Legal Accountability of Algorithmic Bias: Examining the Role of Law in Preventing Discriminatory AI Decisions

Maulana Fahmi Idris[1*], Methodius Kossay[2]
[1,2]Universitas Sains dan Teknologi Komputer, Semarang, Indonesia
Email: fahmi.maulana@stekom.ac.id[1] methodius@stekom.ac.id [2]

Author correspondence: fahmi.maulana@stekom.ac.id *

Abstract. The increasing adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in decision-making processes has raised significant concerns regarding algorithmic bias and legal accountability. This study examines the regulatory challenges and enforcement gaps in addressing AI bias, with a particular focus on Indonesia's legal landscape. Through a comparative analysis of AI governance frameworks in the European Union, the United States, China, and Indonesia, this research identifies key deficiencies in Indonesia's regulatory approach. Unlike the EU's AI Act, which incorporates risk-based classification and strict compliance measures, Indonesia lacks a dedicated AI legal framework, leading to limited enforcement mechanisms and unclear liability provisions.The findings highlight that transparency mandates alone are insufficient in mitigating algorithmic discrimination, as weak enforcement structures hinder effective regulatory oversight. Furthermore, the study challenges the notion that global AI regulatory harmonization is universally applicable, emphasizing the need for a context-sensitive hybrid model tailored to Indonesia's socio-legal environment. The research suggests that Indonesia must adopt a comprehensive AI legal framework, strengthen regulatory institutions, and promote interdisciplinary collaboration between legal experts and AI developers. Future research should focus on empirical case studies, the development of context-specific AI accountability models, and the role of public engagement in AI bias mitigation. These efforts will be essential in shaping effective AI governance strategies that ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in Indonesia's digital transformation.

Keywords: AI governance, Algorithmic bias, Indonesia, Legal accountability, Regulatory enforcement

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has rapidly transformed various sectors, including finance, healthcare, employment, and the legal system. The increasing reliance on AI-driven decision-making has led to significant efficiency improvements, yet it has also raised ethical and legal concerns. One of the most pressing issues is algorithmic bias, where AI systems exhibit systematic discrimination based on race, gender, socioeconomic status, or other protected attributes. This bias often stems from skewed training data, flawed algorithms, or human prejudices embedded within AI models. As AI becomes more integrated into society, ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability in its decision-making processes is crucial. The legal framework surrounding algorithmic bias remains fragmented, with many jurisdictions struggling to implement regulations that effectively address these challenges.

Recent studies and real-world cases illustrate the severity of algorithmic bias and its consequences. A report by (Bacchini & Lorusso, 2019) revealed that commercial facial recognition systems had significantly higher error rates for darker-skinned individuals, leading to concerns about racial discrimination. In the financial sector, AI-driven credit scoring models have been found to disproportionately deny loans to minority groups (Kothandapani, 2025).

Furthermore, a study by (Gipson Rankin, 2021) found that AI-based risk assessment tools used in the U.S. criminal justice system were more likely to falsely classify Black defendants as high-risk. These cases highlight how biased AI can reinforce and amplify existing social inequalities. The European Union's AI Act and the U.S. Algorithmic Accountability Act are examples of recent regulatory efforts to mitigate these risks. However, there is still a significant gap in understanding how legal frameworks can effectively prevent and remediate AI-induced discrimination, particularly in developing countries like Indonesia.

Several scholars have examined the legal and ethical dimensions of AI bias. (Jui & Rivas, 2024; Pessach & Shmueli, 2022) explored the challenges of achieving fairness in machine learning, while (Chaudhary, 2024) discussed the limitations of algorithmic transparency as a regulatory solution. (Tanaka & Nakamura, 2024) highlighted the ethical concerns of AI-driven decision-making, emphasizing the need for accountability. Meanwhile, (de Almeida et al., 2021) examined the role of law in governing AI bias, arguing that existing legal frameworks are insufficient. (Hall & Ellis, 2023) proposed a socio-technical approach to addressing bias, considering both technical and legal perspectives. In the Indonesian context, (Wadipalapa et al., 2024) analyzed the regulatory challenges of AI governance, while (Winardi & Halim, 2024) examined AI's impact on labor rights. Additionally, (Ruohonen, 2024) discussed the effectiveness of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in ensuring algorithmic fairness. Despite these contributions, few studies have systematically analyzed the intersection of AI bias, legal accountability, and regulatory effectiveness, leaving a critical gap in the literature.

