European Research Studies Journal
Volume XXVIII, Issue 1, 2025

pp. 530-542

AI Ethical Dilemmas in the Context of Management Problems

Submitted 12/01/25, 1st revision 07/02/24, 2nd revision 20/02/25, accepted 10/03/25

Andrzej Sztandera[1], Dominik Borek[2], Kamil Nowacki[3]

Abstract:

Purpose: *The purpose of this article is to analyze selected ethical dilemmas related to the application of AI, and then show them in a broader civilizational context useful for managing human teams.*
Methodological foundations: *The authors move away from classical ethical interpretation and focus on contemporary situational ethics enabling a modern approach to AI dilemmas. The dilemma makes it possible to show the problems, in a way, "from the inside", taking into account a variety of moral, psychological, legal, cultural contexts. Just inadequacy of classical ethics in the analysis of complex problems of the modern world prompts the search for new analytical tools.*
Conclusions: *The pessimistic thesis that we are not, as individuals and human teams, prepared for the widespread use of AI is confirmed almost every day. Ethics, law, management, education, medicine and many other fields have not kept up with the rapid advances of digital transformation. This opinion is illustrated by the case studies analyzed in this article. AI is a great opportunity for humanity, however, if we don't turn on the right "fuses" human can be instrumentalized as add-on to machines.*
Practical implications: *Each of the case studies presented in the article can inspire the practical application of AI. However, it is not about specific technological solutions, but rather about the human-machine relationship. AI Governance is an extremely important field that integrates technological and social-communication processes in organizations. The better managed the team, the greater the openness to AI applications. It is about applications that protect human autonomy in relation to intelligent machines.*
Originality/ value: *The AI debate is dominated by the operational)functional approach. This article presents a contextual-critical approach connected with ethics of human-computer interface.*

Keywords: *AI ethical dilemmas, AI Governance, management sciences, tourism, medicine, self – driving cars, situational ethics, trustworthy AI.*

JEL codes: *M14, O33, L86, D63, M15.*
Paper type: *Research article.*

[1]*Menedzerska Akademia Nauk Stosowanych, Polska, ORCID: 0009-0008-1101-923X, e-mail: andrzej.sztandera@interia.pl;*
[2]*Szkoła Główna Handlowa w Warszawie, Polska, ORCID: 0000-0002-4359-9426, e-mail: dpborek@wp.pl;*
[3]*The same as in 1, ORCID: 0009-0004-6276-2665, e-mail: itwolfmaster@gmail.com;*

1. Introduction

When the "Cambridge Analytica" scandal erupted in 2018, revealing the effectiveness of the use of AI in political marketing (US elections, Brexit) many analysts and journalists predicted that further scandals using AI were only a matter of time.

Elon Musk's current projects promoting extremist groups on Platform X, especially in Germany and the UK, confirm the effectiveness of AI algorithms in manipulating voters. Another example of the power of AI in political marketing is the case of the recently invalidated elections in Romania due to an election campaign on TikTok (PISM, 2024). All these examples raise justified concerns about the future of an increasingly illusory democracy.

Putting aside extreme cases of the use of AI to compromise people)deepfake), to extort money, which continue to be reported in the media, we are faced with a disturbing conclusion. We are not, as individuals and as human teams, prepared for the widespread use of new technologies in politics, in management, medicine and in many fields that even seem to be ideal spaces for AI experiments. Synonymous with the modernity of the first half of the 21st century has become the pace of digital transformation.

Meanwhile, according to international surveys, only 1/3 of employees (34%) in a typical European workplace have high hopes for AI and believe that its introduction will significantly improve the conditions and organization of their work. In Poland, there are even fewer such employees, at just 27 percent. The Great Place To Work survey shows that the biggest concerns about AI have primarily those employees who don't trust their leaders. This is a critical issue from a management perspective.

