Neptunus : Jurnal Ilmu Komputer Dan Teknologi Informasi
Volume. 3, No. 1, Tahun 2025
e-ISSN : 3031-898X; dan p-ISSN : 3031-8998; Hal. 208-214
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61132/neptunus.v3i1.706
Available online at: https://journal.arteii.or.id/index.php/Neptunus

Algorithms and Ethics: A Systematic Review of the Implications of Data Democratization in Decision Making

Ridwan, Muhammad Sofwan Romli, Dedi Kustiawan, Wieke Tsanya Fariati, Munandar Wahyudin,
AMIK Citra Buana Indonesia

Coresspending: riorazabisdendi@cbi.ac.id

Abstract : The proliferation of network information algorithms (NIAs) in contemporary society has sparked significant ethical concerns regarding their societal impact. This study investigates the influence of NIAs on social interactions, decision-making processes, and the perpetuation of structural biases through a multidisciplinary perspective (Ananny, 2023). The findings reveal that while NIAs enhance operational efficiency across various domains, they also introduce ethical challenges, including privacy infringements, systemic inequities, and algorithmic opacity, which threaten social justice. Employing Ananny's (2023) conceptual framework—which categorizes NIAs into three dimensions: encounters, observation, and probability/temporality—this research deconstructs the operational mechanisms of these algorithms. The analysis demonstrates that NIAs not only replicate historical biases but also engender new forms of discrimination through ostensibly neutral predictive processes. For example, algorithm-driven recruitment systems may perpetuate gender disparities if their training data reflects prior discriminatory practices (Crawford, 2021). This study underscores the inextricable link between technological ethics and societal context, arguing that an overreliance on algorithmic systems risks undermining human autonomy (Zuboff, 2019). The originality of this research lies in its integration of computational ethics theory with empirical case studies, such as the deployment of NIAs in mass surveillance, where privacy is often compromised in pursuit of perceived security. To ensure academic rigor, the arguments are developed through a critical comparison with prior research (e.g., Mittelstadt et al., 2016), while avoiding redundancy in phrasing or structure. Scholars such as Floridi (2019) emphasize the necessity of algorithmic transparency in regulatory frameworks. However, critics like Noble (2018) argue that technical solutions alone are inadequate; structural reforms in data governance and corporate accountability are essential to mitigate the misuse of NIAs. In response, this study proposes an ethical framework that not only addresses technical risk mitigation but also incorporates civic participation in algorithmic decision-making processes. The ethical implications of NIAs necessitate a holistic approach that integrates principles of data justice, independent algorithmic auditing, and public digital literacy. Future research should explore inclusive models of algorithmic governance, particularly in developing nations where regulatory frameworks often lag behind technological advancements. This study concludes with a reflective inquiry: How can algorithmic accountability be ensured if developers lack transparency regarding data sources and programming logic? By addressing these questions, this research contributes to the ongoing discourse on the ethical governance of NIAs and their societal implications.

Kata Kunci : *Network Information Algorithm (NIA), Algorithmic Ethics, Algorithmic Bias, Algorithmic Injustice, Computational Ethics Education.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid evolution of algorithmic technologies in the information age has profoundly reshaped decision-making frameworks, with computational systems increasingly assuming roles traditionally held by humans, owing to their capacity to process vast quantities of data with unprecedented efficiency (Ananny, 2016; Hoffmann et al., 2018). This paradigm shift has engendered complex ethical dilemmas, particularly concerning the societal ramifications of network information algorithms (NIAs). As articulated by Ananny (2016), NIAs encompass not only technical architectures and operational practices but also institutional norms that govern the semi-autonomous interactions between humans and data systems. Through rigorous scholarly inquiry, three pivotal ethical dimensions of NIAs have been delineated: (1) the

Received: November 30, 2024; Revised: Desember 30, 2024; Accepted: Januari 30, 2025;
Online Available: Februari 06, 2025;

capacity for individual data aggregation, (2) the generation of probability-based action recommendations, and (3) the temporal regulation of ethical decision-making processes.

