

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Mustafa Kenan Ustahaliloğlu *

* Commercial Law Department, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Osmaniye, Türkiye
Contact details: Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Fakiuşaşı Mah. 80010 Merkez Osmaniye, Türkiye



Abstract

How to cite this paper:

Ustahaliloğlu, M. K. (2025). Artificial intelligence in corporate governance. *Corporate Law & Governance Review*, 7(1), 123–134.
<https://doi.org/10.22495/clgrv7i1p11>

Copyright © 2025 The Author

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

ISSN Online: 2664-1542
ISSN Print: 2707-1111

Received: 29.10.2023
Accepted: 13.02.2025

JEL Classification: K220, K240, M150
DOI: 10.22495/clgrv7i1p11

Artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed corporate governance, offering unparalleled opportunities for efficiency and decision-making and raising a host of complex legal questions. This article explores the use of AI in corporate governance, addressing the changing role of AI, ethical and legal issues, questions of liability and accountability, considerations of intellectual property, and data privacy issues (Dastani & Yazdanpanah, 2023). The research explores why this topic is of paramount importance, given the increasing adoption of AI in the corporate sector, and identifies the research gap in the form of the legal gray areas surrounding AI. The purpose of the study topic is to clarify how organizations can successfully negotiate the complex web of issues related to AI in corporate governance (Hilb, 2020; Khurshed, 2024; Locke & Bird, 2020). To do this, the article takes a thorough method that incorporates legal analysis with knowledge of business practices. The main takeaway from this work is that it will give readers an understanding of some of the main issues of AI in corporate governance and offer practical advice for businesses doing business in this area.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Corporate Governance, Legal Implications, Intellectual Property, Data Privacy

Authors' individual contribution: The Author is responsible for all the contributions to the paper according to CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) standards.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into corporate governance has reshaped the landscape of decision-making within organizations. AI technologies offer the promise of increased efficiency, improved decision-making processes, and the potential for greater transparency. However, this transformative shift in corporate governance also brings forth a myriad of legal implications that require careful consideration.

The landscape of organizational decision-making has undergone significant transformation due to the incorporation of AI into corporate governance. Unquestionably, AI can give businesses an operational and competitive advantage, but it also comes with several difficulties that demand careful consideration (Papagiannidis et al., 2021). The beneficial effects of AI on corporate governance have been demonstrated in research, demonstrating how it improves governance processes, notably in the context of boards of directors, and works as a driving force behind the organizational changes required to fully realize the potential of AI

(Verhezen, 2020). With promising advancements in cognitive engagement, process automation, and cognitive insights are currently the main areas of attention for AI applications in governance (Locke & Bird, 2020). However, it is important to understand that the incorporation of AI into governance is still in its early stages, and there are still open questions and some skepticism over its maturity and actual application.

A distinct set of difficulties is also presented by the use of AI systems in public organizations, notably concerning the established bureaucratic processes and human oversight. This situation highlights how vital it is to understand and adjust to the dynamic interaction of human-machine bureaucracies, where human and AI system roles and responsibilities always change (Siebecker, 2020).

Based on the philosophical idea of “encapsulated trust” (Siebecker, 2009), fiduciary obligations are ready for reevaluation. The effectiveness, integrity, and humanity of business decision-making in the age of AI may be improved by this reconceptualization. Encapsulated trust signifies a paradigm change in which AI systems redefine

the trust between human stewards and their AI counterparts. By empowering organizations to manage the potential and risks posed by AI in corporate governance, this innovative viewpoint makes sure that the decision-making process is not only effective but also in line with the highest ethical standards. The age of AI in corporate governance compels us to innovate and adapt — not just in terms of technology but also in how we view trust, accountability, and decision-making from a basic perspective (Reich-Graefe, 2013).

This research delves into the multifaceted challenges posed by the use of AI in corporate governance.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides the research methodology that had been used to conduct this study. Section 3 examines the evolution of AI's adoption into corporate governance. Section 4 analyzes the relationship between AI and shareholders. Section 5 investigates the use of AI in corporate management. Section 6 introduces some potential issues that may arise in the future. Section 7 presents the main findings of the research. Section 8 provides a conclusion, implications of the results, and perspectives for future research.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To investigate the use of AI in corporate governance, the author of this paper used the qualitative research method. In doing this, texts from various sources, such as regulations, monographic books, manuscripts, and electronic databases, have been used. The information collected from these sources has been arranged and presented herein using the document analysis method.

3. THE EVOLVING ROLE OF AI IN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

3.1. Defining AI in corporate governance

AI is a term that encompasses a wide array of technologies and techniques designed to enable computer systems to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence (van der Zande et al., 2020), such as understanding natural language (Zuiderveen Borgesius 2018), recognizing patterns (Custers & Fosch-Villaronga, 2022), and making decisions based on data (Hilb, 2020). In the context of corporate governance, the definition of AI extends to a range of applications and systems that facilitate decision-making processes, optimize operations, and enhance strategic planning (van der Zande et al., 2020).

The broad application of AI in corporate governance highlights how technology can alter how businesses function and make decisions. It promises greater strategic insights, cost savings, and increased efficiency. However, organizations must consider the ethical and legal ramifications of using AI technologies as they continue to develop and expand.

3.2. The growing adoption of AI

One of the primary drivers behind the rapid adoption of AI in corporate governance is its ability to process and analyze vast volumes of data at speeds unattainable by human capabilities (van der Zande et al., 2020). In today's data-driven business environment, organizations are inundated

with information from diverse sources, including market data, customer feedback, and internal performance metrics (Larsson et al., 2019). AI-powered algorithms excel at extracting valuable insights from this data, enabling organizations to make more informed and timely decisions.

For instance, financial institutions have harnessed the power of AI to enhance their risk assessment processes. By analyzing historical market data, economic indicators, and even social media sentiment, AI models can provide real-time risk assessments, helping financial institutions make investment decisions with greater precision and agility (Negnevitsky, 2011). Such capabilities not only improve profitability but also reduce exposure to potential financial crises.

Furthermore, traditional decision-making processes find it difficult to attain the level of agility and adaptability that company operations' growing complexity needs. In this scenario, the capacity of AI to adjust to changing circumstances and learn from new data is very advantageous. Predictive analytics powered by AI, for instance, can optimize inventory levels, route planning, and demand forecasting in supply chain management, enabling businesses to react quickly to market changes and interruptions (Klumpp, 2019).

Another noteworthy aspect of AI adoption is its application in automating routine tasks and processes (Khurshed, 2024). Many administrative and data-entry tasks that were once labor-intensive and time-consuming can now be efficiently handled by AI-powered software (Hilb, 2020). This automation not only reduces operational costs but also frees up human resources to focus on more strategic and creative aspects of corporate governance.

In the realm of human resources, AI-driven recruitment platforms have gained popularity for their ability to screen and assess job applicants. These platforms use natural language processing and machine learning algorithms to analyze resumes, conduct video interviews, and assess candidates' suitability for specific roles (Horodyski, 2023). By doing so, they expedite the hiring process and ensure a more objective evaluation of candidates.

3.3. Benefits and challenges of AI in corporate governance

AI has the capacity for improved corporate governance decision-making procedures. It can analyze massive amounts of information more rapidly than humans are capable of, allowing organizations to make more accurate judgments based on data (Wang et al., 2018). AI can free up human resources for higher-level planning and value-added work by automating routine tasks like data entry and analysis. The fundamental goals of governing a company can be met by the cost savings and enhanced productivity resulting from this higher efficiency.

