

Opinion Article

Towards a New Paradigm of Engineering Ethics in Artificial Intelligence

Viktor Chmyr^{1,*} ¹ Bohdan Khmelnytskyi National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine, Ukraine* Correspondence: chmyrvm@ukr.net<https://doi.org/10.59652/jcpas.v3i3.688>

Abstract: The article aims to explore how the rapid advancement of AI technologies necessitates a fundamental rethinking of engineering ethics. The central objective is to identify the ethical, professional, and global challenges posed by AI and to propose a conceptual framework that integrates moral responsibility into every stage of technological development. The methodology employed is primarily theoretical and analytical, drawing on existing literature in engineering ethics, philosophy of technology, and AI governance. Through a critical review of professional codes of conduct, corporate practices, and international policy frameworks, the article synthesizes diverse perspectives to articulate a comprehensive model for ethical engineering in the context of AI. The analysis also draws on comparative case examples from global engineering associations and technology firms to highlight emerging trends and gaps in current ethical governance. The main outcomes of the study include a set of recommendations for revising professional ethical codes, embedding ethics within corporate structures, and fostering cross-border cooperation to ensure consistent ethical standards worldwide. Ultimately, the article concludes that a paradigm shift – toward anticipatory, inclusive, and globally responsive ethics – is essential for sustaining trust, accountability, and justice in the age of artificial intelligence.

Keywords: engineering ethics; ethical model, challenges; service to humanity; competence

1. Introduction

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) across industries has profoundly transformed the landscape of contemporary engineering (Bahadori-Jahromi et al., 2025). Once primarily concerned with the design of predictable mechanical systems and the optimization of physical infrastructures, engineering today increasingly encompasses the creation and governance of autonomous, adaptive, and data-driven technologies (Bansal, 2024). These systems, from self-learning algorithms and autonomous vehicles to predictive analytics in healthcare and finance, are redefining the boundaries of technical expertise and ethical responsibility. As AI permeates every domain of production and decision-making, engineers are no longer merely builders of tools but architects of socio-technical systems that mediate human experience, distribute agency, and shape social realities. This unprecedented expansion of engineering's scope introduces ethical questions of a qualitatively new kind – questions that traditional frameworks, rooted in static notions of safety, reliability, and human welfare, are ill-equipped to answer.

Historically, engineering ethics has been grounded in the principles of professional duty and public welfare (Palazzo et al., 2025). Foundational codes, such as those of the IEEE or the NSPE, emphasize the engineer's responsibility to ensure safety, prevent harm, and protect the environment. These principles emerged in the context of tangible, material systems – bridges, machines, power plants – whose risks could be quantified, managed, and regulated through empirical evaluation and technical oversight. In contrast, the ethical challenges posed by AI are fundamentally different in nature. AI operates within dynamic, data-intensive environments where outcomes are often emergent, probabilistic, and opaque even to their creators (Albukhari, 2025). Machine learning systems can infer patterns from data that reflect or amplify existing social biases, while autonomous agents may act in unpredictable ways once deployed. In such contexts, traditional models of ethical responsibility – premised on human

Received: June 29, 2025

Accepted: September 28, 2025

Published: September 30, 2025

**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors.

Submitted for open access publication

under the terms and conditions of the

Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY)

license

(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

control, foreseeability, and direct causation – are increasingly inadequate.

This inadequacy is reflected in the growing tension between the speed of AI innovation and the slow adaptation of ethical and regulatory frameworks. Existing engineering ethics often presuppose a clear distinction between designers and users, or between technical and moral domains. However, AI collapses these distinctions. The boundaries between technical design decisions and ethical consequences become blurred when algorithms autonomously adjust their behavior, when data flows across social contexts, or when human decisions are influenced by algorithmic recommendations. Moreover, the “black box” nature of many AI systems undermines transparency and accountability, creating moral opacity that challenges conventional notions of responsibility. Who, then, is accountable when an algorithm discriminates, a self-driving car causes harm, or a predictive model misinforms a policy decision? These questions highlight the urgent need for a rearticulation of ethical responsibility in AI engineering.

