Journal of Posthumanism
2025
Volume: 5, No: 3, pp. 1496–1507
ISSN: 2634-3576 (Print) | ISSN 2634-3584 (Online)
posthumanism.co.uk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i3.937

Posthuman Ethics in Social Care Accreditation: Navigating Standards, Automation, and Accountability

Dewi Kartikawati[1], Binahayati Rusyidi[2], Nurliana C.Apsari[3], Sri Sulastri[4]

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to explore the concept of Posthuman Ethics in the context of social care accreditation, focusing on the interplay between evolving standards, automation, and accountability. As accreditation processes increasingly integrate artificial intelligence and automation, ethical considerations become crucial in ensuring fairness, transparency, and inclusivity. This article examines how posthuman perspectives challenge traditional human-centered accreditation frameworks, addressing key concerns such as the ethical implications of automated decision-making, the shifting nature of standards in technologically mediated environments, and the question of accountability in AI-driven accreditation systems. By analyzing these aspects, the article aims to provide a critical discussion on the future of social care accreditation in an era shaped by technological advancements and posthuman thought.

Keywords: *Posthuman Ethics in Social Care Accreditation, Navigating Standards, Automation, Accountability, Social Care Accreditation.*

Introduction

Social care accreditation plays a vital role in ensuring compliance with established quality standards and facilitating ethical service delivery. The standards set forth by various international bodies serve as frameworks for health and social care providers to enhance safety and quality. For instance, the World Health Organization advocates for the development of standards as a means to improve care quality across services, inherently linking them to patient safety and optimal care outcomes (Kelly et al., 2021). Research indicates that effective accreditation processes not only define acceptable care but also influence staff attitudes and work environments, which contribute significantly to service quality (Cunningham et al., 2020). Moreover, accreditation initiatives, such as the Australian health service safety and quality scheme, exemplify global trends wherein quality improvement demands are driven by stakeholder expectations for better healthcare delivery (Greenfield et al., 2014). By addressing gaps in care and promoting structural changes through accreditation, organizations can foster environments conducive to high-quality service provision, ultimately benefiting both providers and recipients of care (Kelly et al., 2022).

[1] Department of Social Welfare, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Padjadjaran University, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia, Email: dewi21018@mail.unpad.ac.id, (Corresponding author)
[2] Department of Social Welfare, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Padjadjaran University, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia.
[3] Department of Social Welfare, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Padjadjaran University, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia.
[4] Department of Social Welfare, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Padjadjaran University, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia.

The integration of automation, software application, and big data analytics into accreditation processes has significantly enhanced efficiency while also raising ethical concerns. For instance, big data analytics serves as a transformative tool in education by delivering insights that inform policy and enhance teaching quality, particularly in developing contexts (Kero & Endebu, 2023). This aligns with findings from various studies indicating improved outcomes through structured accreditation processes, which employ data-driven methodologies to refine quality in healthcare and education systems (Joseph, 2020; Alzahem, 2022). However, this shift also prompts ethical dilemmas related to data privacy and the potential for algorithmic bias, as the reliance on AI systems can complicate conventional accreditation standards (Ang et al., 2020). Additionally, while automation contributes positively to operational efficiency in accreditation, it must be managed carefully to avoid diminishing the human oversight critical to ensuring fairness and equity in educational and healthcare contexts

Posthuman ethics fundamentally challenges the traditional notion of human exceptionalism by advocating for an integrative approach that acknowledges technology as an active decision-making agent. This assertion is grounded in the recognition of a collaborative ethical subjectivity that extends beyond human-centric perspectives. Sayers et al. highlight the need to reevaluate relationships between humans and nonhumans to confront exploitative practices (Sayers et al., 2021). This shift implicates technology as an equal actor within organizational ecosystems, as new kinds of agents, such as algorithms, increasingly participate in strategic decision-making processes (Gladden et al., 2022). Furthermore, the framing of posthuman ethics encourages exploration of cooperation across species, aligning with Braidotti's argument for a new ethical paradigm that encompasses both human and nonhuman elements (Braidotti, 2018). In this context, ethical considerations in technology development and application become paramount, advocating for the expansion of our ethical frameworks to include all forms of agency in the posthuman landscape (Thomas, 2020).