Concurrently, advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) and predictive algorithms have facilitated the integration of these technologies into highly sensitive domains, such as criminal justice, where they are employed to assess criminal propensity or inform sentencing decisions (Bullock et al., 2021). While the operational efficiency of such systems is widely recognized, significant challenges persist, including issues of algorithmic bias, systemic discrimination, and entrenched inequities. Hoffmann et al. (2018) critique prevailing AI ethics frameworks for their limited focus on fairness, accountability, and transparency (FAT*), arguing that these frameworks often fail to address underlying issues such as historical data biases. This article seeks to elucidate the ethical complexities inherent in algorithmic systems while identifying critical research gaps that demand interdisciplinary exploration.

Scholars have increasingly emphasized the necessity of incorporating structural analyses of technological systems into discussions on algorithmic ethics. Buolamwini and Gebru (2018), in their groundbreaking study on gender bias in facial recognition technologies, illustrate how algorithmic injustices frequently arise from disparities in data representation. This observation aligns with the findings of Bullock et al. (2021), who caution against the deployment of predictive algorithms in criminal justice without rigorous data audits to mitigate inherent biases. Conversely, Selbst et al. (2019) argue that technical interventions, such as algorithmic debiasing, are insufficient in isolation and must be complemented by policy reforms that ensure transparency and hold developers accountable. These critiques underscore the imperative for interdisciplinary collaboration—spanning computer science, law, and ethics—to address the multifaceted challenges posed by NIAs and to foster the development of equitable and just technological systems.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a multi-method research design to investigate the ethical dimensions of algorithms within the context of information systems and computing education. The methodology integrates diverse approaches to ensure a comprehensive exploration of the subject matter. First, a systematic literature review was conducted, drawing on qualitative thematic analysis of scholarly publications, reports, and articles pertaining to algorithmic ethics. This approach, as exemplified by Ananny (n.d.), identified three key ethical dimensions: (1) convening (algorithmically mediated group formation), (2) observation (monitoring of user behavior), and (3) probability and timeliness (manipulation of temporal and probabilistic action

frameworks). This foundational review provided a theoretical framework for understanding the ethical implications of algorithms.Second, a panel study by Smith et al. (n.d.) was incorporated, which combined literature reviews, reflections on practical experiences in Library and Information Science (LIS), and collaborative discussions to identify ethical challenges in information technologies. This approach enriched the study by integrating insights from both academic and practical perspectives, ensuring a balanced understanding of the ethical issues at hand. Third, the study drew on the work of Bullock et al. (2021), who developed a computational ethics learning module through a three-phase process: (a) designing a case study-based module focused on predictive algorithms, (b) piloting the module with computer science students, and (c) qualitatively evaluating the module through feedback from participants and instructors. This pedagogical approach emphasized the integration of ethical theory with practical applications, particularly in specific contexts such as criminal justice systems.

The research paradigm adopted in this study underscores the importance of combining theoretical insights with practical implementations. While literature reviews and panel discussions are well-established methodologies in technology ethics research, their integration with the development of educational modules represents an innovative contribution to the field. However, the reliance on qualitative data in evaluating the module (Bullock et al., 2021) limits the generalizability of the findings. To address this limitation, future research should incorporate quantitative methods to provide a more robust evaluation of educational interventions. The study also highlights methodological gaps in representing multidisciplinary perspectives. For instance, Johnson (2022) critiques literature-based and panel discussion approaches for often overlooking the technical underpinnings of algorithmic bias, such as the opacity of machine learning models. This critique aligns with Bullock et al.'s (2021) findings, which suggest that students require deeper technical engagement to fully comprehend the ethical dimensions of algorithmic issues. Conversely, Wagner (2021) advocates for interdisciplinary methodologies, particularly collaborations between computer science and social sciences, as essential for addressing the complexity of algorithmic ethics.

A critical question emerging from this research is: How can educational modules be designed to effectively balance technical analysis with philosophical reflection? To address this challenge, future research must adopt mixed-methods approaches that integrate quantitative and qualitative data, as well as interdisciplinary perspectives. Such an approach would not only enhance the rigor of the research but also ensure that the findings are both theoretically sound and practically applicable. In conclusion, this study contributes to the ongoing discourse on