For employees, it is not clear which option will prevail in the company. Will it be more important to invest in their professional development, or to fill in missing competencies by attracting new, usually younger, people. For now, only 27 percent of employees in typical European workplaces (in Poland it's 25 percent) say their companies have made an effort to invest in their basic knowledge, showing both the benefits and risks of using AI in practice. Even fewer employees, 25 percent in Europe and only 20 percent in Poland, confirm participation in specific training on the use of artificial intelligence in their work (Great Place To Work, 2024).

The general thesis is as follow: The better a company is managed, i.e., employees are genuinely motivated and have the belief that innovation and training procedures are carried out fairly and professionally, the greater the openness to the introduction of AI applications. The worse the management, i.e., there is uncertainty in the company about the direction of development, communication barriers impede the flow of information, etc., the more distrust in the goals and procedures of digital tranformation.

2. Ethical Approach to AI Applications: The Essence of the Problem

The basic problem of classical ethics was the rigidity of "objective" norms of conduct eliminating the context of the act. This acccusation can be made against both ancient virtue ethics (the exception is the late works of Aristotle, especially the "Nicomachean Ethics" which is an example of a situational approach to the problems of morality), as well as the theories of modern ethics.

Kant's deontologism focused on the good will of the perpetrator and J. Bentham's utilitarianism concentrated on the social utility of the act eliminated context and situationality. This allows today to formulate the conclusion that both of these concepts did not concern the problems of morality of a concrete man, with his emotions and intuitions, but referred to the rationalist illusion " homo ethicus" (Sztandera and Borek, 2024).

The ethical dilemmas of the digital age follow similar simplifications. Artificial intelligence algorithms construct a profile of a recipient, customer or employee that is the result of a certain set of data entered into the system. If this data is inaccurate, or intentionally selective, then it can generate decisions that are poorly suited to people's needs, or even influence solutions that are unsafe for them. It may also happen that the programming of everyday devices, e.g. cars, although in accordance with basic ethical standards, will drastically interfere with the unpredictability of events. Artificial intelligence problems can be analyzed at three different but complementary levels, legalistic (legal-code), operational (functional) and contextual-critical.

From an ethical perspective, the third is particularly relevant. This is because it enables critical reflection on the complexity of applying AI in our lives. As Amy Webb rightly notes, existence in a world dominated by new technologies can lead to "millions of mutilations" caused by the rigidity of procedures contrasted by unpredictability of events (Webb, 2019). Deeper ethical and psychological reflection can prevent these sufferings. The case studies presented below illustrate the complexity and largely helplessness of humans in the face of AI expansion. Each of them, in addition to the specific problems they present, can also be taken metaphorically, as a basis for more general reflection.

3. Artificial Intelligence Cases

3.1 Artificial Intelligence in Tourism

A customer booking a vacation trip through a booking portal and errors in the order coordinated by AI:

A senior traveler decided to purchase a travel package through a booking portal, where he independently selected several travel services according to a chatbot's

prompting. The traveler requested that his trip be tailored to a person with special needs (a senior citizen with mobility problems). Therefore, he decided to choose an adequate destination - a lowland area, a hotel with direct access to a sandy beach, and the assistance of qualified nursing staff. The offer proposed to the traveler consisted of the following benefits that make up the tourist event:

- A ride in a means of transportation that includes a special lift for wheelchair access and specialized straps to secure the equipment in the car.
- Overnight stay in a facility fully adapted to the needs of people with disabilities- with special ramps, rooms that meet the conditions of rest for seniors.
- Care of a resident with training to assist and work with people with special needs.
- Pilot service performed by a person who has the ability to use sign language, in the case of deaf people
- Meals adapted for people with disabilities,
- The service of a tourist guide, with appropriate training to lead groups with disabilities.
- Visits to facilities adapted architecturally to accommodate people with disabilities- museums, cultural institutions.
- Additional attractions, e.g. going to a football match of a local team, having a facility adapted to the needs of fans with disabilities.

The above assumptions were too general, due to the fact that every disability or special mobility is different. The tour operator stipulated a condition in the contract that, due to offering different types of facilities, it asks for a description of the disability)special needs so that a "tailor-made" offer can be prepared.

