Future of Work and Digital Management Journal

Article type:
Original Research

Article history:
Received 21 February 2025
Revised 14 May 2025
Accepted 25 May 2025
Published online 01 June 2025

Arezoo. Ahmadvand[1*]

1 Master's degree student, Department of Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Technology, Yadegar Imam Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Corresponding author email address:
arezoo.amd26@gmail.com

How to cite this article:
Ahmadvand, A. (2025). Identifying Barriers to Transparent AI Governance in Human-Centered Work Design. *Future of Work and Digital Management Journal,* *3*(2), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.61838/fwdmj.3.2.3

Identifying Barriers to Transparent AI Governance in Human-Centered Work Design

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore the organizational, sociotechnical, and cultural barriers to implementing transparent AI governance within human-centered work environments. A qualitative research design was employed, utilizing semi-structured interviews with 27 participants from diverse public and private sector organizations based in Tehran. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to capture a range of roles including management, IT, policy, and human resources. Interviews were conducted until theoretical saturation was achieved. Each interview was transcribed and analyzed using inductive qualitative content analysis. NVivo software facilitated systematic coding, enabling the emergence of main themes and subthemes from the data. The analysis yielded three overarching themes: structural and organizational constraints, sociotechnical misalignments, and cultural and cognitive barriers. Participants identified key challenges such as the absence of AI policy frameworks, siloed decision-making, and lack of ethical oversight mechanisms. Sociotechnical barriers included exclusion of stakeholders in AI development, technological opacity, and poor integration with human workflows. Cultural issues like distrust in AI systems, low AI literacy, and fear of job displacement further hindered transparent governance. These findings align with prior studies emphasizing the regulatory, ethical, and human-centered dimensions of AI transparency. The results demonstrate that transparency is not solely a technical feature but a multidimensional construct requiring organizational capacity, ethical culture, and inclusive governance processes. Transparent AI governance in human-centered work design is undermined by intersecting structural, technical, and cultural barriers. Overcoming these challenges requires a shift from compliance-based models to participatory and ethics-driven approaches that prioritize stakeholder engagement, organizational learning, and adaptive oversight. Addressing these barriers is essential for building trust, accountability, and fairness in the workplace as AI technologies become increasingly embedded in decision-making systems.

Keywords: AI governance, transparency, human-centered design, organizational ethics.

Introduction

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into organizational systems has redefined the nature of contemporary work design, shifting the focus from mechanistic efficiency to a more dynamic model centered on human values, ethics, and autonomy. This transformation brings about a dual imperative: the optimization of AI-enabled productivity and the safeguarding of human-centered principles within organizational structures. Central to this tension is the challenge of transparent AI governance, a multifaceted concern involving legal, ethical, organizational, and cultural components. In human-centered work environments, where collaboration, adaptability, and psychological safety are key, the opacity and complexity of AI systems pose unique governance barriers. Despite the growing discourse around AI ethics, there remains a

critical gap in understanding how such barriers manifest in real-world organizational contexts and how they affect the integration of AI within human-centered frameworks [1-3].

The call for transparent AI governance has grown louder in recent years due to widespread concerns over algorithmic bias, data privacy, accountability gaps, and the erosion of human agency in automated decision-making systems [4-6]. These challenges are particularly salient in workplaces that strive to uphold principles of inclusion, trust, and shared responsibility. Transparency is not merely a technical attribute of AI systems; it is a normative requirement grounded in broader legal, social, and ethical expectations. As AI systems increasingly influence recruitment, promotion, performance evaluation, and task delegation, understanding how transparent governance is conceptualized and operationalized in human-centered work design becomes essential [7, 8]. Yet, despite the acknowledged importance of transparency, organizations often struggle with practical implementation due to fragmented policy environments, misaligned values, and insufficient stakeholder involvement [9, 10].