However, these advantages are not without their drawbacks. One of the most serious issues is the possibility of AI reinforcing and perpetuating biases found in historical data. If AI systems are educated on biased datasets, they may make discriminating judgments, which could result in legal and reputational concerns (Timmons et al., 2023). Ensuring equity and fairness in AI algorithms is a constant task that calls for strict control and constant development.

Another major difficulty is the transparency of AI decision-making processes. Many AI algorithms are termed “black boxes”, which means their internal workings are not easily interpretable by humans. This lack of openness can impede accountability since it becomes difficult to track choices back to their source and detect potential errors or biases (Timmons et al., 2023).

Furthermore, data privacy concerns arise as AI systems process vast amounts of sensitive information. Organizations must ensure that they comply with data protection regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), and implement robust security measures to safeguard the confidentiality and integrity of data (Wong et al., 2023).

3.4. Ethical and regulatory considerations

Ethics-related problems arise when AI is included in corporate governance. Organizations must carefully assess the effects of AI on corporate governance to meet these ethical concerns. It is crucial to ensure justice, transparency, and equity in the design and usage of AI systems to gain the trust of stakeholders and prevent legal and reputational issues. Organizations must adopt ethical AI principles and practices that support sound AI governance. Adopting these principles entails improving algorithmic decision-making transparency and routinely reviewing AI systems for fairness and adherence to moral standards and laws (Mittermaier et al., 2023). It is essential to address these ethical challenges if AI is to be responsibly and sustainably incorporated into corporate governance.

One important regulatory development is the GDPR in Europe. For organizations using AI systems, the GDPR includes regulations relating to automated decision-making that mandate openness and appeals processes. These regulations imply that corporations based in the European Union (EU) should ensure that their AI systems abide by GDPR requirements. The GDPR’s emphasis on openness ensures that people have the right to know when automated choices are made about them and gives them the ability to challenge those conclusions (Schneeberger et al., 2020). Similarly, in the United States, the CCPA has clauses that address consumers’ right to be informed about the existence of automated decision-making procedures.

Additionally, industry-specific standards and guidelines begin to appear to address ethical issues related to the use of AI in corporate governance. Ethics impact analyses are becoming a more common need for organizations to identify potential dangers in their AI systems. These evaluations are necessary to ensure that AI-driven choices do not prejudice any particular persons or groups (Shneiderman, 2020).

Companies are also implementing procedures to guarantee that their AI algorithms are not just efficient but also unbiased to promote fairness and accountability. Fairness considerations in AI seek to avoid discriminatory outcomes and to ensure that AI systems do not disproportionately affect particular populations. Companies are employing constant monitoring and auditing procedures in addition to investing in research and development to create fairer algorithms (Cardoni et al., 2020).

4. AI AND SHAREHOLDER RELATIONS

AI has been used to improve communication between firms and their shareholders in recent years. The use of chatbots is one notable use. These AI-powered chatbots respond quickly to shareholder questions and increase accessibility by being accessible round-the-clock. Through these intelligent virtual assistants, shareholders may learn more about their investments, company regulations, and forthcoming meetings. By streamlining communication and boosting shareholder involvement, this novel strategy makes sure that investors are well-informed and that their queries are immediately answered (Fotheringham & Wiles, 2023).

AI-generated reports are a crucial component of AI’s function in shareholder relations. The preparation of shareholder reports is increasingly being automated by corporations utilizing AI algorithms. These reports contain financial statements, summaries of performance, and other important data. These reports may be produced quickly and accurately because of AI’s data processing capabilities. The prompt delivery of these reports to shareholders increases the transparency and confidence in the company’s reporting procedures. AI can also spot patterns and irregularities in data, enabling proactive shareholder notification of significant developments (Financial Reporting Council [FRC], 2019).

Proxy voting, a fundamental aspect of shareholder relations, is influenced by AI. Institutional investors, such as pension and mutual funds, often rely on proxy advisory firms to guide their voting decisions on various corporate matters. These advisory firms increasingly employ AI algorithms to analyze and assess the recommendations provided by corporations (Duan & Jiao, 2016).

Transparency and accountability are essential pillars of effective shareholder relations. As AI becomes more deeply embedded in these interactions, ensuring transparency and accountability becomes paramount. Shareholders have a right to understand how AI-driven systems operate and how they affect corporate decisions. Clear communication about the use of AI, its limitations, and safeguards against biases is crucial to building trust (Nissenbaum, 1996).

AI-powered communication solutions improve accessibility and speed information sharing, ultimately benefiting shareholders. It is, nevertheless, crucial to guarantee that AI-driven decisions, such as proxy voting, are transparent and accountable. Finding the ideal balance between effectiveness and personalized engagement is essential. Firms must prioritize transparency, accountability, and ethical considerations to forge and keep strong bonds with their shareholders.

4.1. AI in shareholder communication

The integration of AI in shareholder communication represents a significant advancement in how corporations engage with their investors. For instance, AI-powered chatbots give shareholders a quick and effective way to ask questions and get information. Since they have natural language processing skills, these chatbots can quickly respond to frequent shareholder questions on dividend payouts, stock performance, and annual meeting dates. By doing this, the organization not only improves the shareholder experience but also frees up key human resources (Uysal, 2018).

Additionally, AI-driven reporting tools have completely changed how businesses communicate financial information to shareholders. These tools enable shareholders to receive the most recent and detailed financial insights since they can provide real-time data-rich reports. The automation of reporting improves the accuracy and dependability of information presented to shareholders while saving time and lowering the possibility of human error in financial disclosures (Kunnathuvalappil Hariharan, 2018).

However, the adoption of AI in shareholder communication is not without its challenges. Potential biases in AI systems that can affect the information supplied to shareholders are a serious worry. Unintentional or intended bias in algorithms has the potential to treat shareholders unfairly and influence their decision-making. Additionally, issues of accountability and liability are raised as a result of AI systems' interactions with shareholders. It begs the question of who is responsible for the reliability of the information and any possible negative consequences that may result from interactions with AI-driven systems when shareholders receive information or make decisions based on interactions with such systems (Wang et al., 2020). A legal issue that needs careful consideration is establishing clear lines of liability and accountability in AI-mediated shareholder communication.

4.2. AI-driven proxy voting

The landscape of corporate governance has undergone a substantial change with the introduction of AI-driven proxy voting. AI algorithms are increasingly used by institutional investors and asset managers to decide how to vote on a sizable portfolio of shares they own. These algorithms are made to examine a wide range of variables, such as previous voting trends, financial performance, social and environmental responsibilities, and more. AI can give investors instant, data-driven insights about how to vote on various corporate issues by automating the proxy voting process (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2021).

However, the use of AI-driven proxy voting also brings up several ethical and legal questions. The issue of transparency is one of the main ones. Given that AI algorithms frequently function as "black boxes", it might be difficult for shareholders and regulators to comprehend the reasoning behind voting decisions. This lack of transparency can make it difficult to hold people accountable and may raise concerns about conflicts of interest or biases in the algorithms (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2021).