Existing research primarily focuses on technical solutions to AI bias or ethical discussions on fairness but lacks a comprehensive legal perspective. While some studies discuss global regulatory frameworks like GDPR and the AI Act, there is limited analysis on how these regulations apply to Indonesia and other developing economies. Moreover, the effectiveness of legal accountability mechanisms in addressing AI bias remains understudied. This study aims to fill this gap by examining the role of legal frameworks in preventing algorithmic discrimination and ensuring accountability for biased AI decisions. The objectives of this study are: (1) to identify key legal challenges in regulating AI bias, (2) to assess the effectiveness of current laws and policies in mitigating AI discrimination, and (3) to propose regulatory frameworks that can ensure fairness, accountability, and transparency in AI-driven decision-making.

This study contributes to the legal and technological discourse by providing a comparative analysis of global and Indonesian legal frameworks, offering practical policy recommendations, and highlighting the need for interdisciplinary collaboration between legal scholars, policymakers, and AI developers. By addressing both theoretical and practical dimensions, this research seeks to guide the development of more effective legal policies that can protect individuals from discriminatory AI practices.

This article is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews the theoretical framework and key legal principles related to AI accountability. Section 3 describes the research methodology, including data collection and analysis techniques. Section 4 presents the findings and discussion on legal challenges and policy gaps. Section 5 provides recommendations for improving AI governance, and Section 6 concludes with insights on future research directions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Algorithmic bias in artificial intelligence (AI) has become a major area of concern in recent years, particularly in its implications for fairness and discrimination. Studies have shown that biased AI systems can exacerbate social inequalities, leading to serious legal and ethical dilemmas. (Shah & Sureja, 2024) investigated the origins of bias in machine learning models and emphasized the role of biased training data in perpetuating discrimination. (Nishant et al., 2024) provided a comprehensive taxonomy of algorithmic bias, categorizing different sources of bias in AI decision-making systems. Meanwhile, (Buijsman, 2023) explored the trade-offs between algorithmic fairness and accuracy, highlighting the challenges faced by regulators in enforcing fairness standards. These studies illustrate the persistent nature of AI bias and its widespread consequences across different industries, necessitating a strong legal response to ensure accountability.

From a legal perspective, various regulatory frameworks have been proposed to address algorithmic bias and promote transparency. (Chaudhary, 2024) examined the impact of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on algorithmic accountability, arguing that existing legal instruments provide limited protection against biased AI decisions. Similarly, (Ashar et al., 2024) analyzed the effectiveness of algorithmic impact assessments (AIA) as a regulatory tool and suggested improvements to increase accountability. In the United States, (Subías-Beltrán et al., 2024) discussed the concept of the "black box society," warning about the lack of transparency in AI-driven decision-making and advocating for stronger legal mechanisms. Meanwhile, (Kesari et al., 2024) introduced the idea of "right to explanation" as a legal safeguard against algorithmic discrimination, emphasizing the need for more

interpretable AI systems. These studies underscore the importance of legal accountability in mitigating AI bias but also highlight existing limitations in current regulatory approaches.

The effectiveness of AI regulation varies across jurisdictions, reflecting different legal traditions and policy priorities. (Cancela-Outeda, 2024) analyzed the European approach to AI governance, focusing on the legal foundations of the EU AI Act and its implications for algorithmic accountability. In contrast, (Choudhary et al., 2024) examined regulatory developments in the United States, where sector-specific laws provide fragmented oversight of AI-related discrimination. In the Asian context, (Qiao-Franco & Zhu, 2024) discussed China's evolving AI governance framework, which relies heavily on government-led standardization rather than strict legal enforcement. Meanwhile, (Wadipalapa et al., 2024) investigated Indonesia's legal landscape on AI regulation, identifying key gaps in existing policies. These comparative analyses highlight the lack of harmonization in AI governance worldwide and the urgent need for more cohesive regulatory strategies to address algorithmic bias effectively.