In the order using the chatbot, the senior could refine the proposal by answering short questions constructed by the AI:

- The place of stay and the area (resort by the sea), the route to the place, the duration of the event was specified as 6 days
- The number of nights during the tourist event was set at 5
- The means of transportation was described as a comfortable bus, adapted to wheelchair users, although the senior placing the order does not use a wheelchair. Chatbot, however, considered that the senior's indicated mobility dysfunctions qualified him to travel by such a means of transportation
- The location of the accommodation was described as - near the beach, but the senior wanted a facility with access to a private beach. In one of the questions asked by the chatbot, he indicated that he would like access to the beach at a distance of 200 meters, due to his vision problems (the senior was sure that he had selected the option with access to a private beach at a distance of 20 meters).

- The number and type of meals were defined as adapted to people with gastric problems, which was also a mistake, because the senior citizen misunderstood the phrase "various gastronomic services" as "various gastric problems"
- The detailed tour program included an outing to a museum, a tour of the old town square, and attendance at a local team's soccer match
- The size of the group was described as small, comprising 10 people.

Information about the accessibility of tourist services for people with reduced mobility, as well as the possibility of adapting them to the senior's needs, was determined by the traveler directly during the conversation with the chatbot.

Meanwhile, the senior was convinced that he was having a conversation with a real person. At the destination of the tourist event, it turned out that due to the errors in the reservation, the vacation did not meet the expectations of the person with special needs.

In addition, he has to pay a local fee (climate tax), of which he was not informed. The resident felt that he had to follow the terms of the contract and could not change the services selected by the senior citizen during the tourist event.

The complexity of the whole situation, typical for many cases of using AI-programmed communicators, requires legal and ethical interpretation. First of all, the disposers of AI-based devices assume that human should adapt himself to the system's requirements.

Meanwhile, human autonomy requires that the system should be tailored to the human's needs and comfort**.** AI devices should therefore be tested repeatedly to improve user experience. Undoubtedly, such testing is being done, but it is done selectively and to a very limited extent. As a result, many, especially older customers, are put in a difficult situation exposing them to stress, discomfort and misunderstanding.

Another problem is testing AI devices on insufficient data, leading to overly general messages and vague questions that ignore the specifics of each situation (Chojnowski, 2022)

Third and finally, establishing legal responsibility in the above case is extremely difficult. In view of the rejection of AI's legal personality, liability is a complex problem requiring a complicated procedure including a lawsuit. Who is responsible: the tour operator, the travel agency, how to determine the resident's responsibility? To what extent the unintentional mistakes of the senior - participant of the tourist event - contributed to the situation? The whole case highlights the unpreparedness of human teams and individuals for the rapid application mode of AI signaled above.

3.2 AI in Medicine

Risk of the medical team not being prepared to work with the surgical robot , risk of unpredictable events occurring during the operation using the robot:

The occurrence of sudden, unexpected events is inherent in the risk of surgical procedures. If the operation is performed by a machine supervised by humans, the risk increases, especially if it is a pioneering operation. Such a situation occurred during a simple biopsy procedure at a Polish hospital in Czerwona Góra (Swiętokrzyskie Voivodeship) last year. A 66-year-old female patient was referred to the hospital for collection of biological material for laboratory analysis.

However, during the biopsy, she was diagnosed with a small lung cancer, which surgeons decided to remove immediately. The surgery was performed using a special surgical robot operated by two Polish doctors, who additionally benefited from the supervision of an Italian instructor. During the operation, instead of the tumor, the aorta was cut, which resulted in hemorrhage and subsequent death of the patient (Wiadomości Onet, 2024).

An important element of the whole incident was the fact that the surgical robot had previously been used for urological procedures, and the analyzed operation on the chest was the first attempt to use it in another high-risk surgical field..

Robotic surgical platforms are a testing field for artificial intelligence. AI models are being used to automate surgical tasks and (potentially) increase intraoperative safety. However, the precision of this automation depends on the amount of data entered into the system and AI training on specific surgical procedures.

From an ethical point of view, the fact that the decision to perform robotic surgery was made suddenly is very important. Perhaps the reason was the seemingly simple course of operation - removal of a small tumor. However, surgery in the thoracic area has a higher risk than urological procedures and therefore should not be performed without thorough thought and testing.

