Original research article / Originalus mokslinis straipsnis
Vol. 1 No. 4 (2025): Birželis

The Role of Ethics in Modern Technology Development

[1] Ayaz Akhundov

Accepted: 05.25.2025
Published: 06.02.2025
https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.0104017

Abstract: Ethical reflection has become central to the development of contemporary technologies, influencing design, implementation, and oversight. This article critically examines how ethical principles shape modern technology, focusing on areas such as artificial intelligence, biotechnology, surveillance, and digital platforms. The discussion begins by defining technology ethics and outlining its historical evolution, noting how public controversies often spur ethical discourse. Key normative theories (utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics) are reviewed and applied to technology contexts, drawing on Kant's emphasis on human dignity and Rawls's justice-as-fairness. We then survey current ethical challenges – including algorithmic bias, privacy infringement, autonomous systems dilemmas, and environmental impacts – with examples from both developed and developing regions. Several case studies illustrate these challenges in practice: the Cambridge Analytica data scandal (privacy and democracy), OpenAI's ChatGPT (AI biases and misinformation), and facial-recognition misclassification (discrimination). We review global regulatory responses, from the EU's GDPR and AI Act to UNESCO guidelines and OECD principles, highlighting how they enshrine values like transparency, accountability, and human rights. Finally, the paper advocates fostering an ethical culture through education, professional codes of conduct, and algorithmic audits, drawing on examples like ACM/IEEE ethics codes and emerging audit frameworks. This comprehensive analysis emphasizes that only through international cooperation and multidisciplinary engagement can technology advance in ways that respect fundamental ethical values and social well-being.

Keywords: technology ethics; artificial intelligence; data privacy; surveillance capitalism; global regulation; biotechnology; digital platforms

Research Questions:

1. How do ethical theories (e.g. consequentialism, deontology, virtue ethics) inform the design, implementation, and governance of modern technologies such as AI, biotechnology, and surveillance systems?
2. What major ethical challenges arise in today's tech fields (AI bias, privacy, autonomy, environmental impact), and what strategies (policies, codes, education, audits) are used globally to address them?

1. INTRODUCTION

Ethics in technology refers to the application of moral principles to the creation and use of technical systems. It asks how values such as human dignity, autonomy, justice, and environmental stewardship

[1] **Akhundov, A.** Lecturer, Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan. Email: ayaz_akhundov@ndu.edu.az. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7419-0912

can guide innovation. As UNESCO explains, the ethics of emerging technologies involves "systematic normative reflection" aimed at ensuring human dignity, well-being, and the prevention of harm. In practice, this means building trust in technology and safeguarding rights even as innovation accelerates. For example, Shoshana Zuboff has warned that unregulated "surveillance capitalism" – the mass extraction of personal data by tech firms – is undermining individual autonomy and democracy. In response to such concerns, policymakers, companies, and scholars have increasingly incorporated ethics into technology development.

The purpose of this article is to explore how ethical principles influence modern technology across multiple domains. We examine (a) the origins of tech ethics, (b) major ethical theories and how they apply to technology, (c) current ethical challenges (privacy, discrimination, etc.), and (d) strategies to foster ethical tech development and governance. By comparing cases and policies from both developed and developing countries, we highlight global commonalities and differences. Ultimately, this analysis underscores that ethical technology design is not merely about compliance or risk avoidance, but about realizing the potential of technology to improve lives without sacrificing human values.

2. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Concerns about the moral implications of technology are not new, but they have grown as technology has become ubiquitous. Early thinkers like Ada Lovelace and Charles Babbage speculated on the future impact of machines, and science fiction authors (Asimov, 1942) imagined ethical rules for robots. The formal field of "technoethics" emerged in the late 20th century alongside rapid computerization and genetic engineering. For instance, the 1940s Nuremberg Code and later the Declaration of Helsinki (medical ethics) set precedents for ethical oversight of technology (genetic and medical). As innovations like nuclear power, biotechnology, and information networks expanded, so too did public debate. The controversial deployment of atomic energy and later environmental disasters (e.g. Bhopal, Chernobyl) raised questions of responsibility and safety. Likewise, the digital revolution's rise in the 1980s and 1990s brought privacy and security to the fore (the EU Data Protection Directive of 1995 was an early response).