The aim of this article is to explore how engineering ethics must evolve to remain relevant and effective in guiding the development and deployment of AI technologies. This involves not merely revising existing ethical codes, but rethinking the conceptual foundations upon which engineering ethics rests. Specifically, this study situates engineering ethics within the broader context of socio-technical systems theory, emphasizing that AI technologies are not neutral instruments but socially embedded entities that co-construct human behavior, institutional practices, and cultural values. By integrating insights from philosophy of technology, science and technology studies, and AI governance, the article seeks to outline a framework of ethical reflection that is dynamic, interdisciplinary, and responsive to the evolving challenges of AI innovation.

Central to this inquiry is the argument that a paradigm shift is necessary – from a compliance-based model of ethics to a value-driven, anticipatory, and socio-technical paradigm of responsibility. Compliance-based ethics, while indispensable in setting minimum standards and ensuring accountability, tends to emphasize adherence to rules and risk mitigation after technological deployment. Such an approach, however, proves insufficient in the AI context, where ethical risks are not fully foreseeable and where harm can arise not from deliberate wrongdoing but from the cumulative and systemic effects of design choices, data practices, and institutional priorities.

Moreover, the article argues that ethical responsibility in AI engineering must be conceived as distributed across networks of human and non-human actors, rather than located solely within individual practitioners. Engineers operate within complex socio-technical ecosystems shaped by institutional pressures, market incentives, and global power structures. Recognizing this distributed nature of responsibility requires collective forms of ethical governance to ensure that AI serves public good and aligns with democratic values. And the transformation of engineering ethics in the age of AI represents not a rejection of traditional principles but their expansion and reinterpretation in light of new technological realities.

2. Traditional Foundations of Engineering Ethics

Engineering ethics has historically functioned as both a professional framework and a moral philosophy guiding the conduct of engineers in their service to society (Mitcham, 2009). While often associated with technical codes and professional standards, the deeper philosophical roots of engineering ethics lie in the human aspiration to align technological mastery with moral responsibility. The engineer, as a figure of modernity, embodies the tension between instrumental rationality and moral agency – the capacity to transform nature through design and the obligation to ensure that such transformation serves human well-being (Lynch & Kline, 2000). Traditional engineering ethics emerged as a response to this tension, seeking to articulate the moral duties of those who shape the material conditions of human life.

In its classical form, engineering ethics is grounded in Enlightenment ideals of rationality, progress, and humanism (Vorst, 1998). It presupposes that technology can and should serve as a means to improve human existence, provided that its creators adhere to principles of integrity, competence, and responsibility. This ethical orientation developed alongside the institutionalization of engineering as a profession during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when rapid industrialization demanded not only technical expertise but also moral accountability. Yet, as a philosophical enterprise, engineering ethics also reflects broader traditions of moral thought – drawing on deontological duty, utilitarian calculation,

and virtue ethics to frame the engineer's role as both a moral agent and a public servant.

The historical development of engineering ethics mirrors the broader evolution of professional morality in modern industrial societies. In the early industrial period, the identity of the engineer was primarily technical: an expert devoted to efficiency, precision, and innovation. Ethical reflection was implicit, guided by personal conscience and craftsmanship rather than codified standards (Lynch & Kline, 2000). The moral dimension of engineering became explicit in the early twentieth century, when failures of technology made evident the societal consequences of technical error and negligence (Mitcham, 2009).

From these traditions emerged a constellation of enduring principles that have defined engineering ethics for over a century: responsibility, integrity, competence, and service to humanity. Though articulated pragmatically in professional codes, each of these principles carries deeper philosophical significance.

Responsibility stands as the cornerstone of engineering ethics (Durbin, 1997). At its core lies the recognition that technological action is never morally neutral. Every design decision embodies assumptions about values, priorities, and risks (Chance et al., 2021). In the Aristotelian sense, the engineer's *techne* is an expression of *praxis* – a form of moral activity shaped by deliberation and oriented toward the good. Responsibility thus involves both causal accountability and moral responsiveness (to the broader implications of technology for society).

Integrity, both as personal virtue and professional obligation, functions as the moral glue of engineering practice. It requires truthfulness, transparency, and consistency between one's knowledge and actions. Integrity is not merely honesty in data reporting or avoidance of fraud; it is a deeper epistemic virtue (Mitcham, 2009).