It is most likely that the team of doctors performing the procedure misjudged the risks. Why? Perhaps the reason was the desire to make a name for themselves in the medical community through a successful procedure to remove a lung tumor with the use of AI. We do not know the answer to this question, as the hospital has consistently refused to explain. We also don't know whether the Italian expert supervised the operation directly or via the Internet. This was certainly of significant importance.

In the history of medicine, we know of many cases when similar mistakes resulted in the future more knowledgeable surgeries, but this does not deprive the performers (surgeons, hospitals) of responsibility for human life or health in every situation.

As in the previous tourist case, it must be emphasized that establishing legal responsibility will be extremely difficult. Meanwhile, the family of the deceased patient feels deeply wronged and expects above all a precise explanation of the causes of the tragedy, as well as a just verdict from the court. “Our mother was treated like a guinea pig,” - states the daughter of the deceased patient. The public perception of such an incident certainly deepens the sens of confusion and the lack of trust in new technologies.

Perhaps a certain solution would be to grant medical robots the status of electronic persons with legal responsibility.This topic is currently the subject of lively discussion. However, this raises a justified fear of transferring legal responsibility to robots by institutions /hospitals, clinics/ and individual doctors/surgeons performing surgeries (Wynsberghe, 2021).

Similarly, as in the case in tourism, we can conclude that medical team was not sufficiently prepared to carry out procedures using advanced AI.

3.3 Self – Driving Cars

The complexity of ethical criteria for programming self – driving cars, the collision of ethical criteria and the risk of traffic emergencies, the unpreparedness of drivers for the complexity of using self - driving cars:

Case study scenario:
In the not-too-distant future, a driver declaring the purchase of a super-modern sedan of brand X reports to the showroom of a reputable car dealer. During the pre-sale conversation, the customer is informed about all the advantages of the car. It is eco-friendly, super-safe, designed with the latest AI technology including an autonomous driver . The salesman also informs that the programming of the driver takes into account “ the best ethical standards”.

- What are these standards? - asks the customer.
- Sir, the car will be driven according to the criterion of “least number of casualties”, does this utilitarian approach suit you?
- After brief consideration, the customer accepts the criterion and is directed to the showroom to see and test the car. Here a casual conversation ensues with the agent, who at one point states confidentially.
...but you understand that the criterion of “least number of victims” in extreme situations can turn against you?
- how so?, asks the customer.

- Well simply ... If you are driving at high speed and suddenly around a bend there is a pedestrian crossing and just now a group of school children is crossing to the other side , and the car has not a chance to effectively brake, then, you understand, the car violently turns left or right and hits the adjacent building, because, after all, you are

the “ least number of victims.” But this is an extreme case, generally such situations do not occur, although yesterday I read that in Milan, Italy....
- What are you saying about? Asks the driver, I didn't think of that.
- Gosh, I thought you had taken this into account.
- No, replies the driver (clearly embarrassed).

- I will explain it to you in more detail, says the agent. In the version that interests you, we have 5 levels of autonomization. Levels 0 - 2 mean decisive control of the driver, while levels 3 - 5 mean decisive control of the system. It is up to you which level to choose. I suppose you decide to choose the autonomous system for reasons of convenience, such as reading while driving, urgent conversations or other activities ....

- Yes yes, says the driver, I would like to buy this car not only with a view to myself, but also to my wife, who reads a lot while driving and , in her habit, talks on the phone for a long time.
- Of course, and so you can at some point go to level 4 or 5 , where the driver is already a de facto passenger who has no influence on the course of driving.

However, I reiterate that it is up to the driver which level he chooses. This is very important, so we remind all customers of this.
-Theoretically I know these rules, but only you made me aware of their practical importance. I think about it and come to the conclusion that I would prefer to decide on my own in extreme situations.
- And your wife also?, asks the agent.