This study explores the evolving landscape of accreditation in the context of automation and software application-driven processes. How are accreditation standards evolving with automation?. What are the ethical challenges in AI-driven accreditation systems?. Who holds accountability in a technology-mediated accreditation process?. The primary objectives of this research are to examine the shifting role of accreditation standards under posthuman conditions, investigate the ethical implications of automation in accreditation, and analyze accountability frameworks within software application-assisted accreditation systems. By addressing these aspects, the study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the intersection between technology, ethics, and governance in accreditation processes.

Posthuman Ethics in Accreditation

Posthuman Ethics in accreditation refers to an ethical framework that moves beyond human-centered perspectives to consider the role of artificial intelligence, automation, and non-human agencies in accreditation processes. Rooted in posthumanist thought, this approach challenges traditional assumptions about objectivity, authority, and decision-making by emphasizing the entanglement of humans, machines, and institutional structures (Braidotti, 2013; Wolfe, 2010). In the context of accreditation, Posthuman Ethics interrogates how technological mediation influences standards, fairness, and accountability while advocating for more inclusive, transparent, and adaptable systems that recognize the agency of both human and non-human actors (Floridi, 2013; Bayne, 2015).

Analyzes the ethical and philosophical concerns surrounding technology-driven learning and assessment systems. The integration of technology-driven learning and assessment systems raises significant ethical and philosophical concerns. One primary issue is academic integrity, as highlighted by Pan, who notes that while AI tools can enhance writing skills, challenges arise from students' lack of guidance on ethical writing practices (PAN, 2024). This issue of integrity is compounded by the ethical dilemmas surrounding data privacy and algorithmic bias, as discussed by Shubham et al.; they emphasize the necessity for transparency in data-driven technologies to mitigate these ethical risks (Shubham et al., 2023). Moreover, Wehrens et al. underline that the ethical framing of data-driven initiatives often overlooks crucial concerns surrounding bias and surveillance, demonstrating the need for ethical considerations in the development of such technologies (Wehrens et al., 2021).

Posthumanism critiques the anthropocentric bias in ethical decision-making, emphasizing human-technology entanglement.Posthumanism fundamentally critiques the anthropocentric bias that has historically dominated ethical decision-making, urging a reevaluation of the human-technology entanglement. This critique stems from the recognition that anthropocentrism positions humans as the primary referent in ethical considerations, thereby marginalizing other entities and perspectives (Can, 2023). Posthumanism seeks to dismantle this framework by advocating for a more inclusive understanding that acknowledges the interconnectedness of humans, nonhumans, and technologies (Vindrola-Padrós, 2023).

The software application and automated systems are no longer mere tools but active participants in accreditation. The integration of software applications and automated systems in accreditation processes reflects a significant evolution from their traditional roles as mere tools to active participants. As highlighted in recent literature, state-of-the-art digital systems are essential for automating and streamlining outcomes assessment, which is crucial for Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) and securing accreditations such as those offered by ABET (Hussain et al., 2020). Furthermore, the incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in accreditation processes enhances operational efficiency by automating data collection and analysis, thereby facilitating better decision-making and quality assurance (Alshahrani et al., 2024). This technological advancement is particularly relevant as emerging organizations seek to define clear processes for accreditation, thereby improving the academic environment and ensuring compliance with institutional quality requirements (Alkhatib, 2022).

The contributions of Rosi Braidotti, N. Katherine Hayles, and Francesca Ferrando on posthuman ethics and technology governance present a multifaceted view of the interplay between humanity and technology. Braidotti emphasizes the need for a new ethical framework that acknowledges the interconnectedness of all life forms, urging a departure from anthropocentrism towards an inclusive understanding of existence (LaGrandeur, 2021). Hayles discusses the evolving notion of the self in a digital context, emphasizing that identities are increasingly shaped by virtual interactions and technological interfaces, which raises ethical concerns regarding autonomy and agency (Tambling & Hayles, 2001; Elms, 2000). Ferrando expands on these ideas by interrogating the ethical implications of human enhancement and artificial intelligence, positing that advancements in technology necessitate a re-evaluation of moral principles guiding human development and societal governance (Kerasovitis, 2020; Mikki & Bhuvaneswari, 2023). Collectively, these theorists urge a rethinking of ethics in light of technological advances, leading to more responsible governance mechanisms that account for the complex interdependencies in a posthuman world