Competence fuses epistemic and ethical dimensions of professionalism (He et al., 2023). It demands not only technical proficiency but also humility in recognizing the limits of one's expertise. The ethical dimension arises from the fact that technical errors can translate directly into human suffering. Thus, competence is a moral as much as a practical requirement.

Philosophically, competence reflects both Kantian duty – to act only on the basis of adequate knowledge – and Mill's utilitarian ideal – to maximize welfare through skillful design. The NSPE and IEEE codes explicitly tie competence to continuous professional development, implying that ethical responsibility includes a commitment to lifelong learning. In a deeper sense, competence embodies the principle of epistemic responsibility: the moral obligation to ensure that the knowledge one applies in shaping the world is accurate, sufficient, and socially attuned (Doorn & Nihlén Fahlquist, 2010).

Finally, the ideal of service to humanity situates engineering within a moral horizon larger than mere technical mastery (Amadei et al., 2009). Rooted in humanistic and utilitarian ethics, this principle affirms that technology must ultimately serve human flourishing. The engineer is not a neutral technician but a participant in the moral project of civilization – one who contributes to the advancement of welfare, justice, and sustainability.

Therefore, the traditional foundations of engineering ethics – anchored in responsibility, integrity, competence, and service to humanity – represent one of the most enduring moral architectures of modern professional life. They embody the Enlightenment faith in rational progress and the moral agency of the individual expert. These principles have safeguarded the public, nurtured professional trust, and ensured that technological innovation remained tethered to humanistic values. Yet they are also products of a historical context defined by material technologies, clear causal chains, and stable professional identities.

3. Ethical Challenges Unique to Artificial Intelligence

The emergence of AI marks a decisive transformation in the ethical landscape of engineering. While traditional technologies extended human physical power, AI extends cognitive and decision-making capacities, blurring the boundaries between human and machine agency (Chance et al., 2021). This shift from mechanical to cognitive extension introduces not only new capabilities but also unprecedented moral ambiguities. AI systems do not merely execute tasks; they interpret, decide, and learn within complex environments. As such, they generate outcomes that cannot always be anticipated, controlled, or even understood by their creators.

The following analysis explores four interrelated ethical dimensions that distinguish AI from prior forms of engineering: (1) autonomy and decision-making, (2) data and bias, (3) accountability and transparency, and (4) human-machine collaboration. Together, these issues illuminate the conceptual discontinuity between classical engineering ethics and the

emerging moral challenges of AI-driven systems.

One of the most distinctive ethical features of AI is its capacity for autonomous decision-making (Durbin, 1997). Whereas traditional technologies functioned as passive instruments – executing commands within predefined parameters – AI systems exhibit varying degrees of independence. Through machine learning and adaptive algorithms, they are capable of generating novel solutions, recognizing patterns, and making operational choices without direct human intervention.

This autonomy, though functional rather than metaphysical, gives rise to a phenomenon that may be described as the delegation of moral agency. Engineers and organizations increasingly rely on AI systems to perform tasks that have moral consequences: diagnosing disease, approving financial loans, determining parole eligibility, or even identifying military targets (Rosin et al., 2022). These are not ethically neutral actions; they embody value-laden judgments about fairness, risk, and human worth. When such judgments are performed by algorithms, moral agency becomes displaced into a computational domain that lacks consciousness, empathy, or deliberative reason.

The second distinctive ethical challenge of AI lies in its dependence on data as both the substrate and the determinant of decision-making. AI systems do not acquire knowledge from first principles but from large-scale datasets that represent social reality. These datasets, however, are never neutral. They are shaped by historical inequalities, institutional biases, and human choices about what to measure, record, and value. Consequently, AI systems can inherit and amplify the very injustices they are meant to transcend.

Algorithmic bias occurs when the data or design of an AI system systematically favors certain groups or outcomes over others (Kotsis, 2025b). For example, facial recognition systems have been shown to perform less accurately on darker skin tones, and hiring algorithms have reproduced gendered and racialized stereotypes embedded in historical employment data. These biases are not mere technical flaws; they are epistemic injustices, reflecting and reinforcing asymmetries of knowledge and power (Doorn & Nihlén Fahlquist, 2010).

