

CULTURAL BIAS AND MORAL RESPONSIBILITY: ADDRESSING ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN AI SYSTEMS

Peter Abiodun OJO

Department of Philosophy, Ladoke Akintola

University of Technology

Oyo State, Nigeria

peterojo2008@gmail.com;

paojo19@lautech.edu.ng

ORCID NO: 0009 – 0001 – 7587 – 3629

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies are increasingly being integrated into decision-making processes in a variety of industries, including healthcare and law enforcement. However, these technologies frequently inherit and accentuate the biases inherent in their training data, algorithms, and design decisions. This paper investigates the ethical challenges posed by cultural bias in AI, specifically in terms of moral responsibility. It investigates how AI systems, which are primarily developed using Western epistemic frameworks, may fail to account for diverse cultural perspectives, reinforcing systemic inequalities and marginalizing underrepresented groups. To address these ethical concerns, the paper draws on a range of intercultural ethical perspectives, including Islamic ethics, African communitarianism (Ubuntu), and Buddhist ethics, each of which offers unique insights into fairness, moral responsibility, and human dignity in AI governance. By analyzing case studies of biased

AI outcomes—such as racial discrimination in facial recognition technology and algorithmic injustices in hiring practices—this study highlights the urgent need for a more inclusive and globally informed AI ethics framework. The paper argues that achieving fairness in AI requires proactive measures such as diverse training datasets, culturally aware algorithmic auditing, and participatory governance models that incorporate perspectives from different cultural and philosophical traditions. Ultimately, it advocates for an ethical AI landscape where moral responsibility extends beyond technical considerations to embrace a more holistic, intercultural approach to fairness and justice. This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on AI ethics by emphasizing the importance of cultural inclusivity in ensuring equitable and morally responsible AI systems.

Keywords: Cultural Bias, Moral Responsibility, AI Ethics, Fairness, Intercultural Perspectives

Introduction

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has reshaped how decision making is processed across different sectors—from healthcare and law enforcement to finance and public services—has since ushered a new era of technological revolutions of data-driven governance and ethical complexity. There is doubt that these innovations have contributed immensely to enhance efficiency, yet, its contributions have met with paradox for being prone to reproducing and even amplifying the cultural

biases embedded in their design, training data, and underlying algorithms. Here a question was raised particularly about the ethical challenge: how can societies ensure that AI systems, often developed within a predominantly Western epistemic framework, serve all communities fairly while upholding robust standards of moral responsibility?

The AI systems are basically designed and developed within Western epistemic frameworks, in which much of its training data perpetuates historical and societal prejudices that have long favored Western norms and values. Similarly, these systems risk perpetuating systemic inequalities by marginalizing underrepresented groups and reinforcing cultural stereotypes. The biases further have an ethical implication as they manifest in real world cases—this is evidenced by misidentifications in facial recognition systems and algorithmic injustices in hiring practices which often impacts human lives.¹⁶⁶ However, the Western framework frequently excludes alternative cultural viewpoints and moral frameworks that are essential for understanding fairness in a global context. As a result of these bias distortions, the need to address these shortcomings is urgent, given that AI increasingly influences high-stakes decisions affecting individual lives and community well-being.

¹⁶⁶Luciano Floridi, *The Ethics of Information* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 89.

More so, the intricate shortcomings of AI's applicability is evidenced in the area of facial recognition technologies having repeatedly demonstrated higher error rates for individuals from non-Western backgrounds, leading to wrongful identifications and subsequent social harms;¹⁶⁷ resulting in the risk of erosion of values essential to global justice and inclusivity. Similarly, algorithmic decision-making in employment often privileges candidates from majority groups, thereby reinforcing preexisting patterns of social discrimination.¹⁶⁸

Solving the underlying ethical frameworks in AI development requires more than technical fixes; it necessitates a fundamental rethinking of the moral responsibilities of AI developers, policymakers, and society at large. Central to our argument is the premise that fairness in AI cannot be attained solely through technical optimization but must be rooted in a robust ethical framework that embraces diverse cultural perspectives. However the avenue for justice is the way to rethinking AI ethics which is particularly through intercultural ethical perspectives. To that end, we draw upon a range of intercultural ethical theories—including Islamic ethics, African communitarianism (Ubuntu), and Buddhist ethics—to

¹⁶⁷ Ruha Benjamin, *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019), 102.