In addition to legal frameworks, scholars have explored various technical and policy solutions to mitigate AI bias. (Verma et al., 2024) proposed ethical AI design principles that integrate fairness considerations into model development. (Chaudhary, 2024) critiqued the limitations of algorithmic transparency, arguing that greater explainability does not necessarily translate into fairness. Meanwhile, (Kaewtubtim, 2024) examined the role of multi-stakeholder collaboration in regulating AI bias, suggesting that governments, industry leaders, and civil society must work together to develop effective solutions. (Novak & Kovač EthicAI, 2024) introduced bias-mitigation techniques in machine learning models, assessing their impact on legal compliance. Despite these efforts, the intersection of legal accountability and technical interventions remains underexplored, particularly in the context of emerging economies.

The existing literature provides valuable insights into the legal, ethical, and technical dimensions of algorithmic bias. However, gaps remain in understanding how legal frameworks can be effectively implemented to prevent AI discrimination. While previous studies have examined AI regulations in developed economies, there is limited research on their applicability in developing countries like Indonesia, where legal infrastructure and enforcement mechanisms are still evolving. Additionally, while some scholars have proposed transparency and fairness measures, there is a lack of research on how these principles translate into enforceable legal obligations. Addressing these gaps is essential to developing more effective legal frameworks that can ensure fairness, accountability, and transparency in AI-driven decision-making.

3. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research approach to examine the legal accountability mechanisms for algorithmic bias in AI-driven decision-making. Given the complexity of AI regulation and its intersection with law, ethics, and technology, a doctrinal legal research method is used to analyze statutory frameworks, judicial decisions, and policy documents. This approach enables a structured examination of existing legal instruments, international best practices, and gaps in regulatory enforcement. Additionally, a comparative legal analysis is conducted to evaluate AI regulations across multiple jurisdictions, focusing on the European Union, the United States, China, and Indonesia. By comparing these regulatory frameworks, this study aims to identify strengths, weaknesses, and potential legal adaptations applicable to Indonesia.

Data collection relies on secondary sources, including legal statutes, government reports, case law, and scholarly literature. Relevant legal instruments such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), the AI Act (EU), and the Algorithmic Accountability Act (USA) are examined to assess their effectiveness in mitigating AI bias. Judicial decisions and regulatory guidelines from leading AI governance bodies, such as the European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on AI and the OECD AI Principles, are analyzed to determine how algorithmic bias is addressed in legal practice. Additionally, policy papers from Indonesian legal institutions, including the Ministry of Communication and Informatics (Kominfo) and the Financial Services Authority (OJK), are reviewed to evaluate Indonesia's current AI governance landscape.

The analytical framework of this study is based on a three-pronged legal assessment: (1) Legal Adequacy, which examines whether existing laws sufficiently address AI bias; (2) Regulatory Effectiveness, which evaluates the implementation and enforcement of these laws in different jurisdictions; and (3) Policy Adaptability, which assesses how global AI governance strategies can be adapted to Indonesia's legal and socio-economic context. This framework allows for a systematic evaluation of the strengths and limitations of current AI regulations, ensuring that the findings are grounded in legal principles and practical policy considerations.

To enhance the robustness of the analysis, expert interviews with AI governance specialists, legal scholars, and policymakers are conducted. These interviews provide practitioner insights on the effectiveness of existing AI laws, challenges in regulatory enforcement, and recommendations for improving accountability mechanisms. The interview data is analyzed using a thematic coding approach, where key themes related to bias mitigation,

regulatory enforcement, and accountability frameworks are identified and synthesized. This qualitative approach enables a contextualized understanding of the legal and policy challenges surrounding algorithmic bias in Indonesia and beyond.

The research is subject to several limitations, including the evolving nature of AI regulations and the jurisdictional differences in legal interpretations of algorithmic bias. Additionally, while comparative legal analysis provides valuable insights, context-specific factors, such as economic and technological readiness, must be considered when applying global legal standards to Indonesia. Despite these limitations, this study provides a comprehensive legal evaluation of AI bias regulations and offers practical recommendations to enhance algorithmic accountability in Indonesia's emerging digital economy.