Traditional engineering ethics – grounded in notions of safety and reliability – struggles to conceptualize such moral harms (Smoliarov, 2024). Bias does not always produce immediate physical danger but rather long-term social inequities: the denial of fairness, opportunity, and recognition. Addressing these issues requires a form of ethical reasoning that links design decisions to their sociopolitical contexts. Engineers must develop what might be called data reflexivity – an awareness that datasets are not objective representations of the world but normative constructions that embed particular worldviews (Lynch & Kline, 2000).

AI systems also rely on continuous data extraction from human behavior, environments, and interactions (Rosin et al., 2022). This creates ethical tensions around surveillance, privacy, and autonomy. The pervasive collection of personal data – whether through smartphones, social media, or biometric sensors – enables unprecedented predictive and manipulative capacities. Users become transparent to systems that are themselves opaque, generating a profound asymmetry of visibility and power (Palmås, 2024).

This condition raises the issue of informational autonomy – the right to control how one's data is collected, used, and interpreted. The erosion of this autonomy through unconsented surveillance represents not only a legal or technical violation but a moral injury to personhood. When individuals are reduced to data profiles and predictive probabilities, their agency is reconfigured in ways they cannot perceive or contest.

Then AI concerns the difficulty of assigning responsibility and ensuring transparency in distributed systems (Chance et al., 2021). Traditional engineering ethics assumed a relatively linear chain of accountability: an identifiable designer or operator could be held responsible for technological outcomes. AI systems, however, function as complex networks of human, institutional, and algorithmic actors whose interactions produce emergent behaviors that no single participant can predict or control.

Machine learning models, particularly deep neural networks, operate as “black boxes.” They generate results through layers of computation that are not interpretable even to their developers (Buhrmester et al., 2021). This opacity undermines the principle of transparency, which is foundational to both professional ethics and democratic governance. If decisions cannot be explained, they cannot be contested or justified. The opacity of AI systems thus introduces a new form of epistemic irresponsibility – not necessarily through deceit but through inscrutability.

Beyond opacity, the distributed nature of AI development diffuses moral accountability across multiple actors – software engineers, data scientists, corporations, regulators, and end-

users. Each contributes partially to the system's behavior, yet none controls it fully (Doorn & Nihlén Fahlquist, 2010). This creates what philosophers term the problem of many hands: the difficulty of attributing moral responsibility within collective enterprises.

In AI engineering, this problem is intensified by the system's capacity for autonomous adaptation (Rosin et al., 2022). Once deployed, machine learning systems continue to modify themselves in response to new data, making it impossible to fix responsibility at the moment of design. The result is a form of moral indeterminacy in which accountability is perpetually deferred. Existing legal and ethical frameworks, which depend on identifiable agents and discrete actions, cannot easily accommodate this dynamic.

To address this, scholars have proposed a shift from liability-based ethics to responsibility-as-practice – a continuous, collective engagement with the moral implications of technological development. Rather than treating accountability as a post hoc process of blame, engineers must cultivate anticipatory responsibility: an ongoing attentiveness to how design choices, data flows, and institutional incentives shape the moral landscape of AI systems.

A final ethical dimension concerns the evolving relationship between humans and intelligent systems (Lawlor, 2021). As AI increasingly operates not as a mere tool but as a collaborative partner, the traditional distinction between operator and machine becomes porous. Engineers now design systems that learn from human behavior and, in turn, shape it.

AI also compels a rethinking of the engineer's professional identity. In the classical paradigm, the engineer was a guardian of safety and a steward of material progress. In the AI era, this identity expands to include roles as data curator, ethical mediator, and social interpreter. Engineering becomes less about constructing stable artifacts and more about managing dynamic relationships between humans, machines, and environments.

4. Towards a New Paradigm

Historically, engineering ethics has been largely reactive – activated in moments of failure, scandal, or harm (Amadei et al., 2009). Ethical inquiry often enters only after the technology has been built and deployed, functioning as a form of damage control or retrospective moral accounting. Such a posture may have sufficed when technologies were stable and their effects predictable. Yet in the case of AI, where systems continuously learn and adapt, post-hoc ethics is both insufficient and irresponsible.