Evolution of Standards in Social Care Accreditation

The evolution of social care accreditation reflects a paradigm shift from traditional human-centered methods to data-centric AI-driven models. Historically, accreditation relied on manual evaluations, site visits, and document audits—processes that prioritized professional expertise but were often time-consuming and inconsistent (Eubanks, 2018). Today, AI-driven systems leverage predictive analytics and automated compliance checks to streamline decision-making, identifying risks or service gaps with unprecedented speed and scalability (Cath et al., 2018). However, this shift raises critical implications: while data-centric models enhance efficiency, they risk reducing complex, context-dependent care scenarios to quantifiable metrics, potentially overlooking relational nuances vital to quality care (Floridi, 2019). For instance, an algorithm might flag a care provider as "non-compliant" due to missing paperwork, ignoring mitigating circumstances a human evaluator would recognize. Additionally, reliance on historical data can perpetuate systemic biases, as seen in cases where marginalized communities face disproportionate scrutiny under automated systems (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018). Balancing the benefits of innovation with ethical safeguards—such as hybrid models retaining human oversight—is essential to ensure accreditation standards evolve without eroding the humanistic foundations of social care (European Commission, 2021).

The thoroughness of such processes is evident in the extensive preparation required, as seen in the Canadian context where institutions expended considerable resources, including time and money, to collect Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) data for accreditation. However, the manual nature of traditional accreditation poses challenges, including constraints on the comprehensiveness and effectiveness of evaluations (Onyura et al., 2023). Current critiques emphasize that despite the historical significance of such processes in quality assurance, there remains a pressing need for methodological renewal to enhance their relevance and utility in modern educational contexts (Onyura et al., 2023).

Predictive analytics and automated compliance checks are transformative tools in the software accreditation landscape, enhancing data-driven decision-making. The use of structured assurance case models emphasizes an evidence-based approach to software assurance, arguing for the necessity of explicit evidence to validate claims of dependability in software systems (Rhodes et al., 2010). Furthermore, automated compliance checks not only facilitate adherence to various regulations but also significantly reduce the effort required to ensure compliance (Preidel & Borrmann, 2018). The integration of these methodologies within software engineering programs, mandated by accreditation standards, highlights their critical role in maintaining security and other relevant qualities in software development. While accreditation programs are required to cover security topics, the specifics of implementation are flexible and left to individual programs (Schilling, n.d.). This combination of technology fosters a robust framework for assessing software quality and ensures that accreditation processes are more efficient and effective, although discussions on best practices for implementing and selecting compliance software remain limited (Fossen et al., 2021).

The transition from human-centered to data-centric accreditation models reflects a significant evolution in social care assessment. Traditional accreditation processes often emphasized structural and resource-based metrics, as highlighted by Khan et al. (Khan et al., 2019), who articulate that the prevalent "process model" relies heavily on physical infrastructures and self-evaluative measures. This shift towards data-centric models facilitates ongoing performance evaluations and the correlation of curriculum effectiveness with governance practices, as

demonstrated in the work by Popov et al. (POPOV et al., 2022). Such trends signal a move towards enhanced accountability and transparency in accreditation processes, aligning institutions more closely with industry needs and community expectations. The implications of this transformation are profound as accreditation bodies refine their standards to leverage empirical data, ensuring continuous improvement in social care quality and outcomes.

Ethical Challenges of Automation in Accreditation

Posthuman ethics challenges traditional human-centric frameworks by redefining accountability, agency, and value in social care accreditation systems that increasingly integrate artificial intelligence (AI). Unlike conventional models that prioritize human decision-makers as sole moral agents, posthuman ethics acknowledges the entanglement of humans, algorithms, and institutional infrastructures in shaping care outcomes. This paradigm shift demands accreditation standards that recognize relational agency—where responsibility is distributed across developers, regulators, organizations, and even the AI systems themselves (Floridi, 2019). For instance, when AI tools determine eligibility for social services, their design (e.g., training data, algorithmic logic) and deployment (e.g., organizational policies, regulatory oversight) collectively influence ethical outcomes. However, this raises critical questions: Can an algorithm bear moral responsibility? How do we ensure hybrid systems uphold dignity and justice for care recipients?