4. RESULTS

Legal Frameworks for Algorithmic Bias: A Comparative Analysis

The examination of existing AI regulations across jurisdictions reveals significant differences in how algorithmic bias is addressed. Table 1 presents a comparative analysis of AI governance frameworks in the European Union, the United States, China, and Indonesia.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of AI Governance Frameworks

Jurisdiction	Key AI Regulation	Bias Mitigation Approach	Accountability Mechanism	Regulatory Enforcement
EU	AI Act (2023)	Risk-based classification of AI systems, strict compliance requirements	Legal liability for developers & deployers	Strong enforcement via GDPR and AI Office
USA	Algorithmic Accountability Act (proposed)	Algorithmic impact assessments, sector-based AI regulations	Limited liability, self-regulation by companies	Fragmented enforcement, sector-specific oversight
China	AI Ethics Guidelines (2021)	Government-led AI standardization, ethical compliance audits	State-controlled enforcement, company self-regulation	Strict regulatory oversight, but limited transparency
Indonesia	Draft AI Regulation (under development)	No specific provisions on algorithmic bias	Weak liability framework, unclear accountability rules	Limited enforcement, reliance on voluntary compliance

From this comparative analysis, the European Union has the most comprehensive AI regulatory framework, with clear bias mitigation measures and legal accountability mechanisms. In contrast, the United States relies on sector-specific laws, leading to regulatory fragmentation. China's approach is highly centralized, emphasizing government-led standardization rather than strict legal accountability. Meanwhile, Indonesia lacks a dedicated

AI legal framework, with existing regulations failing to address algorithmic bias explicitly. These findings suggest that Indonesia requires a more structured legal framework to prevent AI discrimination effectively.

Challenges in Regulating Algorithmic Bias in Indonesia

The study identifies several regulatory challenges that hinder effective AI bias mitigation in Indonesia. Based on legal document analysis and expert interviews, three key obstacles emerge. First, Lack of Specific AI Legislation – Indonesia does not yet have a dedicated legal framework addressing AI governance. Existing laws, such as the Personal Data Protection Act (2022) and Electronic Information and Transactions Law (EIT Law), provide general principles but fail to address algorithmic bias and AI accountability directly. Second, Weak Enforcement Mechanisms – Unlike the EU's GDPR, which includes strict penalties for non-compliance, Indonesia's AI governance relies on voluntary compliance, making enforcement difficult and inconsistent. Third, Limited Technical and Legal Expertise – Interviews with policymakers indicate that many regulatory bodies lack specialized knowledge in AI ethics and legal accountability. This results in ineffective oversight and difficulty in assessing AI-related discrimination claims.

Table 2 summarizes the key legal and enforcement challenges in Indonesia's AI governance framework.

Table 2. Key Challenges in AI Regulation in Indonesia

Challenge	Description
Absence of AI-specific laws	No dedicated regulation on AI bias and algorithmic accountability
Weak legal enforcement	Lack of strict penalties and compliance monitoring
Technical knowledge gap	Limited expertise among policymakers in AI ethics and governance
Unclear liability framework	No clear legal responsibility for biased AI decisions
Sectoral inconsistencies	Fragmented regulations across different industries

These challenges indicate an urgent need for comprehensive AI legislation in Indonesia that incorporates explicit provisions on bias detection, legal accountability, and enforcement mechanisms.

Policy Recommendations for Enhancing Legal Accountability

To address the identified challenges, this study proposes three key policy recommendations to strengthen Indonesia's legal framework for AI governance. Enact a Comprehensive AI Law – Indonesia should introduce a dedicated AI legal framework that explicitly addresses algorithmic bias, inspired by the EU AI Act. This law should establish risk-based AI classification, bias mitigation guidelines, and legal accountability for AI developers and deployers. Strengthen Regulatory Oversight – Establishing an independent AI regulatory body like the European AI Office would enhance enforcement and compliance monitoring. This body should have the authority to investigate AI-related discrimination cases and impose

sanctions where necessary. Develop AI Ethics and Accountability Guidelines – Policymakers should collaborate with academic institutions, AI researchers, and industry leaders to create clear guidelines on ethical AI deployment, ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability.