A proactive model of ethics begins not at the end but at the inception of the design process (Haghighattalab et al., 2019). It treats ethical reflection as intrinsic to technological creativity, shaping the conceptual frameworks, data practices, and implementation choices from the outset. The ethical question – “what ought we to build, and for whom?” – is thus not secondary to feasibility or profitability but constitutive of engineering itself.

Proactive ethics also redefines the temporal dimension of responsibility (Rosin et al., 2022). Rather than responding to harms after they occur, engineers engage in anticipatory ethics, identifying potential consequences, value conflicts, and vulnerabilities before deployment. This shift requires cultivating an ethical imagination capable of foreseeing how technologies might interact with diverse social contexts and human values. Such imagination is not speculative indulgence but a professional competency: the ability to map the moral topography of innovation.

Embedding ethics within design cycles can be operationalized through tools such as ethical impact assessments, scenario analysis, and participatory design workshops. These practices enable engineers to visualize moral risks alongside technical specifications, making ethics an integral dimension of engineering creativity. In this sense, proactive ethics transforms the moral posture of engineering from that of a reactive regulator to that of a responsible co-creator of the future.

A second pillar of the new paradigm is socio-technical awareness concerns the recognition that AI systems are never merely technical artifacts but socially embedded systems (Haghighattalab et al., 2019). Their design, deployment, and effects are shaped by political, cultural, and economic conditions. To treat AI as an isolated technical object is to obscure its role as a participant in networks of meaning, power, and human relationship.

From a philosophical standpoint, this recognition resonates with the postphenomenological insight that technologies are mediators of human-world relations (Kleijnen, 2011). AI systems mediate not only action but perception and value – they influence how individuals interpret reality, make decisions, and understand themselves. Thus, ethical analysis must extend beyond algorithmic logic to the social imaginaries that sustain

and are sustained by technology.

To cultivate socio-technical awareness, engineers must therefore learn to see through and beyond their systems: to understand the institutional, cultural, and affective infrastructures that shape how technologies are used and interpreted (Palmås, 2024). This requires new methodological sensibilities – drawing from sociology, anthropology, and political theory – to analyze how technologies participate in broader social dynamics.

Such awareness also guards against technological reductionism, the belief that social problems can be solved by technical optimization. AI ethics, in this new paradigm, becomes a mode of critical reflection on how technological solutions reconfigure human relations and redistribute power. Engineers, in this light, must become reflective practitioners who understand that every line of code participates in the moral architecture of society.

At the core of this paradigm shift lies the concept of value-sensitive design (VSD) – a framework that integrates human values into the technical and conceptual foundations of engineering practice (Gerdes & Frandsen, 2023). Rather than viewing ethics as an external constraint, VSD posits that values such as fairness, accountability, privacy, and transparency can and must be designed into technological systems.

This approach challenges the traditional myth of engineering neutrality (Garst et al., 2022). Technologies are not morally inert; they embody specific assumptions about what is good, efficient, and desirable. As philosophers of technology such as Langdon Winner and Helen Nissenbaum have argued, artifacts have politics. Therefore, ethical responsibility begins not with regulation after the fact but with design decisions that encode or exclude certain values.

A new paradigm of engineering ethics cannot be sustained within the boundaries of a single discipline. The complexity of AI systems demands interdisciplinary collaboration (Chmyr & Bhinder, 2023). Ethical reflection must therefore bridge engineering, philosophy, social sciences, and law to create holistic frameworks capable of capturing both technical and human dimensions of AI. Interdisciplinary collaboration functions on multiple levels. It represents a shift from expert authority to collective wisdom (Palmås, 2024). The engineer, in this model, is not an isolated inventor but a participant in a moral ecology of expertise. Similarly, philosophers and social scientists move beyond critique to constructive partnership, contributing to the co-design of systems that align with human values.

This interdisciplinarity also fosters ethical resilience – the capacity to adapt moral reasoning to the evolving complexities of AI ecosystems (Lawlor, 2021). Legal scholars can clarify accountability frameworks; sociologists can analyze differential impacts; philosophers can articulate normative foundations; engineers can translate them into design logic. Together, these collaborations create what might be called ethical infrastructure – a network of shared responsibility that sustains trust and legitimacy in technological innovation.