A posthuman ethical framework emphasizes hybrid accountability, combining legal, technical, and social governance mechanisms. For example, the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act (2021) proposes risk-based oversight for AI in public services, requiring audits and transparency for high-stakes systems like social care accreditation. Yet, posthuman ethics goes further, advocating for participatory design processes that include marginalized communities in shaping AI tools (Stilgoe, 2020). Case studies such as the Netherlands' SyRI scandal—where opaque welfare algorithms wrongfully accused families of fraud (Amnesty International, 2021)—highlight the dangers of excluding human judgment and ethical scrutiny. Conversely, Scandinavian pilot programs demonstrate how AI-human collaboration can enhance equity when social workers actively interpret algorithmic outputs (AI Now Institute, 2020).

Central to posthuman ethics is the deconstruction of binary hierarchies (human/machine, subjective/objective) that dominate accreditation practices. For instance, reducing care quality to quantifiable metrics (e.g., compliance checklists) risks erasing the contextual, relational dimensions of caregiving. Posthuman theorists like Braidotti (2019) argue for "affirmative ethics" that value ambiguity and interdependence, urging accreditation systems to accommodate fluid, context-specific needs—such as culturally sensitive care for Indigenous communities or adaptive support for neurodiverse individuals. This requires reimagining standards as dynamic, co-created processes rather than static rules, aligning with the Montreal Declaration for Responsible AI (2018), which prioritizes societal well-being over technical efficiency.

To operationalize posthuman ethics, accreditation systems must adopt anticipatory governance and ethical prototyping. Regulators could mandate "algorithmic impact assessments" to preempt biases (Wachter et al., 2017), while developers might embed explainability interfaces to demystify AI decisions for care recipients. Organizations, meanwhile, should establish redress mechanisms that empower individuals to challenge automated outcomes, as stipulated by GDPR (2016). Ultimately, posthuman ethics in social care accreditation is not about replacing humans with machines but fostering symbiotic ecosystems where technology amplifies—rather than diminishes—the moral imperatives of care: empathy, justice, and solidarity.

The ethical challenges of automation in social care accreditation are multifaceted, reflecting the risks of prioritizing efficiency over equity and humanity. Algorithmic bias remains a critical concern, as automated systems trained on historical data risk replicating and amplifying societal inequities. For example, if past accreditation decisions disproportionately excluded marginalized groups (e.g., racial minorities or low-income individuals), the AI could perpetuate discriminatory outcomes, undermining access to essential services (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018). Transparency issues compound these risks, as "black-box" algorithms often lack explainability, leaving social workers and service users unable to scrutinize or challenge decisions. This opacity contravenes principles of accountability and fairness, particularly in high-stakes domains like social care (Wachter et al., 2017; GDPR, 2016).

Dehumanization arises when automation reduces the relational, context-dependent nature of care to rigid metrics. Over-reliance on quantitative data risks neglecting empathy, cultural nuance, and individualized needs—elements central to effective care (Eubanks, 2018; Gebru et al., 2021). For instance, an algorithm might deny accreditation to a vulnerable elderly person because their unique circumstances defy standardized criteria, prioritizing efficiency over human dignity. Addressing these challenges requires governance frameworks that balance technological efficiency with ethical imperatives

Navigating Standards, Automation, and Accountability

Reconfiguring social care accreditation standards in a posthuman context demands hybrid models that harmonize human expertise with algorithmic assessments, ensuring decisions remain ethically grounded and contextually adaptive. Traditional accreditation frameworks, designed for human-centric governance, struggle to accommodate the complexities of AI integration, where software applications increasingly influence eligibility determinations and resource allocation. Hybrid approaches, as argued by Floridi (2019), must retain human oversight to counteract the rigidity of algorithmic systems, particularly in addressing ambiguities or ethical dilemmas that require empathy and situational judgment—qualities irreplaceable by automation.