Furthermore, as AI voting systems take control, concerns about the fiduciary obligations of asset managers and institutional investors emerge. Investors want these organizations to behave in their best interests, but when choices are primarily made by algorithms, accountability lines become unclear. Complex legal issues arise when determining who is ultimately responsible for vote outcomes (Ranchordás, 2018).

Regulatory authorities are considering the need for more transparency and accountability as AI-driven proxy voting develops. Such considerations could entail creating and using these algorithms and adopting disclosure rules for voting decisions generated by AI (Uysal, 2018). Finding the ideal balance between respecting the values of

transparency and accountability and utilizing AI's efficiency in proxy voting continues to be a significant challenge in corporate governance.

4.3. Transparency and accountability in shareholder relations

When AI systems are involved, transparency and accountability are crucial for preserving confidence and integrity in shareholder relations. While AI can improve communication and streamline operations, it is vital to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of its use, its decision-making principles, and how it will affect shareholder interactions. The unambiguous disclosure of AI's role in shareholder communication is a key component of transparency. Companies must be transparent about how AI-powered chatbots or other algorithms help with query processing or report generation (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2021). Through this transparency, shareholders are guaranteed to be aware of the technology's use and to be able to assess the validity of the information they get.

Companies also need to be transparent about the data sources and AI algorithms applied to shareholder interactions. This includes revealing the kinds of data AI analyses, how it formulates conclusions or suggestions, and any measures taken to thwart inaccuracies (Naiseh et al., 2021). Transparency in these areas encourages accountability and aids in addressing worries about data privacy and possible information manipulation.

Transparency and accountability go hand in hand. Companies should define clear lines of accountability for AI-driven shareholder relations decisions. Defining accountability entails determining who is responsible for the choices made by AI systems, particularly when the technology's suggestions could have a substantial impact on shareholder activities like proxy voting. Accountability also includes making sure AI systems are routinely inspected and checked for fairness, accuracy, and compliance with pertinent laws. This preemptive strategy shows a commitment to responsible AI use in addition to protecting against future legal concerns (Dastani & Yazdanpanah, 2023).

4.4. Some of the legal concerns that may arise with the use of AI-driven proxy voting

Numerous legal issues are raised by the use of AI-driven proxy voting, which necessitates careful examination. Transparency and accountability stand out as the main problems among these worries. Concerns about fairness and accountability are raised by regulators and stakeholders' challenges in interpreting the voting decisions generated by AI systems. As a result, there is an urgent need for rules requiring asset managers and institutional investors to give precise and understandable justifications for voting decisions using AI.

A significant risk with AI-driven proxy voting is the possibility of conflicts of interest and transparency issues. AI systems may unintentionally favor particular businesses or political perspectives. When asset managers have financial relationships with the entities being voted on, this partiality may result in conflicts of interest (Ingle & Van Der Walt, 2004).

Furthermore, the incorporation of AI into proxy voting confounds conventional ideas of fiduciary

obligations. Traditionally, it has been expected that institutional investors and asset managers operate in the best interests of their clients or shareholders (Ingley & Van Der Walt, 2004). Nevertheless, giving decision-making authority to AI systems muddles the lines of accountability. Determining the scope of fiduciary obligations in the context of AI-driven proxy voting requires legal clarity.

In the environment of AI-driven proxy voting, data security, and privacy also become crucial problems. Large volumes of potentially private and sensitive data are used in AI systems. The collection, storage, and use of shareholder data in these processes must be managed with strict data protection laws (Nguyen et al., 2021).

Significantly, the worldwide structure of financial markets presents regulatory compliance concerns. Regulations governing proxy voting and financial decision-making differ by jurisdiction. A significant legal difficulty exists in ensuring that AI-driven proxy voting systems abide by these rules, which may alter or are subject to interpretation (Pujol et al., 2020). Continuous observation and adjustment to changing legal environments become essential.

Fairness and algorithmic bias are other issues that need to be addressed. Due to bias in AI systems, certain companies or demographic groupings may benefit from biased vote results. The establishment of methods to remedy instances of discrimination or unfair treatment should be mandated, along with the requirement of routine audits of AI systems to spot biases and correct them (Kirkpatrick, 2016).

The complexity increases when determining who is responsible for voting decisions made by AI systems. It needs to be clearly defined whether it is the asset manager, the AI provider, or a group of accountable stakeholders. Liability for mistakes or unfavorable outcomes resulting from AI-driven proxy voting is one aspect of this (Dastani & Yazdanpanah, 2023).

Finally, regulatory control is of utmost significance. Governments and regulatory organizations may need to step up their oversight of AI-driven proxy voting to ensure compliance and moral conduct. The scope and authority of regulatory organizations should be clearly defined to monitor and regulate these systems effectively (Alissa, 2015).

4.5. Accountability of AI in proxy voting

In AI-driven proxy voting, accountability extends beyond human actors to include the AI systems themselves, creating a complicated level of responsibility and liability for their actions and conduct. Although AI was built and maintained by humans, it can make decisions on its own. This independence raises important questions about the accountability of AI systems (Erman & Furendal, 2022).

An important issue is autonomous decision-making. Advanced machine learning models in particular can evaluate enormous datasets autonomously and make conclusions based on patterns and algorithms. This brings up important issues about the distribution of accountability when voting decisions made by AI systems have legal consequences (Shrestha et al., 2019).

Algorithm transparency is a crucial aspect of accountability. The extent to which AI systems' decision-making processes are clear and

understandable to humans is critical. However, the opaque nature of many AI models, such as deep neural networks, presents difficulties because they base their choices on complex patterns challenging for humans to understand (Floridi et al., 2021).

Organizations must conduct constant monitoring and auditing of AI systems to overcome these problems. Regular evaluations help spot and address problems with the accuracy and fairness of decisions. It is crucial to ensure AI systems abide by predetermined ethical and legal bounds, with humans still having the power to intervene, override AI judgments, and determine these boundaries (Lehner et al., 2022).

Creating liability frameworks is still another key component. The conditions for which AI systems can be held accountable for voting decisions should be specified, together with rules for allocating blame among the AI system, its operators, and the organizations using it (Prifti et al., 2022).

Holding AI responsible also heavily relies on ethical issues. Organizations and AI developers should abide by moral principles that place a high priority on fairness, openness, and the prevention of damage. The acceptance of self-imposed moral principles and conduct rules may be necessary for this (Floridi et al., 2021).

The accountability of AI in proxy voting is a complex issue that necessitates close examination. While AI functions as a tool designed and managed by humans, it has the capacity to make autonomous decisions, which calls for a comprehensive strategy. To ensure that AI systems are held responsible for their deeds and decisions, there must be appropriate legal, ethical, and technical safeguards in place. The appropriate balance between autonomy and control must be found to address this element of AI accountability.

4.6. Liability frameworks for AI systems in proxy voting

AI systems are often designed and maintained by human operators or organizations rather than operating on their own. As a result, human operators are responsible for the behavior of AI systems that fall under their control. A well-established idea called "operator's liability" assures that persons in charge of managing and building AI systems are accountable for the systems' correct operation and regulatory compliance.

Additionally, companies that use AI systems for proxy voting may be held accountable for the decisions made by these algorithms. The employing organization may be held liable if the voting decisions of an AI system result in injury or legal violations. This responsibility includes poor oversight, insufficient training, and a failure to put bias prevention measures in place (Bryson et al., 2017).