The transformation of engineering ethics also requires a transformation of engineering education (Chmyr & Bhinder, 2023). Traditional curricula have privileged technical mastery and problem-solving efficiency, often relegating ethics to peripheral modules or compliance courses. In the age of AI, this pedagogical model is no longer adequate. Engineers must be prepared not only to build systems but to interrogate their moral significance – to ask how their designs shape human identity, justice, and meaning.

Ethical literacy denotes more than familiarity with professional codes; it is the capacity to think critically, empathically, and contextually about the moral dimensions of technology (Kotsis, 2025a). It involves cultivating intellectual virtues such as humility, courage, and imagination – the ability to navigate uncertainty and moral ambiguity.

Finally, cultivating reflective practitioners demands institutional commitment (Lawlor, 2021). Universities and professional associations must value ethical competence as highly as technical skill, embedding reflection into accreditation criteria, research funding, and organizational culture. Only then can the profession produce engineers who understand that their work is not merely instrumental but existential—shaping the moral architecture of the world we inhabit.

5. Implications for Policy and Practice

The emergence of AI as a pervasive technological force has redefined the ethical landscape of engineering practice. As AI systems increasingly influence economic structures, social interactions, and political processes, the boundaries between technical and moral responsibility have blurred. This new reality necessitates a comprehensive transformation in the ways that ethical principles are institutionalized within engineering professions, corporate

governance, and international policy frameworks. The implications for policy and practice are thus far-reaching, requiring coordinated reforms that reinforce accountability, transparency, and justice in the global AI ecosystem.

Traditional engineering ethics have long rested upon principles such as integrity, safety, and the protection of public welfare (Haghighattalab et al., 2019). However, these foundations are insufficient to address the novel ethical challenges introduced by AI. Autonomous decision-making systems, machine learning algorithms, and data-driven infrastructures create ethical ambiguities regarding accountability and transparency. When algorithms err or perpetuate bias, the line between technical malfunction and moral failure becomes difficult to discern. Consequently, engineering associations must update their professional codes of conduct to reflect the distinctive nature of AI technologies.

Revised ethical frameworks should explicitly address issues such as algorithmic fairness, data privacy, explainability, and human oversight (Lynch & Kline, 2000). Professional bodies like the IEEE and national engineering councils could require members to adhere to new standards that prioritize transparency in algorithmic design and continuous monitoring of AI systems' social impacts. Additionally, ethical education must evolve to include training in interdisciplinary reasoning, drawing on philosophy, social sciences, and law to prepare engineers for the socio-technical complexities of AI (Lofti & Laajan, 2025). Ethical reflection should be positioned not as a peripheral obligation but as an integral element of engineering competence.

Professional organizations can also establish internal ethics committees or review boards tasked with evaluating high-risk AI projects (Chmyr & Bhinder, 2023). These entities would function similarly to research ethics boards in academia, ensuring that professional engineers engage in anticipatory ethical analysis before implementing AI systems. By codifying such mechanisms, engineering institutions can bridge the gap between abstract ethical ideals and concrete professional practice.

Corporate actors occupy a central position in shaping the ethical trajectory of AI development (Adams, 2020). While many technology firms have articulated aspirational principles of "ethical AI," such commitments often remain superficial unless embedded within governance structures and operational culture. To ensure genuine ethical accountability, corporations must move beyond voluntary codes toward institutional mechanisms that make ethical deliberation a continuous and measurable process.

Embedding ethics into corporate governance requires several key strategies (Kleijnen, 2011). First, organizations should establish independent ethics boards or advisory panels with authority to review and influence decisions related to AI design, deployment, and commercialization. Second, ethical risk assessments should be integrated into every stage of the product development lifecycle – from conceptualization to post-deployment monitoring. This would allow companies to identify potential harms early and implement mitigation strategies systematically.

Equally crucial is the cultivation of an internal ethical culture that empowers engineers to voice moral concerns without fear of reprisal (Lawlor, 2021). Corporate training programs should promote moral reflexivity, encouraging employees to weigh the broader social implications of technical choices. Moreover, performance metrics and incentives should be restructured to reward ethical innovation rather than purely economic efficiency. Executive leadership must also be held accountable for ethical outcomes through transparent reporting and external audits. In this sense, ethics becomes a structural component of corporate identity rather than a rhetorical accessory.