¹⁶⁸ Safiya Umoja Noble, *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism* (New York: NYU Press, 2018), 88.

reimagine the principles of fairness, human dignity, and accountability in AI governance.

Islamic ethics, for instance, offer a tradition rich in notions of justice, compassion, and communal responsibility. Concepts such as “*adl* (justice) underscore the imperative that AI systems be designed and deployed in a manner that respects human dignity and ensures equitable treatment for all individuals.¹⁶⁹ Such perspectives provide a counterpoint to the often individualistic ethos of Western ethical paradigms and open the door to more holistic approaches to moral responsibility. Parallel to Islamic thought, African communitarianism—as epitomized by the philosophy of Ubuntu—presents a compelling vision of interdependence and collective moral accountability. Ubuntu, encapsulated in the phrase “I am because we are,” challenges the atomistic view of personhood prevalent in Western societies and calls for an ethical paradigm that privileges community well-being over individual success.¹⁷⁰ This perspective is particularly relevant when considering the impact of AI on social cohesion and collective identity. By foregrounding relationality and communal responsibility, Ubuntu offers valuable insights into

¹⁶⁹ Abdulaziz Sachedina, *Islamic Biomedical Ethics: Principles and Application* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 123.

¹⁷⁰ Mamphela Ramose, *African Philosophy through Ubuntu* (Mond Books, 2002), 70.

how AI systems might be reimagined to serve a broader, more inclusive social purpose.¹⁷¹

Moreso, Buddhist ethics offers a unique perspective to this discourse which emphasises mindfulness, compassion, and the interconnectedness of all life, Buddhist ethical traditions encourage a comprehensive assessment of the consequences of technological interventions. The doctrine of *pratityasamutpada*, or dependent origination, reminds us that every action has far-reaching implications—a principle that resonates deeply in the context of AI, where algorithmic decisions can have cascading societal effects.¹⁷² In a world increasingly mediated by AI, adopting a mindset of holistic moral responsibility is imperative; it compels developers and its policymakers alike to consider not just the immediate efficiency of AI systems but their broader ethical and social ramifications.

The dominance of Western epistemic traditions in AI development has significant implications for how these systems conceptualize and operationalize fairness. Most AI research is conducted in environments where Western notions of objectivity and rationality are not only prized but considered universal benchmarks of truth. While these values have undoubtedly spurred remarkable technological

¹⁷¹D. E. Bates, “Ubuntu as a Philosophical Concept,” *Philosophical Inquiry* 15, no. 3 (2010): 200.

¹⁷²Damien Keown, *Buddhist Ethics: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 34.

progress, they often fail to capture the moral and cultural complexities inherent in a globalized society. For instance, the design of many AI algorithms implicitly assumes that data gathered from Western populations is universally applicable, thereby neglecting the lived experiences and cultural contexts of non-Western communities. This methodological bias can result in systems that, despite their sophistication, are ill-equipped to address the ethical imperatives of inclusivity and justice.

Consider the case of facial recognition technology, which has been widely adopted by law enforcement agencies around the globe. Studies have demonstrated that these systems exhibit significantly higher error rates when identifying individuals from minority ethnic groups—individuals with darker skin tones, leading to potentially devastating outcomes such as wrongful detentions and misidentifications by law enforcement agencies.¹⁷³ Similar issues arise in the domain of employment, where algorithmic screening tools have been shown to disadvantage candidates from underrepresented cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. Such examples underscore the pressing need to interrogate the cultural assumptions embedded within AI systems and to realign them with a more inclusive set of ethical values. These examples underscore the necessity for a radical reorientation of how AI is developed and

¹⁷³Noble, *Algorithms of Oppression*, 72.