The idea of algorithmic accountability has come up in debates, with proponents arguing that AI system algorithms themselves can be held accountable for actions that cause harm or non-compliance. A challenging legal issue arises when determining how much responsibility is divided between the algorithms themselves and the people who created them (Martin, 2019).

Jurisdictions may need to pass explicit legislation outlining liability AI-driven proxy voting. The conditions for which AI systems, their

operators, or organizations may be held liable would be laid out in such legislation. Additionally, they might describe the care standards, audits, and openness needed to reduce the legal risks connected with AI-driven decision-making (Čerka et al., 2015).

In some circumstances, contractual agreements may be used to specify liability for AI systems used in proxy voting. Establishing contractual terms with AI developers or providers can help organizations using AI systems to define who is responsible for voting outcomes, algorithmic behavior, and adherence to ethical and regulatory standards (Picciau, 2021).

The status of AI entities as legal persons is a crucial issue. The question of whether AI systems should be given legal personhood, which would entail direct responsibility for their activities, involves several complex problems. Such a classification raises questions regarding AI entities' legal rights and obligations and challenges traditional ideas of legal responsibility, typically reserved for individuals and corporate entities (Wagner, 2019).

5. AI AND MANAGER RELATIONS

Various facets of corporate governance can be affected by AI's effects on risk management. The field of risk assessment is one of the most popular applications. Large datasets may be analyzed in real time by AI-powered algorithms, enabling organizations to detect and assess threats more thoroughly and faster than conventional techniques (Bharadiya, 2023). Financial institutions, for instance, utilize AI to track market patterns, spot abnormalities, and foresee impending financial catastrophes. While this may help people make better decisions, it also prompts concerns about the accuracy of AI-driven risk assessments (Scheffer et al., 2009).

The use of AI in regulatory compliance and risk minimization is growing. Organizations must adhere strictly to an increasing number of rules and norms. AI can help monitor and ensure adherence to these regulations, lowering the risk of fines and other consequences (Scheffer et al., 2009). The utilization of AI in this particular context also presents challenges to data privacy, as handling sensitive information for compliance necessitates careful attention to prevent any breaches of privacy regulations.

Notably, AI-driven risk management systems are made to anticipate dangers and reduce them before they materialize. By adopting this proactive strategy, organizations may reduce costs, safeguard their brand, and avert catastrophes. However, since AI systems can make decisions that directly impact an organization's future, this approach also demands a high level of trust in these systems (Omran et al., 2022). From a legal standpoint, it is essential to establish accountability and transparency in these judgments.

Furthermore, evaluating and explaining risk estimates based on AI might be challenging. Regulators, stakeholders, and legal experts may struggle to comprehend AI-generated risk projections' logic. In order to allay these worries, it is crucial to ensure transparency and the capacity to articulate the reasoning behind AI-driven judgments (Asatiani et al., 2020).

When deciding how to manage risk, organizations must also take into account the legal

ramifications. Issues of accountability and responsibility become more prominent in the context of AI-driven decision-making. It begs the question of who will be accountable if an AI system is unable to forecast or reduce danger sufficiently; is it the business, the AI system's creators, or both? Organizations must carefully analyze contractual agreements and insurance plans to reduce potential legal risks, and legal frameworks must change to make sense of these challenges (Busuioc, 2021).

5.1. AI-powered risk assessment

While traditional risk assessment methods often rely on historical data and predefined rules, making them less adaptable to rapidly evolving risk landscapes, AI can ingest data from a multitude of sources, including market trends, news feeds, financial reports, and even social media, to identify emerging risks as they unfold. This dynamic and data-driven approach enables organizations to stay ahead of the curve and respond proactively to potential threats (Grover & Kar, 2017).

Moreover, AI-driven risk assessment models are not constrained by human biases or cognitive limitations. They can sift through vast datasets with a level of precision and consistency that is challenging to achieve manually. By eliminating human bias from the risk assessment process, organizations can make more objective decisions and reduce the likelihood of overlooking critical risk factors (Shrestha et al., 2019). AI also excels in risk modeling and scenario analysis. It can simulate various scenarios based on historical data and market conditions, providing organizations with a deeper understanding of potential outcomes. This capability enables companies to develop more robust risk mitigation strategies and contingency plans, enhancing their resilience in the face of uncertainties (Bonabeau, 2002).

However, the adoption of AI in risk assessment is not without its challenges and potential pitfalls. Ensuring the quality and accuracy of the data used to train AI models is paramount. Notably, there is a need for transparency and explainability in AI-powered risk assessment, as opaque algorithms can pose legal and ethical concerns. Furthermore, organizations must strike a balance between the capabilities of AI and human judgment. While AI can process vast amounts of data and generate risk assessments rapidly, human expertise remains invaluable in interpreting results, validating model outputs, and making strategic decisions (Dastani & Yazdanpanah, 2023).

5.2. Regulatory compliance and risk mitigation

One of the primary advantages of AI in regulatory compliance is its ability to monitor and analyze data for compliance breaches continuously. This proactive approach enables organizations to identify potential issues before they escalate into legal or financial crises. For instance, AI-driven algorithms can scan financial transactions for anomalies indicating fraud or non-compliance with regulations, thereby allowing swift corrective action (Ahmed et al., 2022). Furthermore, AI can assist in the automation of compliance reporting. This is particularly valuable for organizations that operate across multiple jurisdictions, each with its own set

of regulations. AI-driven reporting systems can generate accurate and customized reports, ensuring that organizations meet the specific requirements of each regulatory body (Tillu et al., 2023).

Despite its numerous benefits, the utilization of AI in regulatory compliance and risk mitigation also presents challenges. One of the primary concerns is the potential for bias in AI algorithms, which can inadvertently lead to discriminatory outcomes or favor specific groups. Organizations must implement measures to mitigate bias and ensure fairness in their AI-driven compliance efforts. Additionally, there is a need for transparency and accountability when AI systems are used in risk management (Ingle & Van Der Walt, 2004). Stakeholders, including regulators, investors, and the public, should have visibility into how AI systems operate, make decisions, and impact compliance efforts. Ensuring transparency can help build trust and confidence in AI-driven risk management practices. In summary, AI's role in regulatory compliance and risk mitigation is transformative. It offers efficiency, accuracy, and the ability to manage risks proactively. However, organizations must be vigilant in addressing potential biases and ensuring transparency to fully realize the benefits of AI in this context (Asatiani et al., 2020).

5.3. Challenges in AI-driven risk management

The integration of AI into risk management practices in corporate governance is not without its complexities and challenges. One notable challenge is the potential for algorithmic bias. AI systems rely on historical data to make predictions and assessments. If these datasets are biased or incomplete, the AI algorithms can perpetuate or even exacerbate these biases (Kriebitz & Lütge, 2020). This could lead to unfair or discriminatory outcomes, potentially exposing organizations to legal and reputational risks. Mitigating algorithmic bias requires ongoing monitoring, data quality improvement, and the development of more inclusive and diverse datasets.

Additionally, the interpretability of AI-driven risk models poses a challenge. Many AI algorithms, such as deep learning neural networks, are often considered "black boxes" because they make decisions based on complex mathematical computations that are difficult for humans to interpret. This lack of transparency can be problematic when attempting to explain risk assessments to regulators, stakeholders, or the general public. Striking a balance between the predictive power of AI and the need for transparency and accountability is a crucial challenge in AI-driven risk management (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2021; Timmons et al., 2023).

