	Moving toward AI-assisted decision-making: Observation on clinicians' management of multimedia patient information in synchronous and asynchronous telehealth contexts examines how clinicians integrate AI-assisted systems for decision-making in telehealth. The study highlights the challenges and benefits of using AI in managing multimedia patient data.
Bao (2023)	A Literature Review of Human–AI Synergy in Decision Making: From the Perspective of Affordance Actualization Theory reviews research on the interaction between humans and AI in decision-making processes. Bao applies affordance actualization theory to discuss how AI's capabilities are perceived and utilized in collaborative contexts.
Khadka (2023)	AI-Driven Customization in Financial Services: Implications for Social Innovation in Nepal explores the role of AI in personalizing financial services in Nepal. Khadka analyzes how AI contributes to social innovation by enhancing accessibility and inclusivity in economic systems.
Gualdi and Cordella (2021)	Artificial Intelligence and Decision-Making: The Question of Accountability investigates AI's accountability challenges in decision-making processes. The paper discusses the implications of attributing responsibility to AI systems and developers.
Zhang (2023)	Impact of AI on Human Decision-Making: Analysis of Human, AI, and Environment of Interaction examines the effects of AI on human decision-making by analyzing the interactions between

-	human agents, AI systems, and their environments. Zhang offers a
	framework for understanding these dynamics.
Alanzi (2023)	Surveying Hematologists' Perceptions and Readiness to Embrace Artificial Intelligence in Diagnosis and Treatment Decision-Making presents findings from a survey of hematologists' attitudes toward AI integration in medical decision-making. The study evaluates the readiness, perceived benefits, and challenges of AI adoption in hematology.
Huriye (2023)	The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Examining the Ethical Considerations Surrounding the Development and Use of AI addresses ethical issues in AI development and deployment. Huriye discusses the moral implications of autonomy, accountability, and bias in AI decision-making systems.
Tiwari (2023)	Explainable AI (XAI) and its Applications in Building Trust and Understanding in AI Decision-Making review the concept of explainable AI (XAI) and its applications in enhancing trust and transparency. Tiwari explores how XAI helps users comprehend AI-driven decisions and fosters acceptance.
Wang (2023)	The Impact of AI on Organizational Employees: A Literature Review provides a comprehensive literature review on the effects of AI on employees within organizations. Wang examines how AI adoption impacts job satisfaction, productivity, and decision-making roles.

The discourse analysis of the selected peer-reviewed articles on the biological and social ramifications of AI-powered economic policies revealed four prominent themes: 1) Ethical and Accountability Challenges, 2) Human-AI Interaction and Its Biological Implications, 3) Social Equity and Access Issues, and 4) Economic Impact and Workforce Dynamics. Each theme encapsulates critical insights from the literature, highlighting the multifaceted impacts of AI in economic contexts.

#### **Ethical and Accountability Challenges**

The ethical implications of AI deployment in economic policies are a significant concern across the literature. Gualdi and Cordella Gualdi & Cordella (2021) emphasize the necessity of accountability in AI decision-making processes, arguing that integrating AI in public sector decisions necessitates a reevaluation of existing accountability frameworks. This sentiment is echoed by Huriye (2023), who discusses the ethical dilemmas arising from AI's capacity to make decisions that significantly affect individuals and society, underscoring the importance of transparency and ethical governance in AI applications. Furthermore, Chiang et al. (2021) provide operational guidelines for conducting ethical AI research, emphasizing the need for ethical

De-Veer, Junior and Sentre

frameworks to assess the potential consequences of AI technologies in various fields, including healthcare and the financial (Koffi, 2023).

#### Human-AI Interaction and Its Biological Implications

The interaction between humans and AI systems is critical in shaping decision-making processes and has profound biological implications. Zhang et al. (2020) discuss how microglial dysfunction is associated with various neurodegenerative disorders, highlighting the importance of understanding the biological ramifications of AI in clinical settings. Bao (2023) presents a framework for understanding human-AI synergy, emphasizing that effective collaboration can enhance decision-making outcomes. Hah and Goldin (2020) explore the dynamics of AI-assisted decision-making in healthcare, revealing that clinicians' preferences and understanding of AI tools significantly influence their effectiveness, which can directly impact patient outcomes.