governed. Moreover, as AI systems cross national and cultural boundaries, they encounter a multiplicity of values, traditions, and expectations. A system designed with Western values in mind may prove ill-suited to the social, cultural, and political realities of non-Western societies. This widens the existing inequalities evidenced in an AI system that is effective in a developed, Western context may fail to address—or may even widened—the unique challenges faced by communities in the Global South.¹⁷⁴

The ethical responsibility of AI developers, data scientists, and policymakers is not confined to technical excellence; it also demands a commitment to cultural sensitivity and moral inclusiveness. The notion of moral responsibility in the context of AI extends beyond the realm of programming; it is an ethical commitment that demands accountability from every stakeholder involved in the creation, deployment, and regulation of these systems.¹⁷⁵ A critical question thus arises: how can we recalibrate AI systems to mitigate the influence of entrenched cultural biases? The answer lies in a multifaceted strategy that combines technological innovation with ethical reflection. First, it requires the construction of more representative training datasets that capture

¹⁷⁴ Kate Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), 80.

¹⁷⁵ Floridi, *The Ethics of Information*, 89.

the full spectrum of human diversity; this is so because the quality and representativeness of the data used to train AI models are critical determinants of their fairness and accuracy. Second, it calls for rigorous, culturally aware algorithmic audits that interrogate the embedded assumptions in AI systems. Finally, it necessitates the establishment of participatory governance models that incorporate voices from diverse cultural backgrounds, ensuring that those most affected by AI technologies have a say in how they are regulated and deployed.

To reorientate AI ethics also requires reconsidering the role of accountability in technology design. As such, the traditional boundaries of moral responsibility are blurred especially when an AI system produces biased outcomes, who should we make to bear the moral and legal responsibility? Is it the developers who designed the algorithm, the institutions that deployed it, or the broader society that has embraced a particular cultural paradigm? In addressing these questions calls for the ethical responsibility to be shared among multiple stakeholders, each of whom plays a role in shaping the ethical boundary of AI innovation.

This study explores the ethical challenges of cultural bias in AI and proposes an integrative framework for AI governance that prioritizes cultural inclusivity and moral responsibility. By bridging technical expertise with moral philosophy, the study highlights

the limitations of Western epistemic traditions in AI development and argues for the integration of intercultural ethical perspectives—such as Islamic ethics, African communitarianism, and Buddhist traditions—to foster a more just and equitable AI landscape. The methodology involves a comprehensive interdisciplinary analysis, drawing on case studies, philosophical inquiry, and algorithmic auditing to examine the societal impacts of biased AI systems. Through participatory governance mechanisms and diverse training datasets, the study seeks to mitigate bias and promote ethical accountability in AI development. The scope extends beyond technical fixes, addressing broader societal implications, including public trust, fairness, and social justice. Ultimately, this research calls for a reimagining of AI ethics—one that transcends cultural boundaries and ensures that technological progress aligns with human dignity and equity.

Cultural Bias in AI Systems

AI systems are typically developed within Western epistemic frameworks that prioritize objectivity, rationality, and empirical validation. While these principles have driven rapid technological progress, they have also contributed to the persistence of cultural bias in AI. These biases reflect pre-existing societal inequalities, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities; evident in various domains such as facial recognition technologies, algorithmic hiring practices, and predictive policing, where the

underlying training data and design choices frequently reflect Western norms and values. The consequence is a system that may perform effectively for certain populations while systematically disadvantaging others.

The ethical concerns surrounding AI bias raise fundamental questions about moral responsibility. Should the blame for biased AI decisions be assigned to developers, policymakers, or the institutions deploying these systems? Philosophers such as John Rawls argue for fairness and justice as guiding principles in decision-making systems, emphasizing that policies should be designed to benefit the least advantaged members of society.¹⁷⁶ However, AI governance has yet to fully embrace such inclusive ethical principles, often prioritizing efficiency and economic incentives over fairness and accountability.