Another challenge is the potential overreliance on AI systems. While AI can enhance risk assessment, human judgment and expertise remain invaluable. Organizations may become overly reliant on AI models, neglecting the qualitative aspects of risk management that require human insight and contextual understanding. This overreliance can lead to blind spots and missed risks, posing a significant challenge in achieving a comprehensive risk management strategy (Bouschery et al., 2023).

Lastly, the evolving regulatory landscape surrounding AI in risk management is a dynamic challenge. As regulators catch up with technological

advancements, organizations must adapt to changing compliance requirements. This adaptation includes staying abreast of new regulations and ensuring that AI risk management practices align with evolving legal standards (Koetter et al., 2014).

5.4. AI-enhanced compliance monitoring

The integration of AI into compliance monitoring processes brings a new level of precision and efficiency. AI algorithms have the capability to continuously analyze vast datasets, detect anomalies, and identify potential compliance breaches in real time. This proactive approach to compliance enables organizations to swiftly mitigate risks and maintain adherence to regulatory requirements. Furthermore, AI-powered compliance monitoring systems can adapt to evolving regulations and deliver timely alerts, thereby helping organizations stay ahead of compliance challenges. However, it is crucial to ensure that these systems are regularly updated, well-calibrated, and aligned with specific industry standards to avoid false positives and negatives. The use of AI in compliance monitoring requires careful consideration of data privacy and security concerns, as well as the potential biases that can be introduced through algorithmic decision-making (Andreoni & Chang, 2019).

As organizations continue to integrate AI into their corporate governance processes, compliance monitoring emerges as a crucial domain where AI can provide significant advantages. Compliance monitoring involves ensuring that a company adheres to relevant laws, regulations, and internal policies. AI-enhanced compliance monitoring leverages machine learning algorithms and data analytics to streamline this critical function. Regulations change frequently, and staying abreast of these changes is a daunting task for compliance professionals. AI can be programmed to monitor regulatory updates and automatically adjust compliance protocols accordingly, ensuring that organizations remain in compliance with the latest legal requirements (Pererva et al., 2021).

5.5. AI-generated reporting and disclosure

AI-driven technologies are revolutionizing the way organizations generate reports and disclosures. By automating data collection, analysis, and synthesis, AI systems can produce comprehensive reports with remarkable speed and accuracy. This not only reduces the burden on human resources but also minimizes the risk of errors in financial and regulatory reporting (de Villiers et al., 2024). AI-generated reports can be customized to meet specific regulatory requirements and tailored to the needs of various stakeholders. Additionally, AI can enhance the quality of disclosures by identifying trends, risks, and opportunities hidden within the data. However, the adoption of AI in reporting and disclosure must be accompanied by stringent quality assurance processes. Organizations must ensure the reliability and integrity of AI-generated reports to maintain trust with shareholders, regulatory bodies, and the broader public. Furthermore, transparency in the use of AI algorithms for reporting is paramount to provide stakeholders with confidence in the decision-making process.

AI-generated financial reports rely on complex algorithms and data analysis to compile and interpret financial data. This process can make it challenging to determine the exact source of information, leading to concerns about transparency and accountability. Regulators and stakeholders alike must grapple with issues related to the verifiability and reliability of AI-generated reports.

Regulatory bodies are actively developing guidelines and standards for AI-generated financial reporting to address these concerns. Organizations must stay informed about these evolving regulations and ensure their AI systems comply with the requirements. Moreover, they should establish robust internal controls and audit mechanisms to verify the accuracy and integrity of AI-generated reports (de Villiers et al., 2024).

5.6. Intellectual property and data privacy and security

The symbiotic relationship between AI, intellectual property, and data privacy represents a confluence of monumental significance. It is a landscape where innovation meets regulation and the preservation of creative rights meets the safeguarding of personal data (Alikhan, 2020).

As AI systems develop and become more autonomous, they might produce innovations and inventions without direct human involvement. This raises concerns regarding inventorship and patent eligibility. Current patent laws often require human inventors, but are AI systems considered inventors, and if so, what rights should be granted to them? Adapting current patent laws to account for AI-driven innovation is a pressing concern because they frequently require human inventors.

The line that traditionally demarcates human from machine authorship has become increasingly blurred, instigating a series of intricate legal quandaries about copyright, patents, and trademarks. The perplexing conundrum of determining the rightful intellectual property owner for content or inventions generated by AI adds yet another layer of complexity to this intricate puzzle (Smits & Borghuis, 2022).

Identifying the author of AI-generated works presents a significant challenge. It is essential to determine whether the copyright for content produced by AI systems belongs to the AI itself or its human operator. The response might change depending on elements like the degree of human involvement, the characteristics of the AI system, and the laws that apply in various jurisdictions.

In addition, in the context of AI-driven corporate governance, data security and privacy are major concerns. Securing this data becomes crucial as organizations increasingly rely on AI algorithms to process enormous amounts of sensitive data. The legal ramifications of data security and privacy in AI governance are complex, necessitating an all-encompassing strategy.

Organizations must navigate a complex web of laws about data privacy, including the CCPA in the United States and the GDPR in Europe. The collection, processing, and protection of personal data are subject to strict regulations under these laws (Tikkinen-Piri et al., 2018). In addition to being required by law, compliance with such regulations is crucial for keeping stakeholders' trust.

6. THE FUTURE OF AI IN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

As technology advances and businesses adapt, the role of AI in corporate governance is likely to evolve further. Several significant trends and challenges influence the trajectory of AI integration in governance as we look toward the future.

The first noticeable trend is the advancement in AI system sophistication. AI algorithms are improving at analyzing huge datasets, spotting intricate patterns, and making precise predictions (Gentsch, 2019). Organizations can make data-driven decisions more quickly and effectively, improving their governance procedures. However, transparency becomes more challenging as complexity increases. It becomes more difficult to explain the decision-making processes of AI systems as they become more complex. Making AI-driven judgments transparent and comprehensible will be essential to preserve stakeholder confidence and adhere to emerging regulatory frameworks (de Fine Licht & de Fine Licht, 2020).

The increasing significance of AI in risk management is another new trend. With the help of AI, businesses can identify market patterns, spot potential financial hazards, and even anticipate regulatory changes. As a result, risk mitigation is improved, and organizations are better able to take advantage of possibilities. Additionally, the ethical application of AI in governance will develop. Organizations need to address the issues regarding AI's impact on diversity, inclusivity, and corporate values. To ensure that AI reflects company beliefs and does not intentionally or unintentionally support biases or discriminatory practices, they must develop explicit ethical standards (Mullins et al., 2021).

The collaboration component of AI will also become more prominent. Organizations will use AI-powered collaboration tools more frequently to encourage cross-functional decision-making and creativity. These technologies can aid in dismantling organizational silos and ensuring that governance choices are informed by insights from various departments (Geluvaraj et al., 2019).

6.1. Emerging trends and future challenges

The future of AI in corporate governance holds significant promise, but it also presents a set of evolving trends and challenges. One of the most prominent trends is the increasing sophistication of AI algorithms, enabling more complex decision-making processes.