Ooo!, the customer falls silent for a moment and smiles. You know, she would probably say the same thing, but.... my wife is a lawyer and is constantly on the phone. Sometimes she's also ...charmingly absent minded and has trouble making decisions on the road. I will admit to you that I am buying this car primarily with her in mind. I wish she would not to be stressed, to be able to work calmly, and the system to be able to decide for her. Of course, I'm afraid of that drastic scenario you just mentioned.

- My wife, says the agent, drives better than me, she is a great driver.
Is she also driving an autonomous car?
- No , her car has a classic driving system.
- And couldn't you, asks the customer, install a system that would be programmed differently, such as protecting the driver's life first and foremost in any situation. Wouldn't that be a better solution?
- And that's another problem, says the agent. If you have a moment I invite you to the buffet, where I will explain it in more detail
- Indeed, I am not in a hurry, so why don't we have a cup of coffee and talk more freely.

- After a while, sipping espresso, the agent develops the topic. You know, in terms of protecting the life of the driver in any situation on the road.... On the one hand, it's a basic moral principle, protect our own lives and those of our loved ones. However, the whole problem begins when we treat this principle arbitrarily. Imagine that you are driving on a three-lane highway. You are alone in your car, on the left you have a car with two people , and on the right with three. At some point, a piece of luggage breaks off from the trailer of the truck driving in front of you and flies straight at you. You are driving on level 5 of autonomization. Then there are three options: either the system will steer the car forward and then, according to the criterion of least number of victims, you will be that victim, or, if the system is programmed to protect the driver first and foremost, the car will turn left or right.

- After all, this is still not a drastic solution, especially since it is not known what the actual consequences of such event will be, says the customer
- Well, yes, in this case I can agree with that.

However, let's say, we have another situation. You are driving down a street in a crowded neighborhood. The sidewalks are full of people. Suddenly, the car driving in front of you brakes abruptly. Later it turns out that the driver fainted at the wheel (heart attack or stroke) and hit the brakes at the last moment. You are a few meters behind him and driving at level 5 autonomy. Then the system, programmed to protect the driver's life above all else, turns sharply to the left. On your right side there is a row of buildings just behind a narrow sidewalk.

On your left, however, you have a crowded sidewalk, and just behind it a square, also with a lot of people. The system bypasses the barriers, the car drives onto the sidewalk, hits 2-3 people and stops only on the square, as a result of which even several people can die. In a normal situation, if you are the driver, your skills: control of emotions and many other factors that are at least indirectly influenced by the driver are decisive. However, if you are driving at level 5, there is no more time to turn off the system and then the car stops in the square, and next to it a lot of victims.

- Something like that!
- You know, of course it's a staged situation, but it's possible. Other events, when the system, for example, misjudged the distance and people died as a result of this error, happen from time to time. But it doesn't end there. A few days ago we had a meeting with our marketing specialists, where an expert on terrorist threats was invited. He told us that at the moment a whole team of people is working on the problem related to the possible use self – driving cars for terrorist attacks. It's worth saying a few words about it. This includes a situation in which a car driven by an autonomous driver can be deliberately used for an attack, even though the whole event looks like an ordinary accident.

- Is that possible?

- Of course. I mean a scenario in which the whole event is "staged" in such a way that the collision is deliberately made dangerous, only to suddenly change the car's trajectory and direct it, for example, to a square with a lot of people. You may remember the attacks in Magdeburg or New Orleans. In a world where autonomous cars are becoming commonplace, such terrorist attacks may look a bit different. Then there is the legal problem of how to prove such a crime. After all, the driver was not driving the car, the system was operating at a high level of autonomy.
- Well, yes, but the terrorist's data should be in the system and then the autonomous driver can react differently!
- Theoretically, however, then a collision actually occurs, and what's more, the terrorist may not be in the police records at all, like this Magdeburg attacker. For these reasons, which have recently been analyzed in detail and commented on in the media, producers are seriously considering the option: to protect the driver's life first.
- I admit that I haven't thought in such detail about the various aspects of using artificial intelligence in driving. I will probably decide to buy the version with the option of the lowest number of victims. However, I still have to discuss it with my wife. See you.