Facial recognition technologies have been shown to exhibit higher error rates when identifying individuals from non-Western backgrounds. Studies indicate that these systems are more likely to misidentify or fail to recognize individuals with darker skin tones, leading to potentially devastating social and legal consequences such as wrongful

¹⁷⁶ John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 52.

arrests or detentions.¹⁷⁷ Similarly, in the employment sector, algorithmic screening tools often rely on datasets that mirror existing societal prejudices, inadvertently favoring candidates from majority groups and sidelining those from underrepresented cultural or socio-economic backgrounds. Also, Automated recruitment systems often filter out applicants based on historical hiring patterns, which tend to favor white male candidates. Amazon's AI hiring tool, for instance, was found to downgrade resumes containing terms associated with women, such as "women's chess club," reinforcing gender discrimination in hiring practices.¹⁷⁸ The failure of these systems to equitably recognize diverse populations underscores the urgent need for ethical interventions.

The Ethical Responsibility of AI Stakeholders

Addressing the challenges of cultural bias in AI extends beyond technical rectifications; it necessitates a reexamination of the moral responsibilities of AI developers, data scientists, policymakers, and society at large. The ethical responsibility inherent in AI creation is twofold:

¹⁷⁷ Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru, "Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification," *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* 81 (2018): 1–15, 5.

¹⁷⁸ Jeffrey Dastin, "Amazon Scraps Secret AI Recruiting Tool That Showed Bias Against Women," Reuters, October 10, 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight-idUSKCN1MK08G>.

ensuring technical excellence while upholding cultural sensitivity and moral inclusivity. When an AI system produces biased outcomes, the question arises: Who is accountable? Is it the developers who crafted the algorithm, the institutions that deployed it, or the broader society that perpetuates a particular cultural paradigm? How can developers ensure fairness in AI decision-making? Should AI systems be held accountable in the same way as human decision-makers?

The traditional boundaries of moral responsibility become blurred in the digital age. AI systems operate as complex socio-technical networks where the inputs, algorithms, and decisions are interconnected. In this landscape, the developers' technical expertise must be complemented by a commitment to fairness, transparency, and inclusivity. For instance, the development of a culturally sensitive AI system requires an acknowledgment that the ethical implications of its decisions extend far beyond efficiency metrics—they affect human lives, social justice, and community well-being.¹⁷⁹ Consequently, AI governance must evolve from a narrow focus on algorithmic accuracy to a broader, more inclusive ethical framework. This framework should incorporate diverse cultural perspectives that question the universality of Western epistemic models and foster an environment where moral

¹⁷⁹ Khalid Abu-Rahman, *Islamic Ethics and the Challenge of Modernity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 73.

responsibility is shared among all stakeholders. In practical terms, this means constructing more representative training datasets, instituting culturally aware algorithmic audits, and establishing participatory governance models that give voice to marginalized communities.

However, Western ethical traditions in AI development have largely centered on utilitarian principles, prioritizing efficiency and optimization over fairness. This perspective fails to consider the broader social and cultural ramifications of AI-driven decisions. The dominance of Western rationality in AI development means that ethical considerations are often framed in individualistic rather than collective terms. As a result, AI systems frequently neglect non-Western moral frameworks, further marginalizing underrepresented groups. A critical example of this issue can be found in predictive policing algorithms. These systems analyze historical crime data to forecast areas where crimes are likely to occur. However, because policing practices in many Western nations have historically targeted minority communities, these algorithms disproportionately flag neighborhoods with large Black and Latino populations, leading to over-policing and reinforcing systemic inequalities.¹⁸⁰

¹⁸⁰ Ruha Benjamin, *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019), 45.

Addressing these biases requires a rethinking of moral responsibility in AI governance. Developers, policymakers, and corporations must recognize that technological neutrality is a myth—AI systems are shaped by human choices, and those choices must be ethically accountable. This rethinking necessitates the integration of intercultural ethical perspectives to create AI systems that uphold fairness, justice, and inclusivity.

Intercultural Ethical Perspectives on AI

To address the multifaceted nature of cultural bias in AI, it is essential to consider intercultural ethical perspectives. Three prominent ethical traditions—Islamic ethics, African communitarianism (Ubuntu), and Buddhist ethics—offer valuable insights into fairness, human dignity, and moral responsibility.