#### Social Equity and Access Issues

The social ramifications of AI-powered economic policies are profound concerning equity and access. Khadka (2023) discusses how AI-driven customization in financial services can lead to social innovation yet raises concerns about potential disparities in access to these technologies. Alanzi (2023) highlights the importance of AI literacy among healthcare professionals, suggesting that a lack of understanding can exacerbate inequalities in healthcare delivery. Smith (2016) adds to this discourse by arguing that emotional and cognitive biases in AI systems can perpetuate existing social inequities, necessitating a critical examination of how AI technologies are implemented in various sectors. The findings suggest that AI could widen the gap between different socio-economic groups without careful consideration.

#### **Economic Impact and Workforce Dynamics**

Integrating AI into economic policies significantly impacts workforce dynamics and economic growth. Wang (2023) reviews the impact of AI on organizational employees, noting that while AI can augment decision-making capabilities, it also poses challenges related to job displacement and changes in workplace dynamics. This is complemented by insights from Gonzales (Gonzales, 2023), who indicates that AI patents positively impact economic growth, suggesting that AI can drive innovation and efficiency in various sectors. However, the potential for job loss and the need for workforce reskilling are critical issues that must be addressed to ensure that the benefits of AI are equitably distributed across society. The literature indicates that while AI has the potential to enhance productivity, it also requires proactive measures to mitigate its adverse effects on employment.

Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into economic policies presents a complex landscape with significant ethical and accountability challenges. As AI systems increasingly influence public sector decision-making, robust ethical frameworks are paramount. Gualdi and Cordella (2021) articulate that deploying AI technologies necessitates reevaluating accountability structures, particularly in

De-Veer, Junior and Sentre

contexts where decisions can profoundly affect public welfare. This concern is echoed in the literature, highlighting the potential for algorithmic bias to exacerbate existing social inequalities, necessitating a critical examination of how AI technologies are implemented across various sectors (Smith, 2016). The ethical dilemmas surrounding AI are not merely theoretical; they manifest in real-world consequences that can undermine public trust and exacerbate systemic injustices. Thus, establishing clear ethical guidelines and accountability mechanisms is essential to ensure AI technologies are harnessed for the public good rather than perpetuating inequities.

Moreover, the interaction between humans and AI systems reveals profound biological implications that merit careful consideration. The literature suggests that effective human-AI collaboration can enhance decision-making outcomes, particularly in healthcare settings Hah & Goldin, 2022; Bao, 2023). However, integrating AI into clinical practice raises critical questions about the potential impacts on patient care and health outcomes. For instance, Zhang et al. (2023) discuss how AI can influence clinical decision-making processes, illustrating AI technologies' potential to directly affect healthcare outcomes. This intersection of technology and healthcare necessitates a nuanced understanding of how AI tools are designed and implemented, ensuring they align with human cognitive and emotional needs. The importance of clinician training and AI literacy emerges as a critical factor in maximizing the benefits of these technologies while minimizing risks to patient care. As AI systems become increasingly embedded in healthcare, the implications for biological outcomes and the quality of care must be prioritized.

The social ramifications of AI-powered economic policies extend beyond ethical considerations to encompass issues of equity and access. The potential for AI-driven innovations to foster social progress is tempered by the risk of widening the gap between those with access to advanced technologies and those without (Khadka, 2023). Alanzi (2023) emphasizes the importance of AI literacy among healthcare professionals, suggesting that a lack of understanding can exacerbate inequalities in healthcare delivery. This theme resonates with the broader discourse on digital equity, which posits that equitable access to AI technologies is essential for ensuring that all individuals can benefit from economic policies and healthcare system advancements. The findings indicate that AI could entrench existing social disparities without careful consideration, underscoring the need for policymakers to prioritize inclusivity and equitable access to technology.

Finally, the economic impact of AI on workforce dynamics presents opportunities and challenges that must be navigated with care. While AI has the potential to enhance productivity and drive economic growth, it also poses significant challenges related to job displacement and changes in workplace dynamics (Wang, 2023). The literature indicates that adopting AI technologies can lead to substantial job losses, particularly among low-skilled workers, necessitating proactive measures to reskill and upskill the workforce (Kumar, 2023). Moreover, the potential for AI to reshape organizational structures and decision-making processes raises questions about the future of work and the nature of employment in an AI-driven economy. As organizations increasingly rely on AI to augment decision-making, it is crucial to consider the implications for employee well-being and job satisfaction. The findings suggest that while AI can enhance productivity, it also requires a concerted effort to mitigate its adverse effects on employment, ensuring that the benefits of AI are equitably distributed across the workforce.