For instance, case studies such as the Netherlands' SyRI (System Risk Indication) scandal reveal the dangers of over-reliance on opaque AI tools in welfare systems, where algorithmic profiling led to wrongful fraud accusations against vulnerable populations (Amnesty International, 2021). Conversely, pilot projects in Scandinavian social care demonstrate how AI-enhanced tools, when paired with social workers' input, improve efficiency without sacrificing equity (AI Now Institute, 2020). To future-proof standards, flexibility is critical: accreditation criteria must evolve alongside technological advancements while embedding safeguards against bias and dehumanization. Stilgoe (2020) emphasizes "anticipatory governance," urging regulators to iteratively revise standards using participatory methods that include marginalized stakeholders. This dual focus—balancing innovation with ethical vigilance—ensures accreditation systems remain both technologically robust and humanely accountable, aligning with the EU's proposed Artificial Intelligence Act (European Commission, 2021), which mandates risk-based oversight for public-sector AI.

As we move forward, it becomes critical to ensure that the evolving landscape of social care accreditation remains adaptive to technological innovations while respecting ethical implications. The call for standards that can pivot based on both socioeconomic contexts and technological landscapes is essential to creating a resilient framework for social care accreditation (Blobel et al., 2022). In essence, the future of social care accreditation will depend

on a delicate balance between human expertise, technological efficiency, and ethical considerations that collectively enhance the standards of care delivered to individuals.

Rethinking Accountability in AI-Driven Accreditation Systems

In addressing the question of accountability in AI-driven social care accreditation systems, it is paramount to recognize the multifaceted nature of responsibility among various stakeholders, including AI developers, organizations utilizing AI, and regulators. Each entity plays a significant role in ensuring that AI systems are designed, implemented, and governed with accountability in mind. Responsibility for AI decisions in social care primarily rests with three groups: regulators, AI developers, and organizations that deploy these systems.

Regulators of Social Care, Regulators hold a critical role in defining and enforcing accountability frameworks for AI systems used in social care accreditation. As gatekeepers of public trust, they must establish legal standards that ensure AI aligns with societal values like fairness, transparency, and equity. For instance, the EU's proposed *Artificial Intelligence Act* (European Commission, 2021) categorizes social care systems as "high-risk," mandating rigorous audits, transparency, and human oversight. However, regulatory gaps persist, such as the lack of universal standards for auditing algorithmic bias in care eligibility decisions (Cath et al., 2018). Regulators must also address jurisdictional challenges, as AI tools often operate across borders, complicating enforcement. Without proactive governance, automation risks exacerbating inequities, as seen in the Dutch SyRI scandal, where flawed algorithmic profiling led to systemic discrimination (Amnesty International, 2021).

AI Developers and System Architects, Developers bear technical and ethical responsibility for designing systems that prioritize accountability. This includes embedding transparency mechanisms (e.g., explainable AI techniques) and rigorously testing for bias in training data. For example, Buolamwini and Gebru (2018) demonstrated how facial recognition systems perpetuate racial and gender biases—a cautionary tale for social care algorithms. Developers must also adhere to ethical frameworks like the *Montreal Declaration for Responsible AI* (2018), which emphasizes human dignity and justice. However, technical fixes alone are insufficient; collaboration with social care professionals is vital to ensure systems reflect contextual realities (Floridi, 2019). Failure to do so risks creating tools that prioritize efficiency over empathy, undermining care's human-centric purpose.

Organizations Utilizing AI for Accreditation, Organizations deploying AI for social care accreditation assume operational accountability for outcomes. They must ensure systems are auditable, interpretable, and subject to human override. For instance, the *GDPR* (2016) grants individuals the right to contest automated decisions, requiring organizations to maintain clear redress pathways. Yet, many institutions lack the infrastructure to scrutinize AI outputs, as seen in cases where opaque algorithms denied disability benefits without justification (Eubanks, 2018). Organizations must also train staff to critically engage with AI recommendations, avoiding over-reliance on automated judgments. Proactive measures, such as third-party audits and stakeholder consultations, can mitigate risks while fostering public trust (AI Now Institute, 2020).