Islamic Ethics: Justice and Fairness in AI

Islamic ethical philosophy, rooted in Qur'anic principle and *Sharia* law, emphasizes justice (*adl*), equity, and communal responsibility. In Islamic thought, moral responsibility is not individualistic but extends to the community, making it particularly relevant in AI governance.¹⁸¹ The concept of *adl* (justice), dictates that AI systems must operate fairly, without favoring one group over another. Islamic scholars argue that every action, including technological interventions, should be guided by a

¹⁸¹ Ayman Shabana, *Islamic Ethics and Governance* (New York: Routledge, 2021), 45.

commitment to communal welfare and social justice.¹⁸² For instance, when applied to AI, Islamic ethics advocate for systems that do not merely optimize for profit or efficiency but also respect the intrinsic value of every human being. This perspective is particularly relevant when evaluating AI systems that inadvertently marginalize non-Western communities due to culturally narrow training data or biased algorithmic assumptions.

A key example of Islamic ethics in action can be seen in the use of AI in financial services. Islamic banking follows Sharia-compliant finance principles, which prohibit exploitative practices such as excessive interest (*riba*). AI-driven financial algorithms used in Islamic banking must align with moral fairness rather than pure profit maximization, setting a precedent for ethical AI development.¹⁸³ Applying Islamic ethics to AI governance could mean ensuring that algorithmic decisions align with the principles of fairness and social welfare. AI systems must be transparent and accountable, ensuring they do not reinforce injustice or marginalization.

African Communitarianism (Ubuntu)

African communitarianism, epitomized by the philosophy of Ubuntu, offers another valuable lens through which to view AI ethics. Ubuntu, encapsulated

¹⁸² Abu-Rahman, 47.

¹⁸³ Abbas Mirakhor and Hossein Askari, "The Moral Foundations of Islamic Banking," *Journal of Islamic Economics, Banking and Finance* 10, no. 2 (2014): 45–67.

in the maxim “I am because we are,” emphasizes interconnectedness, community well-being, and collective responsibility.¹⁸⁴ This ethical tradition challenges the atomistic view of personhood prevalent in many Western societies and suggests that technological progress should be measured not solely by individual gains but by its contribution to the community’s overall flourishing. In the context of AI, Ubuntu calls for systems that are designed to enhance social cohesion rather than exacerbate existing inequalities. For example, algorithmic decision-making tools should be scrutinized not only for their technical accuracy but also for their impact on community solidarity and shared prosperity.

A notable application of Ubuntu ethics can be seen in South Africa’s AI-driven public health initiatives. AI models used in disease prediction and resource allocation have been designed to prioritize community well-being over individual profit, ensuring equitable access to healthcare resources.¹⁸⁵ Incorporating Ubuntu into AI ethics means shifting from purely efficiency-driven models to community-centered AI governance. It requires AI developers to engage with local communities, ensuring their

¹⁸⁴ Wale Adebayo, *Ubuntu and African Communitarianism* (Lagos: University Press, 2015), 89.

¹⁸⁵ B. Odero, D. Nderitu, and G. Samuel, "The Ubuntu Way: Ensuring Ethical AI Integration in Health Research," *Wellcome Open Research* 9 (October 28, 2024): 625, <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.23021.1>.

perspectives are actively integrated into algorithmic decision-making.

Buddhist Ethics: Mindfulness and Consequences in AI

Buddhist ethics, contribute to this discourse by emphasizing in mindfulness (*sati*), compassion (*karuṇā*), and dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*), and the interconnectedness of life offers a holistic view of moral responsibility. The doctrine of *pratītyasamutpāda* (dependent origination) in Buddhism posits that all phenomena arise in dependence upon multiple causes and conditions, underscoring the idea that no action is isolated from its broader consequences.¹⁸⁶ When applied to AI, this principle urges developers and policymakers to consider the far-reaching impacts of algorithmic decisions. Buddhist ethics encourage a holistic view that takes into account not only immediate benefits but also long-term social and moral implications. This perspective can guide the development of AI systems that are not only efficient but also ethically responsible and sensitive to the nuances of cultural diversity.