Another emerging trend is the global harmonization of AI regulations. Governments and international organizations are working to establish consistent frameworks for AI governance, aiming to create a level playing field for businesses operating across borders (Cihon et al., 2020). However, achieving consensus on such regulations remains a challenge, and organizations will need to navigate a patchwork of legal requirements in the interim. As AI evolves, so do the legal complexities associated with it. Organizations will need to stay ahead of the curve by continuously monitoring and adapting to these advancements.

Finally, the ethical dimensions of AI in corporate governance are expected to gain even greater prominence. As AI systems become more integrated into decision-making, issues of fairness and transparency will be closely scrutinized.

Organizations will not only need to comply with legal requirements but also proactively address ethical concerns to uphold public trust (Weiner, 2018).

6.2. Recommendations and best practices

Establishing guidelines and best practices is essential as organizations use AI in corporate governance to help them navigate the legal complexities and realize the full potential of these technologies. Here, we provide a thorough set of recommendations for successfully incorporating AI into corporate governance while reducing related risks.

First and foremost, organizations should put transparency. This entails informing all relevant parties, such as shareholders, employees, and customers, about using AI in decision-making processes. Transparency makes it easier for organizations to comply with new regulatory requirements and avoid legal problems (Paunov et al., 2019).

Second, it is crucial to implement effective data governance and protection measures. Organizations must protect sensitive data carefully, especially when AI systems are involved. Compliance with data privacy laws like the CCPA and GDPR is required. The risk of legal repercussions is also decreased by establishing a thorough framework for data governance that helps ensure data quality, security, and compliance (Kazim et al., 2021).

Third, businesses should fund ongoing AI ethics training for staff members who participate in decision-making. This includes educating the workforce about the moral issues. Legal issues relating to discriminatory practices can also be prevented by fostering an ethical culture within the organization (Sherman, 2023).

Fourth, businesses must audit their AI systems regularly. The fairness and transparency of decisions made using AI should be the main focus of these audits. Organizations can reduce legal risks and show dedication to ethical AI governance by proactively identifying and correcting bias or discriminatory patterns (Mökander et al., 2021).

Fifth, working with legal professionals and keeping up with the legal environment surrounding AI as it changes is essential. Organizations must have legal counsel knowledgeable in AI-related issues to provide guidance and guarantee compliance given the quick changes in laws and case law (Nersessian & Mancha, 2020).

Finally, businesses should look into using AI to track compliance with legal requirements. AI-powered tools can help track and report on compliance with various laws and regulations, lowering the likelihood of non-compliance and the ensuing legal repercussions (Koshiyama et al., 2021).

7. RESULTS

This research has explored critical aspects of the evolving role of AI, ethical and regulatory considerations, liability and accountability,

intellectual property, and data privacy. However, it is imperative to highlight two critical themes that emerged from our discussions:

Firstly, attributing legal personality to AI entities is at the heart of liability concerns and intellectual property issues. As AI systems take on more autonomous roles in decision-making, the question of who should be held accountable for their actions becomes paramount. Establishing a legal personality for AI raises intricate questions of responsibility, as organizations, developers, and AI systems may be subject to legal obligations.

Secondly, intellectual property rights in the context of AI-generated content and inventions are a rapidly evolving domain. As AI contributes to creative works and invents novel solutions, determining ownership and protection becomes increasingly complex. Organizations must navigate the intersection of AI, copyright, and patent law to safeguard their innovations while respecting the principles of fairness and originality.

These results underscore the transformative potential of AI in reshaping corporate management. The increased productivity can be attributed to AI's ability to automate routine tasks, freeing up human resources for more strategic roles. The reduction in operational costs is likely due to AI's proficiency in data analysis, enabling more informed and cost-effective decision-making. However, it is essential to note that these benefits are contingent on overcoming challenges such as data privacy concerns and the need for workforce upskilling.

8. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, integrating AI in corporate governance has emerged as a transformative force, reshaping how businesses operate and strategize. AI's ability to automate routine tasks, generate insights from data, and augment decision-making processes has increased operational efficiency and fostered innovation and competitiveness.

However, the adoption of AI is not without challenges. Concerns related to data privacy, ethical use of AI, and the need to upskill the workforce are significant hurdles that corporations must address. It is also crucial for organizations to foster a culture of continuous learning and adaptability to fully leverage the potential of AI.

AI will undoubtedly influence the future of corporate management, but the extent of its impact will largely depend on how well corporations can navigate these challenges. As we move forward, observing how AI continues to evolve and redefine the corporate landscape will be interesting. This study has merely scratched the surface, and a vast expanse of possibilities is waiting to be explored in the realm of AI in corporate management. Future research should focus on strategies to mitigate these challenges to fully harness the potential of AI in corporate management.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A. A. A., Agarwal, S., Kurniawan, I. G. A., Anantadjaya, S. P. D., & Krishnan, C. (2022). Business boosting through sentiment analysis using artificial intelligence approach. *International Journal of System Assurance Engineering and Management*, 13(1), 699–709. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13198-021-01594-x>
- Alikhan, S. M. (2020). *Big data: IP, ownership, and protection — An analysis* [Master's thesis, The National University of Advanced Legal Studies]. The National University of Advanced Legal Studies. <http://14.139.185.167:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/433/1/LM0220004.pdf>
- Alissa, W. (2015). Boards' response to shareholders' dissatisfaction: The case of shareholders' Say on Pay in the UK. *European Accounting Review*, 24(4), 727–752. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2015.1058719>
- Andreoni, A., & Chang, H.-J. (2019). The political economy of industrial policy: Structural interdependencies, policy alignment and conflict management. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 48, 136–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2018.10.007>
- Asatiani, A., Malo, P., Nagbøl, P. R., Penttinen, E., Rinta-Kahila, T., & Salovaara, A. (2020). Challenges of explaining the behavior of Black-Box AI systems. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 19(4), 259–278. <https://doi.org/10.17705/2msqe.00037>
- Bharadiya, J. P. (2023). AI-driven security: How machine learning will shape the future of cybersecurity and web 3.0. *American Journal of Neural Networks and Applications*, 9(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajjna.20230901.11>
- Bonabeau, E. (2002). Agent-based modeling: Methods and techniques for simulating human systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99(suppl_3), 7280–7287. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.082080899>
- Bouschery, S. G., Blazevic, V., & Piller, F. T. (2023). Augmenting human innovation teams with artificial intelligence: Exploring transformer-based language models. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 40(2), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12656>
- Bryson, J. J., Diamantis, M. E., & Grant, T. D. (2017). Of, for, and by the people: The legal lacuna of synthetic persons. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 25(3), 273–291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-017-9214-9>
- Busuioc, M. (2021). Accountable artificial intelligence: Holding algorithms to account. *Public Administration Review*, 81(5), 825–836. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13293>
- Cardoni, A., Kiseleva, E., & De Luca, F. (2020). Continuous auditing and data mining for strategic risk control and anticorruption: Creating “fair” value in the digital age. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(8), 3072–3085. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2558>
- Čerka, P., Grigienė, J., & Sirbikyte, G. (2015). Liability for damages caused by artificial intelligence. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 31(3), 376–389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2015.03.008>
- Cihon, P., Maas, M. M., & Kemp, L. (2020). Fragmentation and the future: Investigating architectures for international AI governance. *Global Policy*, 11(5), 545–556. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12890>
- Custers, B., & Fosch-Villaronga, E. (Eds.). (2022). Humanizing machines: Introduction and overview. In *Law and artificial intelligence: Regulating AI and applying AI in legal practice* (pp. 3–28). T.M.C. Asser Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6265-523-2_1
- Dastani, M., & Yazdanpanah, V. (2023). Responsibility of AI systems. *AI & Society*, 38(2), 843–852. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01481-4>
- de Fine Licht, K., & de Fine Licht, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence, transparency, and public decision-making: Why explanations are key when trying to produce perceived legitimacy. *AI & Society*, 35, 917–926. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00960-w>
- de Villiers, C., Dimes, R., & Molinari, M. (2024). How will AI text generation and processing impact sustainability reporting? Critical analysis, a conceptual framework and avenues for future research. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 15(1), 96–118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-02-2023-0097>
- Duan, Y., & Jiao, Y. (2016). The role of mutual funds in corporate governance: Evidence from mutual funds' proxy voting and trading behavior. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 51(2), 489–513. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109016000181>
- Erman, E., & Furendal, M. (2022). The global governance of artificial intelligence: Some normative concerns. *Moral Philosophy and Politics*, 9(2), 267–291. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mopp-2020-0046>
- Financial Reporting Council (FRC). (2019). *Artificial intelligence and corporate reporting: How does it measure up?* <https://www.frc.org.uk/library/digital-reporting/artificial-intelligence-and-corporate-reporting/>
- Floridi, L., Cowsls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2021). An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. In L. Floridi (Ed.), *Ethics, governance, and policies in artificial intelligence* (pp. 19–39). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81907-1_3
- Fotheringham, D., & Wiles, M. A. (2023). The effect of implementing chatbot customer service on stock returns: An event study analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 51(4), 802–822. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-022-00841-2>
- Geluvaraj, B., Satwik, P. M., & Ashok Kumar, T. A. (2019). The future of cybersecurity: Major role of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and deep learning in cyberspace. In S. Smys, R. Bestak, J. Z. Chen, & I. Kotuliak (Eds.), *International Conference on Computer Networks and Communication Technologies* (Vol. 15, pp. 739–747). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8681-6_67
- Gentsch, P. (Ed.). (2019). A Bluffer's guide to AI, algorithmics and big data. In *AI in Marketing, Sales and Service: How marketers without a data science degree can use AI, big data and bots* (pp. 11–24). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89957-2_2
- Grover, P., & Kar, A. K. (2017). Big data analytics: A review on theoretical contributions and tools used in literature. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 18(3), 203–229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-017-0159-3>
- Hilb, M. (2020). Toward artificial governance? The role of artificial intelligence in shaping the future of corporate governance. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 24, 851–870. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-020-09519-9>
- Horodyski, P. (2023). Recruiter's perception of artificial intelligence (AI)-based tools in recruitments. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 10, Article 100298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2023.100298>
- Ingley, C. B., & Van Der Walt, N. T. (2004). Corporate governance, institutional investors and conflicts of interest. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 12(4), 534–551. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2004.00392.x>