4. Conclusion

The rapid development of artificial intelligence confirms thesis we signaled above: that both individually and collectively, we are unprepared to deal with the complex ethical issues of the digital age. The average user of various AI applications does not realize that the invocation of high ethical standards by programmers and producers is not enough to put anxiety to sleep. For it may turn out, these standards, seemingly unquestionable, in particular random cases mean a threat to our comfort, safety and even life.

The above case studies are not only a description of the problems associated with the use of AI solutions in particular situations. As we mentionefd above, they can also be taken as a metaphor for the difficult existence of humans in a world dominated by new tchnologies. The essence of the problems is the discrepancy between the tendency to control and plan for the future and the increasingly obvious unpredictability of events. Strategic planning is a fundamental element of the mechanistic paradigm of the industrial age. It creates the illusion of control over the future. We plan, we anticipate, we calculate, according to established habit.

However, we are already living in the post-industrial era, which requires us to abandon this habit. We can no longer stand at the end of something we have imagined and plan our actions from this seemingly fixed future. Instead, we should be constantly present.

The world encourages us to focus less on forcing things to adapt to our plans, and more on entering into meaningful relationships with others, living the experience

intensely, and only then observing what comes of it (Laloux, 2014). The world encourages us to participate rather than plan. This idea seems particularly relevant in the Western world, which is suspended between dwelling on the past and planning for the future. Instead, it forgets about the present, despite the fact that it alone is the real basis of human experience.

What do the above comments mean for us, for our organizations? Look 20 - 50 years ahead, and plan only for the coming months. In the complex postmodern world, it is impossible to do otherwise. Let's return to the problem of self - driving cars. It seems obvious to accept autonomous driving sytems, but on the condition that the driver can turn them off at any time, or take control of them.

The idea, then, is to manage new technologies in such a way that humans are the subjects and decision-makers. So instead of planning that, for example, by 2035 we will carry out full automation of production, or in 5 years we will realize the process of digitization of management, etc., we should focus on quick iterations (several months) and on observing the changes that occur in ourselves, in our interactions under the influence of new AI solutions.

Do people understand the deeper meaning of the digitization being introduced, do they realize its various nuances and applications in everyday situations, do these changes trigger good emotions, how do they affect the functioning of individuals and the entire team? Without this attentiveness and presence, we will create solutions that can take away the tools of real control and instrumentalize us as an addition to machines.

So, wanting to prevent the "millions of mutilations" that Amy Webb (2019) warns us about, we should take special attention on the field of AI Governance, which includes three complementary elements in any organization: people, processes, technology. In fact, the implementation of AI solutions is more of a social process than a technological one.

In poorly managed teams, where there are communication barriers and people do not understand the meaning of digital transformation, the result can be conflicts, unforeseen tensions with customer relations, stress and, unfortunately, layoffs of employees unsuited to the challenges of digitization. The role of leaders who can properly manage teamwork processes and effectively inspire employees to change, requires special emphasis. Such leaders are today at a premium.

Our fascination with the development of AI should not take away our ability to reflect more deeply on the future of human in a world of intelligent machines. Polish writer Stanislaw Lem argued that technology creates choices where before it dominated by blind fate, fatalism, coincidences, destiny or Providence (Lem, 2010). On the one hand, humanity has been given a powerful tool, alleviating our existential fears: of death, disability, physical suffering etc. However, along with the

new possibilities also grows human responsibility and the need to make decisions, from which we were previously exempted.

Man's growing dependence on intelligent machines often makes it difficult for us to understand fundamental issues. According to British physicist and mathematician Roger Penrose (Nobel of Physics 2020), humanity has lost its way by attributing to AI possibilities that it does not possess. Artificial intelligence does not reason in ways available to humans because it does not have consciousness (Penrose, 2016). Computers are an example of a particular mathematical structure based on computational mathematics.

However, computationalism should not be taken as truth. The search for truth and the discovery of meaning and morality are strictly human attributes. The domain of AI is big data sets, the capacity of which will increase with the use of quantum computers. However, this is only statistics and probability. Computers can play chess, just as a programmed autonomous driver can drive a car. However, they do so based on the data entered into the system, they "do not know what they are doing" unlike humans.