A major obstacle in AI governance stems from the lack of clear regulatory frameworks that define ethical standards and delineate responsibilities among developers, users, and institutions. In various jurisdictions, existing legal models are either outdated or too generic to address the nuanced risks posed by AI systems in workplace settings [11, 12]. The gap between technological advancement and legislative evolution has resulted in a regulatory lag, leaving organizations to craft their own ad hoc governance mechanisms, which are often inconsistent or symbolic. Scholars have argued for the establishment of operational ethics frameworks that embed transparency into AI development cycles and organizational decision-making [8, 13]. However, in the absence of enforceable standards or effective oversight, such frameworks remain aspirational at best.

This challenge is further complicated by the sociotechnical nature of AI systems. Transparency is not only about revealing algorithms or publishing audit logs; it also involves aligning technological design with human values, expectations, and cognitive capacities [4, 14]. The notion of explainability, for instance, is often interpreted differently by engineers, policymakers, and end-users. While developers may focus on mathematical transparency, organizational actors typically prioritize interpretability, usability, and impact on trust. This disconnect results in systems that are technically transparent but functionally opaque to the very individuals they are intended to serve [15, 16]. Moreover, the absence of participatory design mechanisms excludes critical voices—particularly those of frontline employees—from governance processes, reinforcing a top-down model of AI implementation that undermines accountability and inclusion [17, 18].

In human-centered work design, transparency is also closely tied to psychological safety and organizational culture. Trust in AI systems cannot be sustained solely through technical disclosures; it must be nurtured through ongoing communication, ethical leadership, and inclusive governance structures [19, 20]. Employees' perception of fairness, explainability, and empowerment significantly affects how they engage with AI systems and how they interpret their role in relation to automated processes. Yet, organizational cultures often prioritize efficiency over ethical deliberation, and this creates a misalignment between the espoused values of human-centered design and the operational realities of AI governance [21, 22]. The result is a paradoxical environment in which AI is promoted as a tool for empowerment but is experienced as a mechanism of control and surveillance.

From a global governance perspective, there is growing recognition of the need to harmonize AI governance practices across sectors and regions. Comparative studies have shown that nations with well-developed legal infrastructures and participatory policy-making mechanisms tend to exhibit more consistent ethical oversight in AI applications [3, 10]. In

contrast, countries with fragmented legal regimes or weak institutional capacity often adopt imported AI solutions without adapting them to local ethical norms or labor conditions. This creates significant variation in the quality and transparency of AI governance, particularly in workplaces where transnational platforms and technologies operate [9, 20]. Furthermore, the influence of corporate lobbying and techno-solutionist ideologies has often diluted policy efforts to promote meaningful transparency, framing governance as a barrier to innovation rather than a foundation for trust and legitimacy [6, 12].

Despite these challenges, recent scholarship has proposed practical models for embedding transparency into AI systems through ethical impact assessments, stakeholder audits, and adaptive feedback mechanisms [7, 13]. These models emphasize the importance of context-sensitive governance, where transparency is tailored to the specific risks, user groups, and socio-organizational dynamics of each deployment setting. In this regard, human-centered work design offers a valuable lens for understanding how AI transparency should be implemented—not as a one-size-fits-all requirement, but as a dynamic process grounded in continuous dialogue and ethical reflection [8, 19]. However, empirical research on how such barriers are experienced and interpreted by organizational actors remains limited, especially in non-Western and transitional contexts.

The present study addresses this gap by exploring the barriers to transparent AI governance from the perspectives of professionals working in diverse organizational settings in Tehran.

Methods and Materials

Study Design and Participants

This research employed a qualitative design grounded in an interpretive paradigm to explore the barriers to transparent AI governance within the context of human-centered work design. The study aimed to generate in-depth insights from professionals and stakeholders directly involved in digital transformation, AI implementation, and organizational development. A purposive sampling strategy was used to select 27 participants from Tehran, including managers, IT specialists, policy advisors, organizational psychologists, and human resources professionals across public and private sectors. The sample was constructed to ensure diversity in experience, sector, and organizational role. Recruitment continued until theoretical saturation was achieved—that is, no new themes or insights emerged from additional interviews, confirming the adequacy of the sample size.