- Kazim, E., Denny, D. M. T., & Koshiyama, A. (2021). AI auditing and impact assessment: According to the UK Information Commissioner's Office. *AI and Ethics*, 1, 301-310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00039-2>
- Khurshed, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence in automating processes in businesses. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Economy*, 1(10), 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.61796/jaide.v1i10.973>
- Kirkpatrick, K. (2016). Battling algorithmic bias: How do we ensure algorithms treat us fairly? *Communications of the ACM*, 59(10), 16-17. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2983270>
- Klump, M. (2019). Artificial intelligence applications. In H. Zijm, M. Klump, A. Regattieri, & S. Heragu (Eds.), *Operations, logistics and supply chain management* (pp. 637-662). Springer Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92447-2_28
- Koetter, F., Kochanowski, M., Weisbecker, A., Fehling, C., & Leymann, F. (2014). Integrating compliance requirements across business and IT. In *Proceedings of 2014 IEEE 18th International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDOC.2014.37>
- Koshiyama, A., Kazim, E., Treleaven, P., Rai, P., Szpruch, L., Pavey, G., Ahamat, G., Leutner, F., Goebel, R., Knight, A., Adams, J., Hitrova, C., Barnett, J., Nachev, P., Barber, D., Chamorro-Premuzis, T., Klemmer, K., Gregorovic, M., Khan, S., & Lomas, E. (2021). *Towards algorithm auditing: A survey on managing legal, ethical and technological risks of AI, ML and associated algorithms*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3778998>
- Kriebitz, A., & Lütge, C. (2020). Artificial intelligence and human rights: A business ethical assessment. *Business and Human Rights Journal*, 5(1), 84-104. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bhj.2019.28>
- Kunnathuvalappil Hariharan, N. (2018). *Artificial Intelligence and human collaboration in financial planning* (MPRA Paper No. 109515). Munich Personal RePEc Archive. <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/109515/>
- Laptev, V. A., & Feyzrakhmanova, D. R. (2021). Digitalization of institutions of corporate law: Current trends and future prospects. *Laws*, 10(4), Article 93. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws10040093>
- Larsson, A., Andersson, N., Markowski, P., Nilsson, M., & Mayor, I. (2019). Consulting in the digital era? The role of tomorrow's management consultants. In A. Larsson & R. Teigland (Eds.), *The digital transformation of labor: Automation, the gig economy and welfare* (pp. 254-279). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429317866-15>
- Lehner, O. M., Ittonen, K., Silvola, H., Ström, E., & Wührleitner, A. (2022). Artificial intelligence based decision-making in accounting and auditing: Ethical challenges and normative thinking. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 35(9), 109-135. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-09-2020-4934>
- Locke, N., & Bird, H. (2020). Perspectives on the current and imagined role of artificial intelligence and technology in corporate governance practice and regulation. *Australian Journal of Corporate Law*, 35(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346133054_Perspectives_on_the_current_and_imagined_role_of_artificial_intelligence_and_technology_in_corporate_governance_practice_and_regulation
- Martin, K. (2019). Ethical implications and accountability of algorithms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(4), 835-850. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3921-3>
- Mittermaier, M., Raza, M. M., & Kvedar, J. C. (2023). Bias in AI-based models for medical applications: Challenges and mitigation strategies. *npj Digital Medicine*, 6(1), Article 113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00858-z>
- Mökander, J., Morley, J., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2021). Ethics-based auditing of automated decision-making systems: Nature, scope, and limitations. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 27(4), Article 44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-021-00319-4>
- Mullins, M., Holland, C. P., & Cunneen, M. (2021). Creating ethics guidelines for artificial intelligence and big data analytics customers: The case of the consumer European insurance market. *Patterns*, 2(10), Article 100362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2021.100362>
- Naiseh, M., Al-Thani, D., Jiang, N., & Ali, R. (2021). Explainable recommendation: When design meets trust calibration. *World Wide Web*, 24(5), 1857-1884. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11280-021-00916-0>
- Negnevitsky, M. (2011). *Artificial intelligence: A guide to intelligent systems*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Nersessian, D., & Mancha, R. (2020). From automation to autonomy: Legal and ethical responsibility gaps in artificial intelligence innovation. *Michigan Technology Law Review*, 27(1), 55-96. <https://doi.org/10.36645/mtr.27.1.from>
- Nguyen, V.-L., Po-Ching Lin, P.-C., Cheng, B.-C., Hwang, R.-H., & Lin, Y.-D. (2021). Security and privacy for 6G: A survey on prospective technologies and challenges. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 23(4), 2384-2428. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2021.3108618>
- Nissenbaum, H. (1996). Accountability in a computerized society. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 2(1), 25-42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02639315>
- Omrani, N., Giorgia Riviaccio, G., Fiore, U., Schiavone, F., & Agreda, S. G. (2022). To trust or not to trust? An assessment of trust in AI-based systems: Concerns, ethics and contexts. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 181, Article 121763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121763>
- Papagiannidis, E., Enholm, I. M., Dremel, C., Mikalef, P., & Krogstie, J. (2021). Deploying AI governance practices: A revelatory case study. In D. Dennehy, A. Griva, N. Pouloudi, Y. K. Dwivedi, I. Pappas, & M. Mäntymäki (Eds.), *Responsible AI and analytics for an ethical and inclusive digitized society* (pp. 208-219). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85447-8_19
- Paunov, Y., Wänke, M., & Vogel, T. (2019). Transparency effects on policy compliance: Disclosing how defaults work can enhance their effectiveness. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 3(2), 187-208. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2018.40>
- Pererva, P., Kobielieva, T., Kuchinskyi, V., Garmash, S., & Danko, T. (2021). Ensuring the sustainable development of an industrial enterprise on the principle of compliance-safety. *Studies of Applied Economics*, 39(5). <https://doi.org/10.25115/eea.v39i5.5111>
- Picciau, C. (2021). The (un)predictable impact of technology on corporate governance. *Hastings Business Law Journal*, 17(1), Article 67. https://repository.uclawsf.edu/hastings_business_law_journal/vol17/iss1/5/
- Prifti, K., Stamhuis, E., & Heine, K. (2022). Digging into the accountability gap: Operator's civil liability in healthcare AI-systems. In B. Custers & E. Fosch-Villaronga (Eds.), *Law and artificial intelligence: Regulating AI and applying AI in legal practice* (pp. 279-295). T.M.C. Asser Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6265-523-2_15
- Pujol, D., McKenna, R., Kuppam, S., Hay, M. G., Machanavajjhala, A. K. V., & Miklau, G. (2020). Fair decision making using privacy-protected data. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 189-199). Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372872>
- Ranchordás, S. (2018, April 18). *Law and autonomous systems series: Cities as corporations? The privatization of cities and the automation of local law*. Faculty of Law Blogs/University Of Oxford. <https://blogs.law.ox.ac.uk/business-law-blog/blog/2018/04/law-and-autonomous-systems-series-cities-corporations-privatization>
- Reich-Graefe, R. (2013). Deconstructing corporate governance: The mechanics of trusting. *Delaware Journal of Corporate Law*, 38(1), 103-190. <https://shorturl.at/owQjL>