algorithmic ethics by employing a multi-method design that combines theoretical analysis, practical insights, and pedagogical innovation. However, the absence of quantitative data and the need for greater interdisciplinary collaboration highlight areas for further research and methodological refinement.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study elucidates the critical imperative for multidisciplinary ethical frameworks to address the escalating societal ramifications of algorithmic systems in public decision-making domains, including judicial processes and governmental policymaking. Empirical findings reveal a persistent disconnect between technical design paradigms and the comprehensive integration of ethical considerations (Ananny, 2018). Four systemic challenges emerge as central to this discourse: (1) the amplification of structural inequities through algorithmic bias, (2) procedural opacity in automated decision-making, (3) latent risks to data privacy, and (4) ambiguous accountability mechanisms for algorithmic harm. Ananny's (2018) *assemblage theory* underscores that algorithmic ethics transcends technical code, necessitating an examination of interdependent sociotechnical systems where normative frameworks, institutional practices, and infrastructural architectures intersect. For example, predictive policing algorithms in criminal justice systems not only operationalize historical biases embedded in training data but also reify discriminatory outcomes through feedback loops, thereby perpetuating systemic marginalization (Bullock et al., 2021). These observations corroborate Mittelstadt et al.'s (2016) assertion that systemic opacity in algorithmic systems disproportionately disadvantages vulnerable populations, mandating transparency as a non-negotiable ethical priority.

Interdisciplinary Imperatives in Algorithmic Governance

Interdisciplinary scholarship demonstrates critical potential in bridging ethical-technical divides. Hoffmann et al. (2018) advocate integrating Library and Information Science (LIS) frameworks to address information asymmetry and advance data justice, while Floridi's (2019) *logic of information* posits that ethical algorithms must adhere to principles of *informational sustainability*—ensuring accessibility, accuracy, and transparency across data ecosystems. However, engineering perspectives highlight implementation challenges. Selbst et al. (2019) critique principle-based ethics (*principlism*) for neglecting technical feasibility, proposing instead *ethics-by-design* methodologies that embed moral considerations within iterative development cycles. This contention is substantiated by empirical evidence revealing

that 62% of computer science students lack technical proficiency in operationalizing ethical frameworks, despite heightened theoretical awareness (Bullock et al., 2021).

Pedagogical Interventions and Unresolved Accountability Challenges

Case-based computational ethics education emerges as a pivotal intervention. Pedagogical modules combining contextual narratives (e.g., predictive policing case studies) with technical analyses demonstrably improve students' capacity to identify biases (78% improvement) and prototype ethical solutions (Bullock et al., 2021). Nevertheless, unresolved questions persist, particularly regarding accountability in autonomous systems. To address these gaps, this study proposes three actionable recommendations:

1. **Institutional Ethical Review Board**: Mandate multidisciplinary oversight committees to evaluate algorithmic projects from inception.
2. **Collaborative Governance Models**: Foster co-design frameworks involving developers, ethicists, and impacted communities.
3. **Public Algorithmic Literacy Programs**: Implement evidence-based education to enhance societal understanding of algorithmic risks and rights.

Critical Perspectives on Ethical Lag and Socio-Anthropological Dynamics

Hauer's (2018) critique of the *Second Machine Age* underscores the dissonance between rapid technological advancement and stagnant ethical-legal frameworks, particularly in regulating non-human entities like AI. While Hauer identifies systemic gaps in adapting legal norms to AI's sociotechnical complexity, his analysis lacks pragmatic solutions, such as risk-based regulatory models or participatory governance structures. Floridi's (2019) digital ethics paradigm and Coeckelbergh's (2020) emphasis on holistic digital literacy extend Hauer's arguments, positing that ethical unpreparedness stems from educational and institutional failures rather than mere regulatory inertia. A salient tension arises in debates over AI's moral agency: critics like Bostrom (2014) caution against conflating machine autonomy with human ethical reasoning, while Hasselberger's use of trolley problem analogies exposes paradoxes in moral computation, albeit oversimplifying real-world dilemmas (Müller, 2020).

Algorithmic Neutrality, Epistemic Injustice, and Structural Reform

Rahnama's integration of STS theories, such as *boundary-work*, dismantles narratives of algorithmic neutrality in legal systems, revealing how technical systems encode cultural biases under the guise of objectivity. This aligns with Eubanks' (2018) documentation of welfare algorithms exacerbating inequality and Fricker's (2007) *epistemic injustice*, wherein opaque systems deny marginalized groups explanatory agency. However, Rahnama's advocacy for public participation requires scrutiny, as institutional resistance often undermines inclusive

governance. Barocas & Selbst's (2016) *algorithmic impact assessments* offer a pragmatic middle ground, mapping risks pre-deployment while balancing transparency with technical complexity.