De-Veer, Junior and Sentre

#### **CONCLUSION**

Exploring AI-powered economic policies' biological and social ramifications has illuminated the intricate interplay between technology, ethics, and societal outcomes. The findings underscore the necessity for a comprehensive framework addressing AI deployment's ethical implications, particularly in public-sector decision-making. As Gualdi and Cordella (2021) highlight, accountability mechanisms must be established to mitigate the risks of algorithmic bias and ensure that AI technologies serve the public good. Furthermore, integrating AI into healthcare and other critical sectors necessitates focusing on human-AI interaction, emphasizing the need for clinician training and AI literacy to optimize patient outcomes Gualdi and Cordella (2021)). The potential for AI to exacerbate existing inequalities calls for policymakers to prioritize inclusivity and equitable access to technology, ensuring that all individuals can benefit from advancements in AI. In light of these findings, policymakers must adopt a proactive approach to AI governance. This includes the development of ethical guidelines that prioritize transparency and accountability in AI systems, as well as the establishment of frameworks for continuous evaluation of AI technologies' impacts on society. Policymakers should engage diverse stakeholders, including technologists, ethicists, and community representatives, to co-create policies that reflect the complexities of AI's societal implications. Additionally, fostering public awareness and understanding of AI technologies will be crucial in building trust and facilitating informed discussions about their use in economic policies. Promoting AI literacy among healthcare professionals and the general public can help bridge the knowledge gap and empower individuals to navigate the challenges posed by AI.

Finally, addressing the economic impact of AI on workforce dynamics is essential for ensuring a sustainable future. Policymakers must implement strategies that promote workforce reskilling and upskilling to mitigate the adverse effects of job displacement caused by AI adoption. This can be achieved through partnerships between educational institutions, industry leaders, and government agencies to develop training programs that equip workers with the skills needed to thrive in an AI-driven economy. Furthermore, ongoing research into the economic implications of AI should be prioritized to inform evidence-based policy decisions that foster innovation while safeguarding social equity. By taking these steps, society can harness the transformative potential of AI technologies while addressing the ethical, social, and economic challenges they present.

#### REFERENCES

- Adomavicius, G., & Yang, M. (2022). Integrating Behavioral, Economic, and Technical Insights to Understand and Address Algorithmic Bias: A Human-Centric Perspective. ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems, 13(3). https://doi.org/10.1145/3519420
- Alanzi, T. (2023). Surveying hematologists' perceptions and readiness to embrace artificial intelligence in diagnosis and treatment decision-making. Cureus. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.49462
- Alegría, M., et al. (2018). Social determinants of mental health: Where we are and where we need to go. Current Psychiatry Reports, 20(11), 95.

- Bao, Y. (2023). A literature review of human–ai synergy in decision making: from the perspective of affordance actualization theory. Systems, 11(9), 442. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems11090442
- Fosch-Villaronga, E., Poulsen, A., Søraa, R. A., & Custers, B. H. M. (2021). A little bird told me your gender: Gender inferences in social media. Information Processing and Management, 58(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2021.102541
- Gualdi, F. and Cordella, A. (2021). Artificial intelligence and decision-making: the question of accountability.. https://doi.org/10.24251/hicss.2021.281
- Hah, H. and Goldin, D. (2022). Moving toward ai-assisted decision-making: observation on clinicians' management of multimedia patient information in synchronous and asynchronous telehealth contexts. Health Informatics Journal, 28(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/14604582221077049
- Huriye, A. (2023). The ethics of artificial intelligence: examining the ethical considerations surrounding the development and use of ai. American Journal of Technology, 2(1), 37-45. https://doi.org/10.58425/ajt.v2i1.142
- Isley, R. (2022). Algorithmic Bias and Its Implications: How to Maintain Ethics through AI Governance. N.Y.U. American Public Policy Review, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.21428/4b58ebd1.0e834dbb
- Isley, R. (2022). Algorithmic bias and its implications: how to maintain ethics through AI governance., 2(1). https://doi.org/10.21428/4b58ebd1.0e834dbb
- Jain, L. R., & Menon, V. (2023). AI Algorithmic Bias: Understanding its Causes, Ethical and Social Implications. Proceedings - International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence, ICTAI. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICTAI59109.2023.00073
- Khadka, S. (2023). Ai-driven customization in financial services: implications for social innovation in nepal. NCC Journal, 8(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3126/nccj.v8i1.63128
- Kim, B., Koopmanschap, I., Mehrizi, M., Huysman, M., & Ranschaert, E. (2021). How does the radiology community discuss the benefits and limitations of artificial intelligence for their work? a systematic discourse analysis. European Journal of Radiology, 136, 109566. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2021.109566
- Koffi, B. A. (2024) Stregthening Financial Risk Governance and Compliance in the US: A Roadmap for Ensuring Economic Stability. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24OCT342
- Krüger, S. and Wilson, C. (2022). The problem with trust: on the discursive commodification of trust in ai. Ai & Society, 38(4), 1753-1761. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01401-6
- Lawson McLean, A. (2024). Towards Precision Medicine in Spinal Surgery: Leveraging AI Technologies. In Annals of Biomedical Engineering (Vol. 52, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-023-03315-w
- Malmborg, F. (2022). Narrative dynamics in European commission AI policy—sensemaking, agency construction, and anchoring. Review of Policy Research, 40(5), 757-780. https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12529