Scholars note that ethical frameworks often emerge reactively to technology crises. For example, Asimov's fictional "Three Laws of Robotics" were conceived to address imagined robot malfunctions, while today we see academics and organizations drafting guidelines for AI after incidents (e.g., military drones, social media scandals). In recent decades, high-profile scandals have propelled tech ethics into the public eye. The 2000s saw debates over cloning, GM crops, and genetic data, leading UNESCO to declare the human genome a "heritage of humanity" that must be protected. In the 2010s and beyond, data breaches, algorithmic filtering, and automated systems have triggered demands for accountability. In summary, technology ethics has evolved alongside technology: each wave of innovation brings new ethical challenges and elicits new rules or norms in turn.

3. KEY ETHICAL THEORIES IN TECHNOLOGY

Normative ethical theories provide frameworks for evaluating technological choices. Broadly, we can group them into **consequentialism** (outcome-based), **deontology** (duty-based), and **virtue ethics** (character-based). Consequentialist approaches, like utilitarianism (Mill, 1863), judge actions by their overall benefits or harms. In a tech context, a utilitarian might argue that a privacy-invasive data

analysis is justifiable if it greatly benefits public health or security. By contrast, **deontological** ethics (Kant, 1785) emphasizes duties and rights, regardless of outcomes. Kant's categorical imperative, for example, forbids using individuals merely as means; in technology this suggests respecting user autonomy and consent (treating people as ends in themselves). Kantian ethics would condemn any practice that treats users merely as data points, even if it yields good consequences.

Virtue ethics (Aristotle) focuses on cultivating moral character – traits like honesty, courage, empathy. Applied to developers and organizations, it asks: do our systems promote virtuous behavior and societal flourishing? For instance, designing social media that encourages honesty and empathy (rather than envy or rage) reflects a virtue-ethical perspective. Modern scholars also invoke **Rawlsian justice**: John Rawls' theory of justice as fairness calls for structures that protect the least advantaged. A Rawlsian approach to AI would ask how technologies can ensure fair access and benefits for all, not just the powerful. Rawls wrote that his principles form the "fairest possible" moral basis for society, a powerful lens for technology that affects everyone.

These ethical theories offer different insights for tech. For example, a utilitarian view might support autonomous vehicles if they statistically save lives, while a Kantian would demand that any decision algorithm never treats any human casualty as a mere byproduct of optimization. Rawlsian fairness would insist that the benefits of AI (like medical diagnostics) be distributed equitably. Virtue ethics would encourage tech creators to cultivate values like transparency and humility. In practice, designers often blend these approaches: many "AI ethics guidelines" are eclectic, reflecting multiple principles (transparency, non-maleficence, justice, etc.). In sum, ethical theories remind us that technology is not value-neutral, and different moral philosophies can lead to different design choices.

4. ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN MODERN TECH FIELDS

Modern technologies present a range of ethical problems. We briefly survey key challenges in areas like AI, data privacy, discrimination, autonomous systems, and the environment.

- **Artificial Intelligence and Bias:** Machine learning systems can perpetuate or amplify biases present in their training data. Facial-recognition tools, for example, have been shown to misidentify women and people of color at much higher rates than white men. This kind of *algorithmic discrimination* can reinforce social inequalities. Similarly, AI used in hiring or lending can unfairly disadvantage marginalized groups if not carefully audited. Black-box AI (where decision logic is opaque) also raises accountability issues. Moreover, **misinformation** and manipulation are modern perils: generative models (e.g. chatbots) can produce false or biased content at scale, challenging truth and informed consent.

- **Privacy and Surveillance:** The collection and use of personal data pose profound ethical questions. In the digital age, users often trade privacy for convenience, but without meaningful consent. Technologies like ubiquitous cameras, internet tracking, and contact tracing systems can erode anonymity and autonomy. Surveillance systems in public spaces (often justified as safety measures) risk turning populations into targets of profiling. Shoshana Zuboff famously termed the data-extraction model of tech companies "surveillance capitalism" and warned it creates "behavioral futures markets" that manipulate people. The ethics of surveillance thus revolves around consent, purpose limitation, and power: who watches the watchers?