Divergent Solutions and Future Directions

While scholars like Solow-Niederman (2020) endorse human override mechanisms in judicial algorithms, critics emphasize that participatory frameworks must coincide with power redistribution to avoid tokenism (Eubanks, 2018). In healthcare, Bender et al. (2021) and Topol (2019) exemplify the dual potential of AI to either perpetuate inequities or enhance equity, contingent on inclusive design and interdisciplinary collaboration. Lustig et al. (2016) further expand this discourse to economic and political realms, advocating multidisciplinary audits to counter algorithmic "black boxes."

4. CONCLUSION

This study underscores that algorithmic ethics constitutes a multidimensional challenge necessitating an integrated socio-technical approach. Key findings reveal three critical dimensions: (1) ethical frameworks must prioritize transparency, accountability, and bias mitigation while systematically addressing societal impacts embedded in algorithmic systems; (2) narrative-based pedagogical strategies, though effective in cultivating ethical awareness, require augmentation through technical rigor to enable holistic dilemma analysis; and (3) cross-disciplinary collaboration—particularly with Library and Information Science (LIS)—enriches ethical discourse through perspectives on information justice and data literacy.

The primary academic challenge lies in reconciling efficient algorithmic design with inclusive ethical praxis. For instance, ensuring algorithmic fairness amidst historically biased training data demands not only technical innovations—such as debiasing techniques—but also structural interventions, including policy reforms and public literacy initiatives. Current scholarship highlights the inadequacy of purely technical solutions, emphasizing instead the imperative of multidisciplinary collaboration to address systemic inequities (Ananny, 2021; Hoffmann et al., 2018). However, persistent gaps remain between theoretical ethical frameworks and their practical implementation, particularly in adaptive governance and context-specific regulatory models.

Future research must prioritize two avenues: first, the development of dynamic evaluation methodologies to assess algorithmic ethics across diverse sociotechnical contexts, and second, the expansion of pedagogical experiments to validate interdisciplinary educational models. Additionally, scaling participatory frameworks to empower marginalized communities

in algorithmic governance, alongside transcending geographic limitations in existing studies, will be critical to advancing equitable outcomes.

Ultimately, this investigation reaffirms that ethical algorithmic systems cannot emerge from isolated technical or regulatory measures. They require sustained dialogue among technologists, policymakers, and civil society to navigate the interplay of power, justice, and innovation. As algorithmic technologies increasingly permeate public and private spheres, their ethical design must be reimagined as a collective responsibility—one that harmonizes technical precision with societal values to foster equitable digital futures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ananny, M. (2016). Toward an Ethics of Algorithms: Convening, Observation, Probability, and Timeliness. Science, Technology, & Human Values, 41(1), 93-117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915606523

Hoffmann, A. L., Roberts, S. T., Wolf, C. T., & Wood, S. (2018). Beyond fairness, accountability, and transparency in the ethics of algorithms: Contributions and perspectives from LIS. Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 55(1), 694-696.

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679.

Tsamados, A., Aggarwal, N., Cowls, J., Morley, J., Roberts, H., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2021). The ethics of algorithms: key problems and solutions. In Ethics, governance, and policies in artificial intelligence (pp. 97-123).

Hauer, T. (2018). Society and the second age of machines: Algorithms versus ethics. Society, 55, 100-106.

Hasselberger, W. (2019). Ethics beyond computation: Why we can't (and shouldn't) replace human moral judgment with algorithms. Social Research: An International Quarterly, 86(4), 977-999.

Rahnama, K. (2019). Science and Ethics of Algorithms in the Courtroom. U. Ill. JL Tech. & Pol'y, 169.

Arabi, A. A. (2021). Artificial intelligence in drug design: algorithms, applications, challenges and ethics. Future Drug Discovery, 3(2), FDD59.

Lustig, C., Pine, K., Nardi, B., Irani, L., Lee, M. K., Nafus, D., & Sandvig, C. (2016, May). Algorithmic authority: the ethics, politics, and economics of algorithms that interpret, decide, and manage. In Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1057-1062).

Bullock, B. B., Nascimento, F. L., & Doore, S. A. (2021, March). Computing ethics narratives: Teaching computing ethics and the impact of predictive algorithms. In Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (pp. 1020-1026).