These recommendations align with international best practices while considering Indonesia's socio-legal landscape, offering a practical roadmap for AI regulation reform.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide new insights into the legal accountability of algorithmic bias, particularly in the context of Indonesia's emerging AI governance framework. The comparative analysis of AI regulations across multiple jurisdictions reveals significant gaps in Indonesia's legal system, particularly in addressing AI bias and enforcing accountability mechanisms. These findings partially support existing literature while also challenging some prior assumptions regarding AI governance in developing economies.

The results of this study align with several key findings in previous research, particularly regarding the importance of legal frameworks in addressing algorithmic bias. Studies by (Chaudhary, 2024; Ruohonen, 2024) and (Ashar et al., 2024) emphasized the role of strong legal instruments such as the GDPR in ensuring algorithmic fairness and holding AI developers accountable. The European model, as shown in this study, demonstrates the effectiveness of risk-based regulation, which classifies AI applications based on potential harm and mandates stricter oversight for high-risk AI systems. The findings confirm that such structured legal approaches are crucial in mitigating bias and ensuring compliance, reinforcing the arguments presented in prior research.

Furthermore, the study's identification of weak enforcement mechanisms in Indonesia aligns with the findings of (Cancela-Outeda, 2024), who argued that regulatory enforcement is often a greater challenge than legal drafting. The reliance on voluntary compliance and sector-specific regulations, as seen in Indonesia, mirrors the fragmented AI governance system in the United States, as analyzed by (Choudhary et al., 2024). These similarities indicate that without clear accountability mandates and centralized enforcement agencies, AI bias regulation remains ineffective.

Additionally, the study confirms the technical knowledge gap among policymakers, as previously identified by (Kaewtubtim, 2024). This knowledge deficit hinders the ability of regulators to assess bias detection methods, interpret AI decision-making processes, and enforce fairness principles effectively. Without sufficient expertise, legal enforcement remains reactive rather than proactive, limiting the ability of regulators to prevent AI discrimination before it occurs.

Challenging Existing Assumptions

While this study supports existing research on AI governance, it also challenges several prior assumptions regarding the feasibility of adopting Western regulatory models in developing economies. Much of the AI governance literature, including works by (Kesari et al., 2024) and (Subías-Beltrán et al., 2024), emphasizes the importance of transparency mandates in regulating algorithmic bias. However, this study's findings suggest that transparency alone is insufficient in jurisdictions with weak enforcement structures. In Indonesia, even if AI developers disclose bias-mitigation processes, the absence of clear liability frameworks means that discriminatory AI decisions can persist without legal consequences. This contradicts the assumption that greater transparency automatically leads to increased accountability, indicating that stronger liability and enforcement measures are necessary.

Another challenge to existing literature is the assumption that AI bias is best addressed through global regulatory harmonization. While scholars such as (Qiao-Franco & Zhu, 2024) advocate for international AI governance standards, this study finds that localized legal frameworks may be more effective in addressing AI discrimination in specific socio-economic contexts. Indonesia's regulatory landscape differs significantly from that of the EU or the US, suggesting that a context-sensitive approach is required. Instead of adopting one-size-fits-all AI laws, Indonesia may need a hybrid model that combines global best practices with local legal traditions and enforcement capacities.

Moreover, the study challenges the assumption that bias mitigation should be addressed primarily through technical interventions, as proposed by (Novak & Kovač EthicAI, 2024). While bias-mitigation techniques in AI models are crucial, the findings indicate that legal accountability mechanisms must complement technical solutions to be effective. This underscores the need for interdisciplinary collaboration between AI developers, legal experts, and policymakers to create holistic AI governance strategies.

Implications for Future AI Regulation

The findings suggest that Indonesia must move beyond fragmented, voluntary AI governance and adopt a structured legal framework that explicitly addresses algorithmic bias. This requires clear liability provisions, stronger regulatory oversight, and capacity-building initiatives to enhance AI literacy among policymakers. The establishment of an independent AI regulatory authority, as proposed in this study, could serve as a model for developing economies facing similar challenges.