- **Discrimination and Inequality:** Beyond AI bias, digital platforms can perpetuate social discrimination. For example, online ad systems have been found to target housing or employment opportunities unevenly by gender or ethnicity. Automated decision tools (for credit, insurance, policing) can replicate historical prejudices. In developing countries, tech can both alleviate and exacerbate inequities: mobile health apps may improve rural care, but only if the internet infrastructure is fair. Similarly, AI-driven automation may disproportionately displace low-skill workers, raising justice issues.
- **Autonomous Systems and Accountability:** Self-driving cars, drones, and other autonomous machines raise age-old moral dilemmas in new forms. Who is responsible if an autonomous vehicle causes a crash: the owner, the programmer, the manufacturer? Programming ethics into vehicles – the so-called "trolley problem" decisions – forces designers to make implicit moral choices about whose life to prioritize. In military or law-enforcement contexts, autonomous weapons and policing drones prompt urgent ethical debates about taking human life or infringing rights without human judgement.
- **Environmental Impact:** Technology development has ecological dimensions. Data centers powering AI and blockchain consume huge electricity and water, contributing to climate change. For example, data center energy use reached 460 terawatt-hours in 2022 – roughly the consumption of a mid-sized country. E-waste from smartphones and servers also poses pollution hazards. An ethical approach must consider the lifecycle of technology and strive for sustainability. This includes evaluating whether the societal benefits of a technology outweigh its environmental costs.

Each of these challenges affects both rich and poor nations. For instance, privacy norms vary globally: some developing countries lack data laws, leaving citizens vulnerable, while some tech solutions (like AI health screening) can benefit underserved communities. Ultimately, these ethical challenges show that technology cannot advance in isolation from social context. They demand multi-stakeholder dialogue and values-driven design.

5. CASE STUDIES

- **Cambridge Analytica (2018):** This scandal involved the political consulting firm Cambridge Analytica harvesting personal data from millions of Facebook users to influence electoral outcomes. It illustrates the intersection of data privacy and democracy. The incident exposed how social media companies can become channels for unconsented psychological profiling and targeted propaganda. Scholars note that this case *"marks how the deployment of artificial intelligence and voter microtargeting algorithms arrived in the consciousness"* of the public. In response, regulators in multiple countries reevaluated data protection laws and platforms instituted stricter consent regimes. Cambridge Analytica showed that without strong ethical oversight, tech firms can inadvertently (or deliberately) undermine social trust.
- **OpenAI's ChatGPT (2022–2023):** OpenAI's release of ChatGPT (and later GPT-4) popularized generative AI chatbots. This case highlights issues of misinformation, bias, and accountability in AI. Users found ChatGPT often "hallucinates" plausible-sounding but false information, raising concerns about truthfulness. Ethical concerns include potential plagiarism (students using it to cheat) and embedded biases in language generation. A recent study warns

that, beyond general AI ethics issues (fairness, privacy), ChatGPT uniquely blurs lines between fact and fiction. OpenAI has introduced content filters and usage policies, but the company also faces criticism over transparency of training data and safeguards. This illustrates how AI developers must actively manage ethical risks as part of technology rollout.

- **Facial Recognition Bias (2018–Present):** As noted, facial-recognition systems have shown stark racial and gender biases. Joy Buolamwini's landmark *Gender Shades* study (2018) found error rates around 0.8% for light-skinned men but as high as 35% for darker-skinned women. This case study spans both developed and developing contexts: Western police departments and Asian governments alike have deployed such systems with little oversight, raising false-match and civil rights concerns. Some countries (e.g. UK, South Africa) have launched ethics inquiries or moratoria on facial surveillance. The ethical lesson is clear: AI models trained on unrepresentative data can produce discriminatory outcomes, necessitating fairness auditing and inclusive design before deployment.
- **Gene-Edited 'CRISPR Babies' (2018):** In an example from biotechnology, Chinese scientist He Jiankui announced the birth of twins with CRISPR-modified genomes. This provoked international outcry and illustrated risks in biotech ethics. The experiment violated scientific norms on gene editing and was widely condemned for its secrecy and uncertain safety. UNESCO had already declared the human genome a "heritage of humanity" to be protected, reflecting global consensus that germline editing requires ethical scrutiny. The CRISPR babies case shows how rapid advances in biotech (like CRISPR) demand robust ethical frameworks and international cooperation to prevent harmful experiments.