Data Collection

Data were collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews, which allowed for both consistency across participants and the flexibility to explore individual perspectives in detail. An interview guide was developed based on a preliminary literature review and refined through pilot testing with two professionals. Core questions focused on participants' experiences with AI integration, their understanding of transparency in AI systems, and organizational challenges in aligning AI governance with human-centered principles. Interviews were conducted face-to-face or via secure video conferencing platforms, depending on participant availability and preference. Each interview lasted approximately 60 to 90 minutes and was audio-recorded with informed consent. Interviews were transcribed verbatim immediately after each session to facilitate iterative analysis.

Data analysis

The transcribed interviews were analyzed using qualitative content analysis with the assistance of NVivo software (version 12), which supported systematic data organization and coding. The analysis followed an inductive approach, beginning with open coding to capture meaningful units related to the research objectives. Codes were then grouped into subcategories and main categories through constant comparison and thematic clustering. Throughout the process, analytical memos were maintained to track evolving interpretations and ensure transparency in coding decisions. Two researchers independently coded the data and later reconciled their findings through consensus discussions, enhancing the credibility and dependability of the analysis. The final themes represent recurring and significant barriers perceived by participants in implementing transparent AI governance in human-centered work settings.

Findings and Results

The study involved 27 participants based in Tehran, selected through purposive sampling to ensure diversity in perspectives relevant to AI governance and human-centered work design. Of the total participants, 15 were male and 12 were female. In terms of age distribution, 6 participants were aged between 30–39 years, 11 were in the 40–49 age range, and 10 were aged 50 and above. Professionally, the sample included 8 managers and senior executives, 7 IT and AI system specialists, 6 human resources and organizational development professionals, and 6 policy advisors and legal experts. Regarding the organizational context, 16 participants were employed in the public sector and 11 in private sector organizations. This demographic diversity facilitated a broad and multifaceted understanding of the barriers to transparent AI governance in human-centered workplaces.

Table 1

Categories, Subcategories, and Concepts Identified in the Study

Category (Main Theme)	Subcategory	Concepts (Open Codes)
1. Structural and Organizational Constraints	Lack of AI Policy Framework	Absence of clear protocols, Undefined accountability, Ambiguous implementation paths, No regulatory oversight
	Siloed Decision-Making	Departmental isolation, Disconnected data flows, Limited inter-unit collaboration, Fragmented authority structures
	Resistance to Change	Institutional inertia, Fear of innovation, Hierarchical rigidity, Prioritization of status quo, Passive compliance
	Resource Limitations	Budgetary constraints, Lack of skilled personnel, Inadequate training programs, Technological deficits
	Low Interdepartmental Transparency	Information hoarding, Poor communication channels, Lack of real-time reporting, Political withholding of data
	Weak Ethical Oversight Mechanisms	Absence of ethics board, Lack of monitoring tools, No whistleblower protection, No formal ethics review, Discretionary enforcement
	Ineffective Feedback Loops	Delayed responses, One-way communication structures, Disconnected feedback platforms
2. Sociotechnical Misalignments	Lack of Stakeholder Inclusion	Users excluded from design, Absence of public consultation, Top-down implementation, Neglect of marginalized voices
	Ambiguous AI Accountability	Who is responsible?, Shifting blame, No clear audit trails, Accountability diffusion
	Technological Opacity	Black-box models, Limited explainability, No interpretability tools, Poor model documentation, Vendor lock-in
	Inconsistent Integration with Human Workflows	AI mismatch with roles, Increased task complexity, Workflow disruption, Redundant processes
	Ignoring Human Values	Disregard for autonomy, Erosion of trust, Overemphasis on efficiency, Lack of empathy-driven design, Marginalization of emotional labor
	Unrealistic Expectations from AI	Overpromising capabilities, Misunderstood limitations, Inflated success metrics, Assumption of objectivity
3. Cultural and Cognitive Barriers	Distrust Toward AI Systems	Fear of surveillance, Suspicion of data misuse, Belief in manipulation, Lack of reliability perception
	Fear of Job Displacement	AI as replacement, Anxiety over redundancy, Insecurity in skillsets