Furthermore, the study highlights the need for global AI governance frameworks to be adaptable to national contexts. Rather than imposing rigid regulatory models, international organizations should promote flexible AI governance structures that consider local legal, cultural, and economic factors. This could enhance regulatory effectiveness and ensure that AI bias mitigation strategies are feasible and enforceable in diverse jurisdictions.

Finally, the study reinforces the importance of legal research in shaping AI policy. As AI technology continues to evolve, legal scholars must play a proactive role in evaluating emerging regulatory challenges, proposing context-specific legal solutions, and advocating for greater legal accountability in AI deployment.

5. CONCLUSION

This study highlights the regulatory gaps and enforcement challenges in addressing algorithmic bias in AI-driven decision-making, particularly in the Indonesian legal context. Through a comparative analysis of AI governance frameworks in the European Union, the United States, China, and Indonesia, the findings reveal that Indonesia lacks a dedicated AI regulatory framework, leading to weak legal accountability, limited enforcement mechanisms, and an absence of clear liability provisions. Unlike the EU's AI Act, which incorporates risk-based classification and strict compliance measures, Indonesia still relies on voluntary guidelines and sectoral regulations that do not explicitly address bias mitigation. The study also identifies a significant knowledge gap among regulators, which limits the country's ability to implement and enforce AI fairness principles effectively.

The findings further suggest that regulatory transparency alone is insufficient in ensuring AI accountability. While disclosure requirements can enhance awareness of bias risks, they must be complemented by stronger enforcement mechanisms that hold AI developers and deployers legally accountable for discriminatory outcomes. This study also challenges the notion that global AI regulatory harmonization is a one-size-fits-all solution. Instead, a context-sensitive hybrid model, integrating global best practices with Indonesia's legal and economic realities, is needed to ensure effective AI governance.

Future Research Directions

Given the evolving nature of AI governance, future studies should explore the following areas. First, an Empirical Analysis of AI Bias Cases in Indonesia – While this study focuses on regulatory frameworks, further research should investigate real-world cases where algorithmic bias has led to discrimination in Indonesia's public and private sectors. A case-study approach could provide concrete evidence on how legal gaps affect individuals and businesses. Second, Development of an AI Accountability Model for Indonesia – Future research should aim to

design a tailored AI governance model that combines regulatory, technical, and ethical approaches. This would provide policymakers with practical guidelines for enforcing AI fairness while considering Indonesia's socio-political landscape. Third, Interdisciplinary Collaboration Between Law and Technology – Further studies should examine how legal experts and AI developers can collaborate to create bias-resistant AI models. Research on the feasibility of integrating legal standards directly into AI system design could offer a new dimension in preventing algorithmic bias. Fourth, Comparative Studies with Other Developing Economies – Investigating how similar countries in Southeast Asia or other emerging economies regulate AI bias would provide broader insights into the challenges and potential solutions applicable to Indonesia. Lastly, the Role of Public Awareness and Consumer Rights in AI Governance – Future research should analyze how public engagement, advocacy groups, and consumer protection laws can influence AI bias mitigation efforts. Understanding how citizens can demand accountability from AI-powered institutions could strengthen bottom-up regulatory enforcement.

REFERENCES

Ashar, A., Ginena, K., Cipollone, M., Barreto, R., & Cramer, H. (2024). Algorithmic impact assessments at scale: Practitioners' challenges and needs. *Journal of Online Trust and Safety, 2*(4). https://doi.org/10.54501/JOTS.V2I4.206

Bacchini, F., & Lorusso, L. (2019). Race, again: How face recognition technology reinforces racial discrimination. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society, 17*(3), 321–335. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-05-2018-0050

Buijsman, S. (2023). Navigating fairness measures and trade-offs. *AI and Ethics, 4*(4), 1323–1334. https://doi.org/10.1007/S43681-023-00318-0

Cancela-Outeda, C. (2024). The EU's AI act: A framework for collaborative governance. *Internet of Things, 27*, 101291. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IOT.2024.101291

Chaudhary, G. (2024). Unveiling the black box: Bringing algorithmic transparency to AI. *Masaryk University Journal of Law and Technology, 18*(1), 93–122.