A posthuman accountability framework transcends traditional human-centric models by integrating legal, social, and technological governance. This approach recognizes AI as a co-participant in decision-making, necessitating hybrid oversight mechanisms. For example, Stilgoe (2020) advocates for "anticipatory governance," where regulators, developers, and

communities collaboratively identify risks before deployment. Technologically, blockchain-like audit trails could ensure decisions remain traceable, while socially, participatory design processes could center marginalized voices in system development (Wachter et al., 2017). Legally, frameworks like the EU AI Act (2021) could evolve to mandate real-time monitoring and "algorithmic impact assessments" for social care systems. Such a layered approach ensures accountability is distributed, dynamic, and responsive to both human and algorithmic agency.

Moreover, mechanisms for contesting AI decisions and seeking redress are critical for empowering users, particularly those from vulnerable communities. As discussed by Fanni et al., increasing opportunities for users to contest AI-generated outcomes is vital for maintaining agency in AI-mediated contexts (Fanni et al., 2022). The lack of such mechanisms currently poses risks, emphasizing the need for frameworks that not only facilitate accountability but also enable active user engagement with the technology.

In conclusion, accountability in AI-driven social care accreditation systems is a shared responsibility among regulators, developers, and organizations deploying these technologies. By integrating robust oversight mechanisms, ethical frameworks, and user engagement strategies, stakeholders can better navigate the complexities of AI implementations and uphold accountability across the spectrum of social care.

Conclusion

Social care accreditation is undergoing a fundamental transformation as automation and AI become integral to assessment processes, reshaping traditional evaluation methods and introducing new efficiencies. However, this shift also raises ethical dilemmas, particularly in balancing efficiency, fairness, and human oversight within AI-driven accreditation. While automation enhances objectivity and streamlines compliance monitoring, it also risks reinforcing biases, reducing transparency, and diminishing the role of human judgment in critical decision-making. Accountability remains a key challenge, necessitating interdisciplinary regulatory approaches that incorporate insights from ethics, law, technology governance, and social policy. Ensuring that AI-driven accreditation systems uphold equity, transparency, and ethical integrity requires continuous evaluation, robust policy frameworks, and a commitment to human-centered innovation in social care.

To ensure ethical and effective accreditation in the era of automation, it is crucial to develop AI-human hybrid accreditation models that integrate the efficiency of artificial intelligence with the nuanced judgment of human evaluators. These models should balance data-driven decision-making with ethical, human-centered considerations, preventing the dehumanization of social care services. Additionally, strengthening policy frameworks is essential to promote transparency, fairness, and accountability in AI-driven accreditation processes. Regulatory bodies should implement clear guidelines ensuring that automated systems operate within ethical boundaries, remain auditable, and allow for human intervention when necessary. Furthermore, future research should explore how posthuman ethics can inform regulatory policies, acknowledging AI not merely as a tool but as an active agent in decision-making. This perspective can help shape accreditation policies that accommodate both human and non-human actors, fostering an accreditation system that is equitable, adaptable, and ethically sound in the face of technological advancements.

Acknowledgement

The author extends heartfelt gratitude to Balai Pembiayaan Pendidikan Tinggi (BPPT) and Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP) [the Higher Education Funding Center and the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education] for their invaluable support in covering the entirety of the author's educational expenses. As a recipient of the Indonesian Education Scholarship (Beasiswa Pendidikan Indonesia-BPI), this support has been fundamental in enabling the author to success-fully pursue and complete doctoral studies at Universitas Padjdjaran.

References

(Alzahem, 2022). Thus, understanding the dual nature of these advancements is crucial for developing responsible accreditation practices.

AI Now Institute (2020). Disability, Bias, and AI.

Aldosari, B. and Alanazi, A. (2024). Pitfalls of artificial intelligence in medicine.. https://doi.org/10.3233/shti240474

Alkhatib, M. (2022). An effective and secure quality assurance system for a computer science program. Computer Systems Science and Engineering, 41(3), 975-995. https://doi.org/10.32604/csse.2022.021398

Alshahrani, B., Pileggi, S., & Karimi, F. (2024). A social perspective on ai in the higher education system: a semisystematic literature review. Electronics, 13(8), 1572. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13081572

Alzahem, A. (2022). Institutional academic accreditation journey and challenges. Journal of Medicine and Health Studies, 22-28. https://doi.org/10.37881/jmahs.124

Amnesty International (2021). Xenophobic Machines: Discrimination Through Unregulated Use of Algorithms.