	Low AI Literacy Among Employees	Misunderstanding terminology, Lack of training, Difficulty interpreting outputs, Absence of foundational knowledge
	Perceived Threat to Professional Identity	Loss of expertise value, Role ambiguity, Undermined autonomy, Feeling replaceable
	Cultural Emphasis on Authority and Control	Centralized decision-making, Lack of employee voice, Overcontrol by leadership, Disempowerment

The analysis of 27 semi-structured interviews led to the identification of three main categories: *Structural and Organizational Constraints*, *Sociotechnical Misalignments*, and *Cultural and Cognitive Barriers*. Each category encompassed multiple subcategories that reveal specific and recurrent barriers to transparent AI governance in human-centered work design. Below, the subthemes and their underlying concepts are discussed in detail with direct quotes from participants.

1. Structural and Organizational Constraints

One key subcategory was the *Lack of AI Policy Framework*. Many participants emphasized the absence of clear internal protocols or guidelines for implementing transparent AI. They highlighted how accountability remains undefined and implementation paths are ambiguous. As one IT manager stated, “There’s no overarching framework in our organization that tells us who should do what when it comes to AI—it’s all very ad hoc.” Participants also expressed concern over the lack of regulatory oversight, describing a vacuum in governance mechanisms.

The second subcategory, *Siloed Decision-Making*, referred to the segmented nature of decision-making processes in organizations. Respondents noted that departments operate in isolation, often with disconnected data flows and minimal collaboration. A digital transformation lead explained, “We build systems without consulting others—HR, compliance, even end-users are left out. It's like everyone builds their own AI in a vacuum.” This fragmentation weakens transparency and reduces shared ownership of AI governance.

Another barrier identified was *Resistance to Change*, particularly institutional inertia and fear of innovation. Many participants described their organizations as locked into hierarchical rigidity and passive compliance. A human resources officer noted, “People follow orders, but no one asks whether the AI is working ethically or even logically.” The prioritization of maintaining the status quo over exploring transparent alternatives was a dominant theme.

Resource Limitations emerged as a common constraint, with participants citing insufficient budgets, a lack of qualified personnel, and technological deficiencies. One policy advisor noted, “We don’t have the infrastructure—or the people—to monitor what the AI is doing, let alone explain it to others.” This lack of foundational capacity prevents organizations from building or sustaining transparent AI systems.

Participants also highlighted *Low Interdepartmental Transparency* as a problem. Information hoarding and poor communication practices between departments were frequently mentioned. As a project coordinator reported, “Sometimes legal doesn’t even know what AI tools we’re deploying, and we find out about compliance issues after implementation.”

The subcategory *Weak Ethical Oversight Mechanisms* referred to the absence of ethics boards, lack of monitoring tools, and inadequate whistleblower protections. Several participants reported that ethical review processes were either non-existent or purely symbolic. “We have an ethics committee, but they meet twice a year and have no power,” one interviewee remarked.

Lastly, *Ineffective Feedback Loops* were cited as a barrier to transparency. Participants described communication structures that allowed only delayed or one-way feedback. A senior developer explained, “When users raise concerns about the AI, the message often doesn’t make it to the designers. The loop is broken.”

2. Sociotechnical Misalignments

A major concern in this category was the *Lack of Stakeholder Inclusion*. Many participants described AI implementation as a top-down process that excluded users and stakeholders. “We built the system without asking the people who would use it. No surveys, no pilot, nothing,” reported a UX designer. This exclusion undermines both transparency and trust.

The issue of *Ambiguous AI Accountability* was also central. Interviewees described blurred lines of responsibility when AI systems fail or behave unexpectedly. “When something goes wrong, everyone points fingers. There’s no clear owner of the system,” said a cybersecurity analyst. The absence of clear audit trails further complicated accountability.

Technological Opacity was repeatedly cited, particularly the prevalence of black-box models and a lack of explainability tools. “We don’t know how the algorithm makes decisions. Even the vendor can’t tell us,” one data scientist stated. This opacity makes it difficult to ensure or demonstrate transparency.