Is Roger Penrose right and AI will not produce a new artificial consciousness? What about of strong AI, Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) conception? This question remains open. Philosopher Luciano Floridi offers an evocative metaphor of the relationship between two people, one of whom is intelligent but lazy (human), while the other is dull but hard-working (AI). If the rules of this relationship are not well established, it could end up subordinating humans to the computational logic of machines. Perhaps (unfortunately) such a scenario threatens now humanity (Floridi, 2011).

Futurology is a difficult field in our unpredictable world. So it is worth emphasizing at the end the importance of the ethics principles of trustworthy AI that should apply in the digital age. These principles, published by the European Commission in 2019 (Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI, 2019) were derived from basic human rights:

- The principle of respecting the autonomy of the human person in relations with AI. Man is a subject vis-à-vis intelligent machines. Therefore, he should not be treated instrumentally in any digital transformation projects or influence-building methods. Algorithms should not dominate the human being, but increase the efficiency of his work, facilitate communication, increase motivation. This principle should be the golden rule of AI Governance processes in our organizations.
- Prevention on harm principle. AI systems must be safe, secure and easy to use. This is especially true for people who require special treatment and high-risk situations involving threats to life and health. The way of handling should exclude the events described above in the tourism and medical case studies.

- The principle of transparency - refers to the need to clarify and reconcile data sets with the level of preparation of people for digital tranformation. Managers and decision-makers using AI systems should not use the incompetence of employees and customers to manipulate project management, sales processes, services, etc.
- The principle of ensuring diversity and non-discrimination requires avoiding unfair bias when training and using AI systems, respecting diverse opinions, including people from different backgrounds, cultures and fields of knowledge. It further requires regular feedback from users.
- The principle of accountability. John Stuart Mill drew attention to the possibility of conflict between the ethics of duty and responsibility (Mill, 2020). With regard to AI issues, the principle of responsibility calls for compromise and coordination of all other principles, in case there are conflicts between them. Situationalism often calls for compromise, especially in the case of difficult choices of the lesser evil and risk management.

References:

Chojnowski, M. 2011. Etyka sztucznej inteligencji. Wprowadzenie
file://C:/Users/Andrew/Downloads/ESIW-v2.0_FINAL.pdf
European Commission, Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI;
https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

Floridi, L. 2011. Enveloping the world: the constraining success of smart technologies, In: Computer Ethics Philosophical Enquiry (CEPE) 2011: Crossing Boundaries. Ethics in Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Relation.

Great Place To Work survey, 2024, more information on: www.grateplacetowork.pl.

https://wiadomosci.onet.pl/kielce/dramat-w-szpitalu-66-latke-operowal-robot-chirurgiczny-kobieta-nie-zyje/gpp6bvj.

Laloux, Fr. 2014. Reinventing Organizations: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness. Diateino.

Lem, S. 2010. Etyka technologii i technologia etyki. In: Lem, S, Dialogi (Dzieła, t. XXXII), Warszawa.

Mill, J.St. 2020. Utilitarianism. Bibliotech Press.

Penrose, R. 2016. The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics. Oxford University Press.

PISM, Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, Polish Institute of International Affairs, Unieważnienie wyborów prezydenckich w Rumunii.
https://www.pism.pl/publikacje/uniewaznienie-wyborow-prezydenckich-w-rumunii.

Sztandera, A., Borek, D. 2024. Ethical and Legal Dilemmas in Management: The Case of the Tourism Industry During the COVID-19 Pandemic. European Research Studies Journal, Volume XXVII, Issue 3.

Webb, A. 2019. The Big Nine. How the Tech Titans & Their Thinking Machines Could Warp Humanity. New York.

Wiadomości, Onet. 2024. Dramat w szpitalu. 66-latkę operował robot chirurgiczny. Kobieta nie żyje.

Wynsberghe, A.V. 2021. Healthcare Robots. Ethics, Design and Implementation. Routledge.