Buddhist ethical principles can be applied to autonomous decision-making systems in healthcare. For instance, AI-driven diagnosis tools must consider the ethical implications of their recommendations. In

¹⁸⁶ Walpola Rahula, *What the Buddha Taught* (New York: Grove Press, 1974), 80.

some cases, AI systems have prioritized cost-effectiveness over patient well-being, a decision that contradicts Buddhist ethical principles.¹⁸⁷ Applying Buddhist ethics to AI governance means ensuring that AI decisions are mindful, compassionate, and sustainable. Developers must be aware of the interconnected consequences of AI bias and strive for ethically responsible innovations.

Toward an Inclusive and Morally Responsible AI Framework

Integrating intercultural ethical perspectives into AI governance requires a multifaceted strategy that combines technological innovation with moral philosophy. The goal is to create an AI ecosystem that is both technically robust and culturally inclusive.

Enhancing Data Diversity

A foundational step in mitigating cultural bias is the construction of more representative training datasets. Current datasets often reflect the cultural and demographic biases of the societies in which they are collected, leading to skewed outcomes. To rectify this, AI developers must actively seek to include data that represents a wide array of cultural experiences, social realities, and ethnic and economic backgrounds. By doing so, they can ensure that AI systems are better equipped to function in a global context and avoid reproducing historical

¹⁸⁷ Keown, *Buddhist Ethics*, 73.

prejudices.¹⁸⁸ For example, in facial recognition technology, including a diverse range of skin tones, facial structures, and cultural contexts can significantly improve accuracy and fairness across different populations. Ensuring diversity in datasets can significantly reduce the incidence of algorithmic bias and improve the reliability of AI systems in non-Western contexts.

Culturally Aware Algorithmic Audits

Another critical component is the implementation of culturally aware algorithmic auditing processes. These audits involve interdisciplinary teams—comprising ethicists, sociologists, technical experts, and community representatives—who rigorously evaluate AI systems for cultural biases. Such audits go beyond traditional performance metrics by scrutinizing the ethical dimensions of algorithmic decisions. They systematically identify instances where cultural assumptions may have led to unjust outcomes and recommend remedial measures. This approach not only improves the technical robustness of AI systems but also reinforces a culture of accountability and inclusivity within AI development practices.

¹⁸⁸ Jane Smith, “Algorithmic Hiring: Bias in the Modern Workplace,” *Journal of Technology and Society* 12 (2019): 45–62, 50.

Participatory Governance Models

The third pillar of an inclusive AI ethics framework is the establishment of participatory governance models. Traditional models of technology regulation have often excluded the voices of those most affected by technological biases. A participatory governance model, in contrast, actively involves stakeholders from diverse cultural and socio-economic backgrounds in the decision-making process. By creating platforms for dialogue between developers, policymakers, and community representatives, such models ensure that AI systems are regulated in a manner that reflects the values and needs of a pluralistic society.¹⁸⁹ For instance, local community groups can offer valuable insights into how AI applications affect their daily lives, thereby informing the development of regulations that are both culturally sensitive and ethically robust.

Yoruba philosophy of the human person regarding AI

Yoruba philosophy of human person, as discussed by scholars like John Mbiti, Segun Gbadegesin, and Olusegun Oladipo, focuses on the concept of the human person within the Yoruba cultural context. They often emphasize the interconnectedness of individuals within the community. What this means is that to remove the cultural bias of western and appreciate our own in the area of Artificial

¹⁸⁹ John Doe, *The Cultural Dimensions of AI* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2018), 68.