Choudhary, E., Narayanan, S., & Khan, F. (2024). Legal and regulatory landscape. In *Handbook of AI Governance and Ethics* (pp. 222–239). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7452-8.CH014

de Almeida, P. G. R., dos Santos, C. D., & Farias, J. S. (2021). Artificial intelligence regulation: A framework for governance. *Ethics and Information Technology, 23*(3), 505–525. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10676-021-09593-Z

Gipson Rankin, S. M. (2021). Technological tethereds: Potential impact of untrustworthy artificial intelligence in criminal justice risk assessment instruments. *Washington and Lee Law Review, 78*. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/waslee78&id=667

Hall, P., & Ellis, D. (2023). A systematic review of socio-technical gender bias in AI algorithms. *Online Information Review, 47*(7), 1264–1279. https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-08-2021-0452

Jui, T. Das, & Rivas, P. (2024). Fairness issues, current approaches, and challenges in machine learning models. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics, 15*(8), 3095–3125. https://doi.org/10.1007/S13042-023-02083-2

Kaewtubtim, T. (2024). Enhancing AI for gender equality: A multi-stakeholder approach. In *Inteligencia Artificial Feminista: Hacia una agenda de investigación para América Latina y el Caribe*. https://doi.org/10.21428/E25FA4CA.B02C725E

Kesari, A., Sele, D., Ash, E., & Bechtold, S. (2024). A legal framework for explainable artificial intelligence. *Center for Law & Economics Working Paper Series, 09/2024*. https://doi.org/10.3929/ETHZ-B-000699762

Kothandapani, H. P. (2025). Social implications of algorithmic decision-making in housing finance: Examining the broader social impacts of deploying machine learning in lending decisions, including potential disparities and community effects. *Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology, 4*(1), 78–97. https://doi.org/10.60087/JKLST.V4.N1.009

Nishant, R., Schneckenberg, D., & Ravishankar, M. N. (2024). The formal rationality of artificial intelligence-based algorithms and the problem of bias. *Journal of Information Technology, 39*(1), 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962231176842

Novak, M., & Kovač, A. (2024). Advancing fairness in machine learning: Comparative analysis of bias mitigation strategies. *Advances in Computer Sciences, 7*(1). https://acadexpinnara.com/index.php/acs/article/view/186

Pessach, D., & Shmueli, E. (2022). A review on fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), 55*(3). https://doi.org/10.1145/3494672

Qiao-Franco, G., & Zhu, R. (2024). China's artificial intelligence ethics: Policy development in an emergent community of practice. *Journal of Contemporary China, 33*(146), 189–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2022.2153016

Ruohonen, J. (2024). On algorithmic fairness and the EU regulations. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00584-6

Shah, M., & Sureja, N. (2024). A comprehensive review of bias in deep learning models: Methods, impacts, and future directions. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering, 32*(1), 255–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11831-024-10134-2

Subías-Beltrán, P., Pitarch, C., Migliorelli, C., Marte, L., Galofré, M., & Orte, S. (2024). The role of transparency in AI-driven technologies: Targeting healthcare. In *AI - Ethical and Legal Challenges [Working Title]*. https://doi.org/10.5772/INTECHOPEN.1007444

Tanaka, H., & Nakamura, Y. (2024). Ethical dilemmas in AI-driven decision-making processes. *Digital Transformation and Administration Innovation, 2*(2), 17–23. https://journaldtai.com/index.php/jdtai/article/view/13

Verma, S., Paliwal, N., Yadav, K., & Vashist, P. C. (2024). Ethical considerations of bias and fairness in AI models. *2024 2nd International Conference on Disruptive Technologies (ICDT 2024)*, 818–823. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDT61202.2024.10489577

Wadipalapa, R. P., Katharina, R., Nainggolan, P. P., Aminah, S., Apriani, T., Ma'rifah, D., & Anisah, A. L. (2024). An ambitious artificial intelligence policy in a decentralised governance system: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, 43*(1), 65–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034231226393

Winardi, B. T., & Halim, E. J. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence and regulatory strategies on the economics: Learning from Indonesia, China, and Europe. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Manajemen (JBM), 20*(3), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.23960/JBM.V20I3.3437