Participants also discussed *Inconsistent Integration with Human Workflows*, where AI systems disrupted rather than supported human labor. Several interviewees spoke about redundant processes and increased complexity. “The AI was supposed to automate reports, but it ended up doubling my workload because I had to correct its mistakes,” a financial analyst explained.

Another important subtheme was *Ignoring Human Values*. Participants felt that design decisions often prioritized efficiency over autonomy, trust, or emotional considerations. “The system doesn’t care how people feel. It just optimizes output,” said a workplace psychologist. This disregard for human-centered principles diminishes the legitimacy of AI governance.

Finally, many interviewees mentioned *Unrealistic Expectations from AI*. Inflated claims about AI's capabilities led to disappointment and misunderstanding. A department head shared, “People think AI is some magical solution, but it has real limits. We don’t talk about those limits enough, and that’s dangerous.”

3. Cultural and Cognitive Barriers

The subcategory *Distrust Toward AI Systems* revealed a widespread fear of surveillance, data misuse, and manipulation. Several participants expressed concern about the lack of reliability and ethical safeguards. “We always assume the AI is watching us, and not in a good way,” said a junior employee, reflecting a deep-seated skepticism.

Fear of Job Displacement was another barrier mentioned often, especially by mid-level staff. Participants described anxiety about redundancy and obsolescence. “I worry every day that the next system will make me irrelevant,” stated an administrative officer.

Another issue was *Low AI Literacy Among Employees*. Many participants cited widespread misunderstanding of AI terminology, difficulty interpreting outputs, and a lack of training. “Most people don’t even know what a model is, let alone how to question its decisions,” explained a training coordinator.

The theme *Perceived Threat to Professional Identity* captured how AI systems can make workers feel that their expertise and roles are being undermined. One specialist remarked, “I’ve spent 20 years developing judgment, and now I’m told to defer to an algorithm. That’s demeaning.”

Lastly, the subcategory *Cultural Emphasis on Authority and Control* described organizational norms that suppress bottom-up input and reinforce centralized decision-making. “Everything flows from the top, even when the top doesn’t understand AI. We don’t have a say,” noted a participant in a public-sector organization.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study explored the barriers to transparent AI governance within human-centered work design by analyzing the experiences and insights of 27 organizational stakeholders in Tehran. The findings revealed three major thematic categories—*structural and organizational constraints*, *sociotechnical misalignments*, and *cultural and cognitive barriers*—each encompassing multiple subcategories that reflect the practical, ethical, and institutional complexities organizations face in operationalizing transparency. These results underscore the multi-dimensional nature of AI governance, revealing that transparency is both a technical challenge and a deeply socio-organizational issue.

The first theme, *structural and organizational constraints*, was characterized by the lack of comprehensive policy frameworks, siloed decision-making, resistance to change, limited resources, weak ethical oversight, and ineffective feedback loops. Participants described an environment in which AI governance is fragmented and reactive, shaped more by immediate managerial concerns than by deliberate ethical principles. These observations align with prior literature that identifies regulatory ambiguity and institutional inertia as critical obstacles to ethical AI implementation [11, 21]. Similar to the findings of David et al., organizational actors in this study expressed uncertainty about who holds responsibility for AI-related decisions and how accountability is operationalized across departments [12]. The absence of cohesive oversight bodies or enforceable ethical protocols, as reported by participants, mirrors what Ahmad et al. term "symbolic ethics"—a condition in which ethical structures exist only in name without genuine influence on decision-making [4].

Moreover, the persistence of siloed decision-making highlights the inadequacy of communication between departments and the limited role of cross-functional governance teams. This is consistent with findings by Kolade, who emphasized that inter-agency disconnection and bureaucratic competition often hinder coherent AI oversight in large organizations [20]. Without clear coordination mechanisms or information-sharing platforms, participants in this study noted that AI systems are developed or procured without adequate consultation with HR, legal, or ethics departments. This misalignment can undermine not only the technical efficiency of AI systems but also their legitimacy and trustworthiness among employees.