Ang, L., Ge, F., & Seng, K. (2020). Big educational data & analytics: survey, architecture and challenges. Ieee Access, 8, 116392-116414. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2020.2994561

Bayne, S. (2015). What's the matter with "Technology Enhanced Learning"? Learning, Media and Technology, 40(1), 5–20.

Blobel et al. "Transformation of Health and Social Care Systems—An Interdisciplinary Approach Toward a Foundational Architecture" Frontiers in Medicine (2022) doi:10.3389/fmed.2022.802487.

Braidotti, R. (2013). The Posthuman. Polity Press.

Braidotti, R. (2018). A theoretical framework for the critical posthumanities. Theory Culture & Society, 36(6), 31-61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418771486

Brittingham, B., O'Brien, P., & Alig, J. (2008). Accreditation and institutional research: the traditional role and new dimensions. New Directions for Higher Education, 2008(141), 69-76. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.294

Buetow, S. (2003). Accreditation of general practices: challenges and lessons. BMJ Quality & Safety, 12(2), 129-135. https://doi.org/10.1136/qhc.12.2.129

Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research.

Can, D. (2023). Reinterpreting human in the digital age: from anthropocentricism to posthumanism and transhumanism. Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning, 6(4), 981-990. https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.1341232

Cath, C., et al. (2018). Artificial Intelligence and the 'Good Society'. Science and Engineering Ethics.

Cunningham, S., Taylor, B., & Murphy, A. (2020). Standards in regulating quality of adult community

health and social care: systematic narrative review. Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work, 17(4), 457-468. https://doi.org/10.1080/26408066.2020.1770647

Elish, M. (2019). Moral crumple zones: cautionary tales in human-robot interaction. Engaging Science Technology and Society, 5, 40-60. https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2019.260

Elms, A. (2000). How we became posthuman: virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 36(2), 192-193. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1520-6696(200021)36:23.0.co;2-8

Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor. St. Martin's Press.

European Commission (2021). Proposal for a Regulation on a European Approach for Artificial Intelligence.

Fanni, R., Steinkogler, V., Zampedri, G., & Pierson, J. (2022). Enhancing human agency through redress in artificial intelligence systems. Ai & Society, 38(2), 537-547. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01454-7

Floridi, L. (2019). Translating Principles into Practices of Digital Ethics: Five Risks of Being Ethical. Philosophy & Technology.

Fossen, R., Taormina, R., & LaCasse, J. (2021). Selecting and using faculty data management software systems. Organization Management Journal, 18(5), 187-198. https://doi.org/10.1108/omj-04-2021-1210

GDPR (2016). General Data Protection Regulation.

Gebru, T., et al. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? 🦜. FAccT Conference.

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (2016). Article 22.

Gladden, M., Fortuna, P., & Modliński, A. (2022). The empowerment of artificial intelligence in post-digital organizations: exploring human interactions with supervisory ai. Human Technology, 18(2), 98-121. https://doi.org/10.14254/1795-6889.2022.18-2.2

Greenfield, D., Hinchcliff, R., Banks, M., Mumford, V., Hogden, A., Debono, D., … & Braithwaite, J. (2014). Analysing 'big picture' policy reform mechanisms: the australian health service safety and quality accreditation scheme. Health Expectations, 18(6), 3110-3122. https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12300

Hayles, N. K. (1999). How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics. University of Chicago Press.

Hussain, W., Spady, W., Naqash, M., Khan, S., Khawaja, B., & Conner, L. (2020). Abet accreditation during and after covid19 - navigating the digital age. Ieee Access, 8, 218997-219046. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2020.3041736

Joseph, S. (2020). Impact assessment of accreditation in primary and secondary public healthcare institutions in the state of kerala, india.. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.30.20117432

Kelly, Y., O'Rourke, N., Flynn, R., Hegarty, J., & O'Connor, L. (2021). Factors that influence the implementation of health and social care standards: a systematic review and meta-summary protocol. HRB Open Research, 4, 24. https://doi.org/10.12688/hrbopenres.13212.2

