Reflective Activity 1

Reflection on the Global Governance of Generative Artificial Intelligence

Introduction

The rise of generative artificial intelligence since late 2022 has been nothing short of transformative. With the release of models such as GPT-4, PaLM, and LLaMA, AI has entered a new phase where it no longer performs narrow, rule-based tasks but generates, reasons, and interacts in ways that resemble human cognition (Brown et al., 2020; OpenAI, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023). While these models have unlocked unprecedented innovation in automation, communication, and business operations, they have also i...

This reflection examines how different nations and regions are responding to the governance of generative AI, the ethical and legal dilemmas arising from its deployment, and how computing professionals can navigate this evolving landscape responsibly. The discussion concludes with recommendations for a balanced and practical course of action that upholds innovation while protecting societal trust.

Global Fragmentation and the Challenge of Consensus

One of the central findings in Correa et al. (2023) is that global AI governance is fragmented and lacks a shared framework of values. The diversity of political systems, cultural norms, and economic priorities makes it difficult to establish a unified vision for what “responsible AI” means. For instance, the European Union is moving toward a highly structured, risk-based legal approach through the forthcoming EU AI Act, which emphasises transparency, human oversight, and post-market monitoring (Floridi an...

Although each of these models addresses local priorities, their coexistence has led to regulatory inconsistency. For global technology companies and developers, this means navigating a complex web of overlapping rules. Correa et al. argue that this lack of coherence not only creates compliance difficulties but also undermines public trust, as users cannot be confident that AI systems are governed by the same ethical principles worldwide. The need for international coordination, therefore, becomes a profe...

Ethical and Social Implications

Generative AI reshapes the relationship between humans and technology in profound ways. It can simulate conversation, produce creative work, and even make decisions that once required human judgment. However, this growing autonomy raises questions

about truth, bias, and accountability (Bender et al., 2021; Leslie, 2020).

Bias and fairness remain some of the most pressing concerns. Since large language models are trained on extensive internet data, they often reproduce the biases, stereotypes, and inequalities embedded in that content. This can result in discriminatory or misleading outputs, particularly in areas such as recruitment, finance, or marketing. Correa et al. (2023) highlight that unless these biases are addressed through deliberate design and auditing, AI will continue to amplify existing social disparities.

At a broader level, the trustworthiness of information is also at risk. Deckard (2023) warns of a growing “trust deficit” where users can no longer easily differentiate between authentic and machine-generated content. This erosion of informational trust can have wide societal implications, from the spread of misinformation to the manipulation of public opinion.

Another social dimension is the impact on labour and skills. While AI has the potential to enhance productivity and create new roles, it also threatens traditional employment structures. Tasks once performed by writers, designers, or customer-service agents are now being automated (Dwivedi et al., 2023). The challenge for both policymakers and professionals is to ensure that technological progress is matched by inclusive upskilling and fair transition strategies.

Legal and Professional Responsibilities

The governance of generative AI is not only an ethical issue but also a legal one. Around the world, regulators are grappling with questions related to data protection, intellectual property, and liability. Generative models often learn from vast datasets that include copyrighted materials or personal information, raising privacy and ownership concerns (Rai et al., 2023). Under laws such as the GDPR, these practices could be interpreted as breaches of consent and data-minimisation principles. At the same ...

Deckard (2023) introduces the idea of an algorithmic fiduciary duty, proposing that AI developers and deployers should bear a duty of care similar to professionals in law or medicine. This would mean that computing practitioners must actively prevent harm, ensure fairness, and remain transparent about system limitations. In practice, this could involve conducting bias audits, maintaining documentation of model behaviour, and disclosing the potential risks associated with generative outputs.

Professional organisations such as the ACM and IEEE already embed these principles within their codes of ethics. However, generative AI magnifies the need for them to be more specific and enforceable. For computing professionals, technical competence alone is no longer sufficient—ethical literacy and social awareness are now essential components of responsible practice (Leslie, 2020).

Comparative Analysis of National Strategies

Different countries' responses to generative AI illustrate both the opportunities and tensions in balancing innovation with regulation.