Resistance to change and *resource limitations* emerged as mutually reinforcing barriers. Participants frequently cited a lack of skilled personnel, training, and technological infrastructure needed to monitor and explain AI behavior. This is in line with prior research by Kalkan, who observed that the pace of AI integration often exceeds the development of institutional capacity and human capital, particularly in transitional economies [2]. The fear of disruption and institutional inertia described by respondents echoes Pasupuleti's notion of "governance lag"—a systemic delay in updating institutional norms to match AI's evolving capabilities [14]. Without sufficient training and resource allocation, transparency efforts remain either superficial or technologically unfeasible.

The second major theme—*sociotechnical misalignments*—illuminated the tension between algorithmic design and human-centered values. Participants repeatedly emphasized the lack of stakeholder inclusion during AI development and implementation. This top-down approach, as observed in this study, reflects the critique raised by Aref, who argues that the ethical dimension of AI transparency is often neglected when systems are designed in isolation from end users [8]. Respondents described decisions made without consulting those affected by AI tools, particularly frontline employees, leading to confusion and mistrust. This is consistent with the findings of Wan et al., who identified public concern over the exclusion of user perspectives in the design of AI surveillance technologies [17].

Additionally, the study revealed a significant lack of clarity around *AI accountability*. Participants highlighted confusion over who is responsible when an AI system malfunctions, a situation described by Chintoh et al. as "accountability diffusion"—a condition in which responsibility is so fragmented that no single actor is answerable [7]. This issue is compounded by the technological *opacity* of AI systems, especially those using black-box models. As echoed by Jing-jing et al., even technically advanced systems are often incomprehensible to non-expert stakeholders, creating a perception of AI as inscrutable and uncontrollable [15].

The participants' accounts also suggest that AI systems often *disrupt human workflows* rather than enhance them. Many interviewees shared experiences of increased task complexity and redundancy following AI implementation. This supports Manda et al.'s view that ethical AI in the workplace must not only be transparent but also compatible with existing human processes [19]. When AI fails to integrate seamlessly into organizational routines, it risks diminishing employee autonomy and job satisfaction, both of which are central to human-centered work design. Furthermore, the neglect of *human values*—such as empathy, fairness, and inclusivity—was evident in participants' concerns that AI systems prioritize efficiency at the cost of psychological safety and user dignity. This echoes Singh's argument that ethical AI governance must extend beyond functionality to encompass moral and emotional dimensions of human labor [6].

The final thematic category, *cultural and cognitive barriers*, explored how values, beliefs, and organizational norms shape perceptions of AI transparency. A prevalent concern among participants was *distrust toward AI systems*, often rooted in fear of surveillance and data misuse. These sentiments mirror Zuwanda et al.'s analysis of human rights concerns in AI-enhanced law enforcement, where lack of transparency leads to widespread suspicion and social resistance [16]. Participants also expressed anxiety over *job displacement*, a finding supported by Adhikary's exploration of how mythological narratives in South Asian contexts frame AI as a disruptive force threatening human identity and labor [18]. Such cultural narratives inform cognitive resistance to AI adoption and affect organizational readiness for transparent governance.

The study further highlighted the issue of *low AI literacy*, particularly among non-technical staff. Respondents reported difficulty understanding algorithmic logic, terminology, and outputs, which hinders meaningful engagement with AI systems. This supports the observations of Njoroge, who emphasized the need for AI education and awareness-building in African organizations to bridge the gap between ethical aspirations and practical comprehension [10]. Without adequate training, even the most well-intentioned transparency efforts can fail to deliver on their objectives. Moreover, many participants described how AI challenges their *professional identity*, creating feelings of redundancy or loss of value in human judgment. This aligns with Karami's analysis of EU policy efforts to preserve human dignity and autonomy in AI-driven systems [3]. Lastly, participants discussed how organizational cultures emphasizing authority and control suppress bottom-up feedback and foster environments where ethical concerns are under-prioritized. These findings are congruent with the argument by Obinna and Kess-Momoh that centralized governance often excludes diverse perspectives, weakening ethical resilience [9].