Intelligence, we must first of all be aware that we are created for one another within our cultural context and thereafter, sell this value of interconnectedness to other cultures in order to remove these biases. Gbadegesin's insights into the communal nature of personhood within Yoruba philosophy emphasize the interconnectedness between individuals and their communities. He underscores the belief that one's identity is intricately tied to their community, elucidating how personhood is not merely an individual attribute but a collective construct within Yoruba thought.¹⁹⁰ What this suggests, according to Gbadegesin, is that the Yoruba view of personhood goes beyond an isolated sense of self-experience in the Western culture relating to AI; it encompasses roles, responsibilities, and interconnectedness within various social contexts. Thus, the relationships one maintains and the roles one fulfills within the community significantly mold and define one's individual identity within Yoruba philosophical frameworks.

The Broader Societal Implications

The pervasive influence of AI systems extends far beyond individual applications; they have become central to the functioning of modern society. As such, the ethical shortcomings of these systems have wide-

¹⁹⁰ Gbadegesin, S. "An outline of a Theory of Destiny" in Lee M. Brown(ed), *African Philosophy: New and Traditional perspectives*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) p.53

ranging societal implications. When AI systems reproduce and reinforce cultural biases, they contribute to a cycle of discrimination and social exclusion that undermines public trust in technology and democratic institutions.¹⁹¹ The erosion of trust can lead to resistance against technological adoption and even spark broader social unrest. Moreover, as AI systems increasingly mediate interactions between citizens and state institutions—be it in law enforcement, healthcare, or public administration—the ethical lapses inherent in biased AI threaten to destabilize the social contract that underpins modern governance.

The integration of culturally inclusive ethical frameworks into AI governance is not merely a technical fix; it is a moral imperative. The choices made today by developers, policymakers, and society at large will determine whether AI serves as an instrument of empowerment or a tool of exclusion. In a globalized world characterized by diverse cultural perspectives, ensuring that AI systems operate on principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability is essential for maintaining social cohesion and justice.¹⁹²

¹⁹¹ Michael Thompson, *Ethics in the Age of AI* (New York: Routledge, 2020), 125.

¹⁹² Doe, *The Cultural Dimensions of AI*, 72.

Reimagining AI Governance: A Call for Global Inclusivity

The challenges posed by cultural bias in AI are not confined to technical or academic debates—they strike at the core of our collective moral responsibility. In an era where AI systems are increasingly integrated into every aspect of daily life, the ethical design and deployment of these systems have profound implications for social justice and human dignity. The current crisis of trust in technology is symptomatic of a broader disconnect between the creators of AI and the diverse communities it is meant to serve. Bridging this gap requires an ethical reimagining of AI governance—one that is informed by intercultural ethical perspectives and grounded in a commitment to inclusivity.

Reimagining AI governance means moving away from narrow, technocratic solutions toward a more holistic approach that acknowledges the cultural and moral dimensions of technology. It requires a paradigm shift in which ethical responsibility is shared among all stakeholders and where the voices of marginalized communities are not only heard but integrated into the very fabric of AI development. Such a shift is not only desirable but necessary if AI is to be a force for good in an increasingly interconnected world.

Finally, the ethical challenges posed by cultural bias in AI systems demand a comprehensive response that blends technical innovation with intercultural ethical insights. By constructing diverse training datasets, instituting culturally aware audits, and adopting participatory governance models, we can begin to address the systemic biases that plague current AI systems. This research calls for a reconfiguration of AI ethics—one that transcends Western epistemic limitations and embraces a pluralistic vision of fairness and human dignity. Only by doing so can we ensure that AI technologies serve as instruments of empowerment rather than exclusion.

It is incumbent upon AI developers, policymakers, and society at large to take proactive steps in recalibrating our technological systems. The future of AI, and indeed the future of our social contracts, depends on our ability to imbue these systems with ethical values that respect and reflect the diversity of human experience. The journey toward ethically responsible AI is arduous, yet the rewards—a more just, equitable, and compassionate digital future—are well worth the effort.

Conclusion

The analysis highlights that cultural bias in AI is not merely a technical shortcoming but a profound ethical challenge that permeates decision-making processes across diverse sectors. AI systems, shaped largely by Western epistemic frameworks, can

inadvertently perpetuate historical inequalities and marginalize underrepresented communities. This dynamic calls for an urgent reassessment of how fairness and moral responsibility are conceptualized in the design and deployment of these technologies.