Kelly, Y., O'Rourke, N., Flynn, R., Hegarty, J., & O'Connor, L. (2022). Definitions of health and social care standards used internationally: a narrative review. The International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 38(1), 40-52. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.3573

Kerasovitis, K. (2020). Posthuman knowledge. Information Communication & Society, 23(9), 1388-1391. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2020.1739733

Kero, A. and Endebu, A. (2023). The role of big data analytics in improving teacher training in developing countries: a literature review.. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3111391/v1

Khan, A., Sethi, A., Wajid, G., & Yasmeen, R. (2019). Challenges towards quality assurance of basic medical education in pakistan. Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences, 36(2). https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.36.2.1319

LaGrandeur, K. (2021). The ethics of human enhancement and ferrando's philosophical posthumanism. Journal of Posthumanism, 1(2), 195-198. https://doi.org/10.33182/jp.v1i2.1718

Mikki, A. and Bhuvaneswari, V. (2023). The missing post-humanism: a philosophical posthuman study of don delillo's zero k and william gibson's pattern recognition. World Journal of English Language, 13(7), 299. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n7p299

Montreal Declaration for Responsible AI (2018).

Morgan, D., Hashem, Y., Straub, V., & Bright, J. (2022). High-stakes team based public sector decision making and ai oversight.. https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/arq3w

Omodan, B. (2023). Analysis of connectivism as a tool for posthuman university classrooms. Journal Of curriculum Studies research, 5(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2023.2

Onyura, B., Fisher, A., Wu, Q., Rajkumar, S., Chapagain, S., Nassuna, J., … & Nirula, L. (2023). To prove or improve? examining how paradoxical tensions shape evaluation practices in accreditation contexts. Medical Education, 58(3), 354-362. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.15218

PAN, J. (2024). Ai-driven english language learning program and academic writing integrity in the era of intelligent interface. English Language Teaching and Linguistics Studies, 6(4), p120. https://doi.org/10.22158/eltls.v6n4p120

POPOV, V., Ruis, A., & Cooke, J. (2022). Taking stock and looking ahead. Simulation in Healthcare the Journal of the Society for Simulation in Healthcare, 18(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1097/sih.0000000000000638

Preidel, C. and Borrmann, A. (2018). Bim-based code compliance checking., 367-381. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92862-3_22

Rhodes, T., Boland, F., Fong, E., & Kass, M. (2010). Software assurance using structured assurance case models. Journal of Research of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, 115(3), 209. https://doi.org/10.6028/jres.115.013

Sayers, J., Martin, L., & Bell, E. (2021). Posthuman affirmative business ethics: reimagining human–animal relations through speculative fiction. Journal of Business Ethics, 178(3), 597-608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04801-8

Schilling, W. The state of the practice integrating security in abet accredited software engineering programs.. https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--44487

Shubham, S. and Saloni, S. (2023). Data and science engineering: the ethical dilemma of our time-exploring privacy breaches, algorithmic biases, and the need for transparency. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 18(1), 762-768. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.1.0677

Stilgoe, J. (2020). Who's Driving Innovation? New Technologies and the Collaborative State. Palgrave Macmillan.

Tambling, J. and Hayles, N. (2001). How we became posthuman: virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature and informatics. The Modern Language Review, 96(1), 143. https://doi.org/10.2307/3735725

Thomas, A. (2020). On progress and reason: stories of gods, animals and humans. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 41(3/4), 331-347. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijssp-09-2019-0179

Toli, L. and Manasa, G. (2024). Artificial intelligence: opportunities and challenges for the social education and profession. Scholars Bulletin, 10(04), 143-147. https://doi.org/10.36348/sb.2024.v10i04.005

Vindrola-Padrós, B. (2023). Outline of a theory of breakage. Anthropological Theory, 23(3), 255-291. https://doi.org/10.1177/14634996221139900

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-

Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. International Data Privacy Law.
Wehrens, R., Stevens, M., Kostenzer, J., Weggelaar-Jansen, A., & Bont, A. (2021). Ethics as discursive work: the role of ethical framing in the promissory future of data-driven healthcare technologies. Science Technology & Human Values, 48(3), 606-634. https://doi.org/10.1177/01622439211053661
Wolfe, C. (2010). What is Posthumanism? University of Minnesota Press.