Together, these findings point to a fundamental misalignment between the technical evolution of AI systems and the ethical, cultural, and organizational infrastructures required to support transparent governance. While technological transparency—such as making code interpretable or documenting algorithmic decision paths—is important, this study demonstrates that it is insufficient on its own. Transparency must be socially enacted and culturally embedded to be meaningful in human-centered environments. Moreover, the results suggest that efforts to promote transparency must go

beyond compliance or technical fixes and instead focus on fostering inclusive dialogue, participatory design, and ethical leadership.

While this study offers valuable insights into the barriers to transparent AI governance in human-centered work design, it is not without limitations. First, the research was geographically limited to Tehran, which, while a major urban and organizational center, may not represent the full diversity of workplace cultures and regulatory contexts across Iran or other countries. Second, the study relied solely on self-reported experiences from organizational stakeholders, which may be influenced by individual perceptions or social desirability bias. Third, while the use of semi-structured interviews enabled deep exploration of participant views, it may not have captured all dimensions of organizational practices or decision-making structures. Lastly, the qualitative nature of the study limits the generalizability of its findings, although it does offer rich, context-specific knowledge that can inform broader theory and practice.

Future research could extend this study in several directions. First, comparative cross-cultural studies could explore how barriers to AI transparency differ across regions with varying legal frameworks, technological maturity, and cultural norms. Second, quantitative studies could measure the prevalence and impact of specific barriers identified in this research, such as low AI literacy or lack of stakeholder inclusion, across larger organizational samples. Third, future work could investigate the perspectives of other stakeholders such as frontline employees, trade unions, or AI system developers to triangulate findings and provide a more comprehensive view of governance dynamics. Finally, longitudinal research could examine how organizations evolve their transparency practices over time in response to internal learning or external regulation.

Organizations aiming to promote transparent AI governance should prioritize the development of inclusive, participatory governance frameworks that engage diverse stakeholders from the outset. Building interdepartmental coordination mechanisms, such as AI ethics committees or cross-functional working groups, can help mitigate silos and promote shared accountability. Investing in AI literacy programs and interpretability tools will enable employees at all levels to understand and question algorithmic decisions. Leaders should also foster a culture of openness and ethical reflection, where concerns about AI fairness, transparency, and human impact are encouraged and addressed. Finally, transparency should be viewed not as a one-time compliance effort but as an ongoing process of dialogue, evaluation, and adaptation embedded in the organization’s ethical fabric.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who cooperated in carrying out this study.

Authors’ Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

The study protocol adhered to the principles outlined in the Helsinki Declaration, which provides guidelines for ethical research involving human participants. Written consent was obtained from all participants in the study.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

[1] M. K. Pasupuleti, "Artificial Intelligence in Business Law: Navigating Regulation, Ethics, and Governance," pp. 19-35, 2024, doi: 10.62311/nesx/66203.

[2] G. Kalkan, "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Corporate Governance," *Journal of Corporate Finance Research / Корпоративные Финансы | Issn 2073-0438,* vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 17-25, 2024, doi: 10.17323/j.jcfr.2073-0438.18.2.2024.17-25.

[3] A. Karami, "Artificial Intelligence Governance in the European Union," *Jes*, vol. 20, no. 11s, pp. 2706-2720, 2024, doi: 10.52783/jes.7938.

[4] N. Ahmad, M. Anshari, M. Hamdan, and E. Ali, "Ethics and Public Trust in Ai Governance: A Literature Review," *International Journal of Law Government and Communication,* vol. 9, no. 37, pp. 296-305, 2024, doi: 10.35631/ijlgc.937025.

[5] M. Taddeo, "The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence," 2024, doi: 10.1093/oso/9780197745441.001.0001.

[6] D. Singh, "Navigating the Digital Age: Smart AI Ethics for Seamless Transformation," *International Journal of Advanced Research in Electrical Electronics and Instrumentation Engineering,* vol. 13, no. 11, 2024, doi: 10.15662/ijareeie.2024.1311001.