- Min, A. (2023). Artifical Intelligence and Bias: Challenges, Implications, and Remedies. Journal of Social Research, 2(11). https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v2i11.1477
- Mirbabaie, M., Hofeditz, L., Frick, N., & Stieglitz, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence in hospitals: providing a status quo of ethical considerations in academia to guide future research. Ai & Society, 37(4), 1361-1382. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01239-4
- Ngoma, T., Asiimwe, A. R., Mukasa, J., Binzen, S., Serbanescu, F., Henry, E. G., Hamer, D. H., Lori, J. R., Schmitz, M. M., Marum, L., Picho, B., Naggayi, A., Musonda, G., Conlon, C. M., Komakech, P., Kamara, V., & Scott, N. A. (2019). Addressing the Second Delay in Saving Mothers, Giving Life Districts in Uganda and Zambia: Reaching Appropriate Maternal Care promptly. Global Health: Science and Practice, 7(Supplement 1), S68–S84. https://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-18-00367
- Ouchchy, L., Coin, A., & Dubljević, V. (2020). Ai in the headlines: the portrayal of the ethical issues of artificial intelligence in the media. Ai & Society, 35(4), 927-936. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00965-5
- Parasurama, P., & Sedoc, J. (2022). Gendered Language in Resumes and its Implications for Algorithmic Bias in Hiring. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.gebnlp-1.7
- Roche, C., Wall, P., & Lewis, D. (2022). Ethics and diversity in artificial intelligence policies, strategies and initiatives. Ai and Ethics, 3(4), 1095-1115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00218-9
- Sigfrids, A., Leikas, J., Salo-Pöntinen, H., & Koskimies, E. (2023). Human-centricity in ai governance: a systemic approach. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.976887
- Smith, R. (2016). Idealizations of uncertainty and lessons from artificial intelligence. Economics the Open-Access Open-Assessment E-Journal, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.5018/economics-ejournal.ja.2016-7
- Tiwari, R. (2023). Explainable AI (xai) and its applications in building trust and understanding in AI decision-making. International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management, 07(01). https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsrem17592
- Toll, D., Lindgren, I., Melin, U., & Madsen, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in swedish policies: values, benefits, considerations and risks., 301-310. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27325-5\_23
- Toll, D., Lindgren, I., Melin, U., & Madsen, C. (2020). Values, benefits, considerations, and risks of AI in government. Jedem Ejournal of Edemocracy and Open Government, 12(1), 40-60. https://doi.org/10.29379/jedem.v12i1.593
- Ulnicane, I., Knight, W., Leach, T., Stahl, B., & Wanjiku, W. (2020). Framing governance for a contested emerging technology:insights from ai policy. Policy and Society, 40(2), 158-177. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2020.1855800
- Valdivia, A., Serrajòrdia, J. C., & Swianiewicz, A. (2023). There is an elephant in the room: towards a critique on using fairness in biometrics. AI and Ethics, 3(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00249-2

De-Veer, Junior and Sentre

- Wang, Q. (2023). The impact of AI on organizational employees: a literature review. Journal of Education Humanities and Social Sciences, 19, 45-53. https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v19i.10955
- Wilkens, U. (2020). Artificial intelligence in the workplace a double-edged sword. International Journal of Information and Learning Technology, 37(5), 253-265. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijilt-02-2020-0022
- Zhang, L. (2023). Impact of AI on human decision-making: analysis of human, AI, and interaction environment. Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media, 28(1), 239-245. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/28/20231348