AI's transnational scope amplifies the need for ethical coherence across borders. Algorithms trained in one cultural or legal context often operate globally, influencing populations with diverse social norms, political systems, and economic realities. Consequently, fragmented or nationally confined ethical standards risk generating uneven protections and moral inconsistencies. To address this, policymakers, international organizations, and engineering associations must work collaboratively to establish globally harmonized ethical frameworks for AI governance.

Institutions such as UNESCO, ISO, and the OECD have initiated efforts toward creating shared principles for trustworthy AI. These frameworks emphasize fairness, accountability, transparency, and respect for human rights (Adams, 2020). However, global ethics must not become synonymous with ethical homogenization. A truly effective approach must recognize and accommodate cultural diversity, enabling societies to interpret universal values through their own ethical traditions. This balance between universality and contextual sensitivity is essential to prevent ethical imperialism and to foster inclusive global governance.

Therefore, the policy and practice implications of AI-driven engineering ethics demand systemic transformation across professional, corporate, and global domains. Engineers must operate under revised ethical codes that reflect the realities of algorithmic systems; corporations must embed ethical reasoning into their organizational DNA; and global institutions must craft frameworks that balance universality with cultural plurality. The success of this paradigm shift depends on sustained collaboration among stakeholders committed to redefining the social contract of technology.

Only through such integrated reform can engineering ethics in the age of AI evolve from reactive compliance to proactive stewardship, ensuring that technological progress remains anchored in human dignity, justice, and collective responsibility.

7. Conclusions

The accelerating integration of AI into the fabric of modern society has exposed the inadequacy of traditional engineering ethics to address the profound moral, social, and epistemic challenges that these technologies generate. The transformation of engineering practice in the age of AI calls for more than an incremental adaptation of existing codes – it demands a paradigmatic shift toward a dynamic, reflexive, and human-centered ethical framework. This new paradigm must reconceptualize engineering not merely as a technical profession but as a moral enterprise situated within a complex sociotechnical ecosystem.

At its core, the emerging model of AI engineering ethics should embrace a multidimensional understanding of responsibility – one that extends beyond compliance with professional or legal norms to include anticipatory and collective accountability. Engineers, corporate leaders, and policymakers must recognize that ethical decision-making in AI cannot be delegated to abstract principles or automated systems; it requires continuous critical reflection and the courage to question technological imperatives that prioritize efficiency or profit over human well-being. Ethical deliberation should thus become an intrinsic component of innovation, embedded in every stage of technological development and institutional practice.

This reimagined ethical framework must be globally attuned, capable of responding to AI's transnational impact while respecting cultural diversity and pluralism. Achieving such coherence necessitates sustained dialogue among international professional bodies, governments, and civil society to establish shared moral commitments grounded in justice, transparency, and human dignity.

The new paradigm of engineering ethics in AI envisions an ethically informed technological future – one where innovation serves not only the progress of industry but the flourishing of humanity. By fostering integrity, responsibility, and inclusivity across professional, corporate, and global domains, engineering can reaffirm its foundational purpose: to create technologies that advance human welfare while safeguarding the moral fabric of society.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Adams, T. L. (2020). This Happens All the Time': Organizations, Rationalization and Ethical Dilemmas in Engineering. *Work, Employment and Society*, 34(6), 985-1003. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017020902968>
- Albukhari, I. N. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence (AI) in architectural design: a systematic review of emerging technologies and applications. *Journal of Umm Al-Qura University for Engineering and Architecture*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43995-025-00186-1>
- Amadei, B., Sandekian, R., & Thomas, E. (2009). A Model for Sustainable Humanitarian Engineering Projects. *Sustainability*, 1(4), 1087-1105. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su1041087>
- Bahadori-Jahromi, A., Room, S., Paknahad, C., Altekreeti, M., Tariq, Z., & Tahayori, H. (2025). The Role of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Advancing Civil Engineering: A Comprehensive Review. *Applied Sciences*, 15(19), 10499. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app151910499>
- Bansal, P. (2024) Prompt Engineering Importance and Applicability with Generative AI. *Journal of Computer and Communications*, 12, 14-23. DOI: 10.4236/jcc.2024.1210002
- Buhrmester, V., Münch, D., & Arens, M. (2021). Analysis of Explainers of Black Box Deep Neural Networks for Computer Vision: A Survey. *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction*, 3(4), 966-989. <https://doi.org/10.3390/make3040048>
- Chance, S., Lawlor, R., Direito, I., & Mitchell, J. (2021). Above and beyond: ethics and responsibility in civil engineering. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(1), 93-116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22054952.2021.1942767>
- Chmyr, V. & Bhinder, N. (2023). AI in the Higher Military Institutions: Challenges and Perspectives for Military Engineering Training. *Rupkatha Journal*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v15n4.11>