[7] G. A. Chintoh, O. D. Segun-Falade, C. S. Odionu, and A. H. Ekeh, "Legal and Ethical Challenges in AI Governance: A Conceptual Approach to Developing Ethical Compliance Models in the U.S," *Ijsser,* vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 103-109, 2024, doi: 10.54660/ijsser.2024.3.1.103-109.

[8] E. Aref, "Beyond Algorithms: A Framework for Ethical Assessment of AI Applications in Industry," 2024, doi: 10.32388/3rhk4f.

[9] A. J. Obinna and A. J. Kess-Momoh, "Comparative Technical Analysis of Legal and Ethical Frameworks in AI-enhanced Procurement Processes," *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews,* vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1415-1430, 2024, doi: 10.30574/wjarr.2024.22.1.1241.

[10] J. W. Njoroge, "Comparative Analysis of Ai Governance in Africa Relative to Global Standards and Practices," *Iosr Journal of Computer Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 19-25, 2024, doi: 10.9790/0661-2605031925.

[11] Y. J. Inomovich, "Legal Regulation of the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Corporate Governance," *Uzbek J. Law Digi. Policy,* vol. 1, no. 3, 2023, doi: 10.59022/ujldp.94.

[12] P. David, H. Choung, and J. S. Seberger, "Who Is Responsible? US Public Perceptions of AI Governance Through the Lenses of Trust and Ethics," *Public Understanding of Science,* vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 654-672, 2024, doi: 10.1177/09636625231224592.

[13] J. Krijger, "Operationalising Ethics for AI in the Financial Industry: Insights From the Volksbank Case Study," *JDB,* vol. 8, no. 3, p. 220, 2023, doi: 10.69554/yqzc2796.

[14] M. K. Pasupuleti, "Ethical AI Governance: A Global Blueprint," pp. 60-77, 2024, doi: 10.62311/nesx/97832.

[15] W. Jing-jing, W. Mao, and W. Wenjie, "The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Sociopolitical and Legal Dimensions," *Isslp,* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 27-32, 2023, doi: 10.61838/kman.isslp.2.2.6.

[16] Z. S. Zuwanda, A. F. Lubis, N. Solapari, M. S. Sakmaf, and A. Triyantoro, "Ethical and Legal Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Systems in Law Enforcement With a Study of Potential Human Rights Violations in Indonesia," *The Easta Journal Law and Human Rights,* vol. 2, no. 03, pp. 176-185, 2024, doi: 10.58812/eslhr.v2i03.283.

[17] Y. Wan, Z. Peng, F. Wu, J. Gao, and M. Li, "Understanding Public Concerned Ethic Issues and Ethical Acceptance of AI Surveillance Technology: Analysis From Social Media Data," 2024, doi: 10.3233/faia231257.

[18] R. P. Adhikary, "Ethical and Philosophical Parallels of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Hindu Mythology the Mahabharat," *Mong. J. Arts. Cult.*, vol. 25, no. 49, pp. 112-120, 2024, doi: 10.69561/mjac.v25i49.3834.

[19] V. K. Manda, V. Christy, and M. R. Jitta, "Ethical AI and Decision-Making in Management Leadership," pp. 197-226, 2024, doi: 10.4018/979-8-3693-4147-6.ch009.

[20] T. M. Kolade, "Artificial Intelligence and Global Security: Strengthening International Cooperation and Diplomatic Relations," *Archives of Current Research International*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 23-47, 2024, doi: 10.9734/acri/2024/v24i11945.

[21] M. H. Hadi and A. A. Jasim, "Legislative and Ethical Foundations for Future Artificial Intelligence," *Journal of the College of Basic Education*, vol. 30, no. 126, pp. 127-145, 2024, doi: 10.35950/cbej.v30i126.12231.

[22] Y. T. Naili, E. L. Simanjuntak, and A. Kostruba, "The Role of AI in Health Research: A Policy Review of Higher Education Foundations," *J. Adv. H. Inf. Res.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 102-108, 2024, doi: 10.59247/jahir.v2i2.295.