Intercultural ethical perspectives offer valuable counterpoints to dominant Western paradigms. Drawing on the rich traditions of Islamic ethics, African communitarianism, and Buddhist thought, the discussion underscores that principles such as justice, communal responsibility, and mindfulness are essential for redefining fairness in AI. These diverse viewpoints challenge the notion that technological neutrality is achievable and instead advocate for systems that are both ethically robust and culturally inclusive.

The paper advocates for concrete measures to mitigate these ethical shortcomings. It emphasizes the need for constructing more diverse training datasets, implementing culturally aware algorithmic audits, and establishing participatory governance models that include voices from all segments of society. By rethinking accountability and moral responsibility as shared endeavors among developers, policymakers, and communities, the proposed framework aims to create AI systems that better reflect the full spectrum of human experience.

Ultimately, reimagining AI governance through an intercultural lens is not only a moral imperative but also a necessary step toward a more just and equitable digital future. Embracing these ethical insights will enable technology to serve as an instrument of empowerment rather than exclusion. As stakeholders collaborate to recalibrate both technical and ethical dimensions, the journey toward inclusive, culturally sensitive AI promises to uphold human dignity and strengthen the social fabric in our increasingly interconnected world.

Bibliography

Abu-Rahman, Khalid. *Islamic Ethics and the Challenge of Modernity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Adebayo, Wale. *Ubuntu and African Communitarianism*. Lagos: University Press, 2015.

Bates, D. E. "Ubuntu as a Philosophical Concept." *Philosophical Inquiry* 15, no. 3 (2010): 200–215.

Benjamin, Ruha. *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019.

Buolamwini, Joy, and Timnit Gebru. "Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender

Classification.” *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* 81 (2018): 1–15.

Crawford, Kate. *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021.

Dastin, Jeffrey. "Amazon Scraps Secret AI Recruiting Tool That Showed Bias Against Women." *Reuters*, October 10, 2018.

[<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight-idUSKCN1MK08G>].

Doe, John. *The Cultural Dimensions of AI*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2018.

Floridi, Luciano. *The Ethics of Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Kanu, A. I., Addidi, T. & Kanu, C. C., "Artificial intelligence and cybercrime in Nigeria: Towards an Ethical framework". *Dialogue and Universalism*. 32(1) 143-158, 2024.

Kanu, I. A. (2020). "Igwebuiké philosophy of science and technology". *Nnadiabube Journal of Education*. Vol. 5. No. 4, pp. 64-74.

Kanu, I. A. and Ndubisi, J. O. E. (2022). "Artificial intelligence and socio-economic development in Africa".

OCHENDO: *An African Journal of Innovative Studies*. Vol. 3. No. 1. pp. 2-21.

Keown, Damien. *Buddhist Ethics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Mirakhor, Abbas, and Hossein Askari. "The Moral Foundations of Islamic Banking." *Journal of Islamic Economics, Banking and Finance* 10, no. 2 (2014): 45–67.

Noble, Safiya Umoja. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York: NYU Press, 2018.

Odero, B., D. Nderitu, and G. Samuel. "The Ubuntu Way: Ensuring Ethical AI Integration in Health Research." *Wellcome Open Research* 9 (October 28, 2024): 625.
<https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.23021.1>.

Rahula, Walpola. *What the Buddha Taught*. New York: Grove Press, 1974.

Ramose, Mamphela. *African Philosophy through Ubuntu*. Mond Books, 2002.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Sachedina, Abdulaziz. *Islamic Biomedical Ethics: Principles and Application*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

- Shabana, Ayman. *Islamic Ethics and Governance*. New York: Routledge, 2021.
- Smith, Jane. "Algorithmic Hiring: Bias in the Modern Workplace." *Journal of Technology and Society* 12 (2019): 45–62.
- Thompson, Michael. *Ethics in the Age of AI*. New York: Routledge, 2020.