- Doorn, N., & Nihlén Fahlquist, J. (2010). Responsibility in Engineering: Toward a New Role for Engineering Ethicists. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 30(3), 222-230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467610372112>
- Durbin, P. T. (1997). Engineering Ethics and Social Responsibility: Reflections on Recent Development in the Usa. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 17(2-3), 77-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027046769701700209>
- Garst, J., Blok, V., Jansen, L., & Omta, O. S. W. F. (2022). From Value Sensitive Design to values absorption – building an instrument to analyze organizational capabilities for value-sensitive innovation. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 9(2), 196–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2022.2069994>
- Gerdes, A., & Frandsen, T. F. (2023). A systematic review of almost three decades of value sensitive design (VSD): what happened to the technical investigations? *Ethics and Information Technology*, 25(2), Article 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-023-09700-2>
- Haghighattalab, S., Chen, A., Fan, Y., & Mohammadi, R. (2019). Engineering ethics within accident analysis models. *Accident; analysis and prevention*, 129, 119–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2019.05.013>
- He, W., Cao, J., & Zhao, J. (2023). Exploration and Practice of Teaching “Engineering Ethic” for Professional Degree Graduate Students Under the Background of “New Engineering”. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 10(10), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.1010.15600>
- Kleijnen, J. (2011). Ethical issues in engineering models: an operations researcher's reflections. *Science and engineering ethics*, 17(3), 539–552. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-010-9215-5>
- Kotsis, K. T. (2025a). ChatGPT and DeepSeek Evaluate One Another for Science Education. *EIKI Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.59652/jetm.v3i1.439>
- Kotsis, K. T. (2025b). Legality of Employing Artificial Intelligence for Writing Academic Papers in Education. *Journal of Contemporary Philosophical and Anthropological Studies*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.59652/jcpas.v3i1.375>
- Lawlor, R. (2021). Teaching engineering ethics: a dissenting voice. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(1), 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22054952.2021.1925404>
- Lofti, F. Z., & Laajan, Y. (2025). When AI enters Moroccan primary schools: what uses, challenges, and prospects for tomorrow's education?. *EIKI Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.59652/jetm.v3i1.476>
- Lynch, W. T., & Kline, R. (2000). Engineering Practice and Engineering Ethics. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 25(2), 195-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224390002500203>
- Lynch, W. T., & Kline, R. (2000). Engineering Practice and Engineering Ethics. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 25(2), 195-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224390002500203>
- Mitcham, C. (2009). A historico-ethical perspective on engineering education: from use and convenience to policy engagement. *Engineering Studies*, 1(1), 35–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19378620902725166>
- Palazzo, S., Palazzo, F., & Zambetta, G. (2025). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Advanced Engineering: Current Trends and Future Prospects. *Journal of Intelligent Communication*, 4(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.54963/jic.v4i1.959>
- Palmãs, K. (2024). Engineering Judgment and Education: An Arendtian Account. *Engineering Studies*, 16(3), 184–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2024.2333239>
- Rosin, F., Forget, P., Lamouri, S., & Pellerin, R. (2022). Enhancing the Decision-Making Process through Industry 4.0 Technologies. *Sustainability*, 14(1), 461. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010461>
- Smoliarov, V. (2024). Enhancing the efficiency of management of transport enterprises: modern trends and challenges. *Journal of Economics, Innovative Management and Entrepreneurship*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.59652/jeime.v2i3.305>
- Vorst, R. V. D. (1998). Engineering, Ethics and Professionalism. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 23(2), 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043799808923496>