- Europe has prioritised compliance and accountability through comprehensive legislation. Its approach sets a strong ethical foundation but risks slowing innovation due to administrative burden (Floridi and Cowls, 2022).
- The United States champions flexibility and market-driven progress, fostering rapid development but relying heavily on corporate goodwill rather than binding responsibility (Deckard, 2023).
- Asian and Middle Eastern countries, including Singapore and the UAE, are experimenting with hybrid frameworks, combining investment in AI ecosystems with principle-based ethical guidelines inspired by global standards such as the OECD framework (Correa et al., 2023).

Together, these models suggest that no single governance structure can universally apply. Yet, Correa et al. argue that shared meta-principles—transparency, fairness, and human accountability—can create a foundation for interoperability between national systems. The goal is not identical regulation but mutual alignment, ensuring that AI systems developed in one jurisdiction can operate ethically in another.

A Balanced Course of Action

A suitable course of action for the future of generative AI governance should integrate three complementary dimensions:

1. Global Principles of Responsibility:
International cooperation through bodies like UNESCO, the OECD, or ISO should establish baseline standards for AI transparency, safety, and human oversight. These principles can act as global reference points that nations adapt according to their social contexts (Floridi and Cowls, 2022).

2. Organisational Governance Frameworks:
Companies adopting generative AI must embed ethical oversight directly into business processes. Mechanisms such as explainability tools, bias detection systems, and human-in-the-loop protocols can ensure that AI applications remain reliable and accountable (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

3. Professional Education and Awareness:
Ethical understanding should become a formal element of computing education and professional certification. Engineers and data scientists need the skills to evaluate not only performance metrics but also the moral and social implications of their systems (Leslie, 2020).

Such an approach balances the innovation imperative with the precautionary principle, ensuring that technological growth is sustainable and aligned with human values.

Impact on Legal, Social, and Professional Domains

Implementing these measures would generate tangible benefits across several dimensions. Legally, consistent documentation and ethical auditing would help organisations demonstrate compliance and reduce liability. Socially, transparent systems would strengthen public confidence and counteract misinformation. Professionally, developers would evolve into responsible stewards of technology, maintaining integrity as a measure of technical excellence (Rai et al., 2023).

Importantly, responsible governance can also serve as a competitive advantage. In industries such as e-commerce, healthcare, and finance, trust and accountability are becoming as valuable as innovation itself. Firms that demonstrate ethical credibility may find greater customer loyalty and easier regulatory acceptance (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

Conclusion

The rapid growth of generative AI represents both extraordinary potential and profound responsibility. As Correa et al. (2023) highlight, defining the shared values that should guide this technology is one of the most urgent global tasks. Deckard (2023) reminds us that ethical intentions are insufficient unless backed by professional accountability and enforceable duty. For computing practitioners, this new landscape requires rethinking the role of technology not only as a tool for efficiency but as a fo...

A balanced path forward lies in integrating universal ethical standards with local regulation, corporate governance, and professional integrity. Generative AI will continue to redefine how humans work, create, and communicate—but its true success will depend on whether it remains aligned with the values of fairness, transparency, and respect that underpin both technology and humanity itself.

References

- Bender, E., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A. and Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? Proceedings of FAccT ’21. ACM.
- Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., et al. (2020). Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. NeurIPS.
- Correa, C., et al. (2023). Global AI Governance and the Challenge of Normative Consensus. Journal of AI Policy and Ethics.

- Deckard, T. (2023). The Fiduciary Turn in Generative AI Ethics. AI & Society, 38(4), pp. 1021–1034.
- Dwivedi, Y.K., et al. (2023). Generative AI for Business: Opportunities, Risks, and Policy Implications. International Journal of Information Management.
- Floridi, L. and Cowls, J. (2022). A Unified Framework for AI Governance. AI & Society.
- Leslie, D. (2020). Understanding Artificial Intelligence Ethics and Safety. London: Alan Turing Institute.
- OpenAI (2023). GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv preprint.
- Rai, A., Constantinides, P., & Sarker, S. (2023). Responsible AI for Digital Business. MIS Quarterly.
- Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., et al. (2023). LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. arXiv preprint.