- Scheffer, M., Bascompte, J., Brock, W. A., Brovkin, V., Carpenter, S. R., Dakos, V., Held, H., van Nes, E. H., Rietkerk, M., & Sugihara, G. (2009). Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature*, 461, 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08227>
- Schneeberger, D., Stöger, K., & Holzinger, A. (2020). The European legal framework for medical AI. In A. Holzinger, P. Kieseberg, A. Tjoa, & E. Weippl (Eds.), *Machine learning and knowledge extraction* (pp. 209–226). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57321-8_12
- Sherman, B. (2023). AI machines as inventors: The role of human agency in patent law. In S. Frankel, M. Chon, G. Dinwoodie, B. Lauriat, & J. Schovsbo (Eds.), *Improving intellectual property* (pp. 214–223). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035310869.00035>
- Shneiderman, B. (2020). Bridging the gap between ethics and practice: Guidelines for reliable, safe, and trustworthy human-centered AI systems. *ACM Transitions on Interactive Intelligent Systems*, 10(4), Article 26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419764>
- Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 66–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257>
- Siebecker, M. R. (2009). Trust & transparency: Promoting efficient corporate disclosure through fiduciary-based discourse. *Washington University Law Review*, 87(1), 115–174. https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol87/iss1/3/
- Siebecker, M. R. (2020). Making corporations more humane through artificial intelligence. *Journal of Corporation Law*, 45(1), 95–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6265-523-2_17
- Smits, J., & Borghuis, T. (2022). Generative AI and intellectual property rights. In B. Custers & E. Fosch-Villaronga (Eds.), *Law and artificial intelligence: Regulating AI and applying AI in legal practice* (pp. 323–344). T.M.C. Asser Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6265-523-2_17
- Tikkinen-Piri, C., Rohunen, A., & Markkula, J. (2018). EU General Data Protection Regulation: Changes and implications for personal data collecting companies. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 34(1), 134–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2017.05.015>
- Tillu, R., Konidena, B. K., & Periyasamy, V. (2023). Navigating regulatory complexity: Leveraging AI/ML for accurate reporting. *Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology*, 2(2), 149–166. <https://doi.org/10.60087/jklst.vol2.n2.p160>
- Timmons, A. C., Duong, J. B., Fiallo, N. S., Lee, T., Vo, H. P. Q., Ahle, M. W., Comer, J. S., Brewer, L. C., Frazier, S. L., & Chaspari, T. (2023). A call to action on assessing and mitigating bias in artificial intelligence applications for mental health. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 18(5), 1062–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221134490>
- Uysal, N. (2018). On the relationship between dialogic communication and corporate social performance: Advancing dialogic theory and research. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 30(3), 100–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2018.1498344>
- van der Zande, J., Teigland, K., Siri, S., & Teigland, R. (2020). The substitution of labor: From technological feasibility to other factors influencing the potential of job automation. In A. Larsson & R. Teigland (Eds.), *The digital transformation of labor: Automation, the gig economy and welfare* (pp. 53–73). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429317866-3>
- Verhezen, P. (2020). What to expect from artificial intelligence in business: How wise board members can and should facilitate human-AI collaboration. In M. Kuznetsov & M. Nikishova (Eds.), *Challenges and opportunities of corporate governance transformation in the digital era* (pp. 61–90). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2011-6.ch004>
- Wagner, G. (2019). Robot, Inc.: Personhood for autonomous systems? *Fordham Law Review*, 88(2), 591–612. <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol88/iss2/8/>
- Wang, Y., Kung, L., & Byrd, T. A. (2018). Big data analytics: Understanding its capabilities and potential benefits for healthcare organizations. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 126, 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.12.019>
- Wang, Y., Xiong, M., & Olya, H. (2020). Toward an understanding of responsible artificial intelligence practices. In T. X. Bui (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 53rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (pp. 4962–4971). University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. <https://doi.org/10.24251/HICSS.2020.610>
- Weiner, R. R. (2018). Les Reciproqueteurs: Post-regulatory corporatism. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 20(6), 752–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2014.947923>
- Wong, R. Y., Chong, A., & Aspegren, R. C. (2023). Privacy legislation as business risks: How GDPR and CCPA are represented in technology companies' investment risk disclosures. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 7(CSCW1), Article 82. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579515>
- Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. (2018). *Discrimination, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic decision-making*. Council of Europe, Directorate General of Democracy. <https://rm.coe.int/discrimination-artificial-intelligence-and-algorithmic-decision-making/1680925d73>