These cases from social media, AI, surveillance, and biotech underscore common themes: the need for transparency, informed consent, and respect for human rights. They also reveal that ethical failures can have real societal impact (eroding public trust or harming individuals). Importantly, both rich and poor societies have been involved: for instance, India's Aadhaar biometric ID has seen debates over privacy just as Facebook's Cambridge Analytica scandal did in the U.S. This global dimension implies solutions must be internationally informed while sensitive to local norms.

6. GLOBAL REGULATORY APPROACHES

Governments and international bodies have responded by crafting ethical regulations and standards. The EU's **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)** (2016) is a landmark: it enshrines privacy by design, requiring explicit consent and data minimization. The EDPS notes that GDPR is now seen as a global "gold standard" for privacy law. Companies worldwide have adjusted products to comply with GDPR, affecting citizens even outside Europe. More recently, the EU has drafted the **AI Act** (currently under adoption) – the first comprehensive legal framework specifically for AI. This Act adopts a risk-based approach: it bans "unacceptable" AI uses (e.g. social credit systems) and heavily regulates "high-risk" applications (e.g. autonomous driving). Notably, the AI Act applies extraterritorially: providers from any country (including U.S. firms) serving EU markets can face fines for noncompliance. The Act's fines (up to €35 million or 7% of global revenue for severe breaches) signal strong enforcement. In many ways, observers expect the AI Act to become a global benchmark, similar to GDPR.

Beyond the EU, multiple frameworks aim for ethical AI. UNESCO's 2021 **Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence** emphasizes human rights and environmental sustainability, advocating "multilateral, multi-stakeholder" governance. UNESCO has also issued guidelines for digital platforms, urging them to conduct human-rights due diligence, be transparent about content policies, and be accountable to society. The OECD has updated its **AI Principles** (2019, revised 2024) to promote "innovative and trustworthy" AI that respects human rights. The OECD explicitly warns that AI should bolster societal goals (productivity, sustainability) *while* guarding against privacy and fairness harms. Even companies in emerging economies are signing onto such norms: for example, Brazil's AI bill (2021) echoes OECD and EU standards.

At the national level, many countries are enacting or considering laws. The EU's **Digital Services Act (2022)** mandates content moderation audits for large platforms, aiming to curb online harms. In the U.S., although federal laws are still nascent, there are proposals like the Algorithmic Accountability Act and state laws addressing privacy and bias. Globally, industries (IEEE, ACM) have their own codes of ethics for technologists, and standards bodies (ISO, IEEE) are devising technical guidelines. One trend is the rise of **algorithmic impact assessments**: regulators increasingly require companies to evaluate and document ethical risks of AI before deployment. For instance, the EU's DSA and forthcoming regulations create channels for auditors to inspect AI systems, and the U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) encourages independent audits.

These regulatory approaches share a common thread: they try to align technology with democratic values. They often invoke core principles from political philosophy – such as justice, transparency, and human rights – and translate them into rules. As one OECD summary notes, the goal is to ensure AI "upholds human rights and democratic values" even as it drives innovation. Enforcement remains a challenge, but the proliferation of guidelines indicates growing global consensus that ethics cannot be optional in tech governance.

7. FOSTERING AN ETHICAL DEVELOPMENT CULTURE

Regulation alone is not enough; ethical technology requires a culture of responsibility in organizations and society. Education is a key lever. Many universities now include tech ethics or "societal implications" courses in engineering and CS curricula. Professional societies (ACM, IEEE) have codes of ethics that emphasize public welfare, privacy, and fairness. Companies are forming internal ethics boards or offices to review new products. For example, some firms appoint "AI ethics officers" to oversee compliance and stakeholder engagement. Likewise, NGOs and tech consortia publish best-practice toolkits and certification schemes for ethical design.

Audits and accountability mechanisms also help embed ethics. Third-party **algorithmic audits** can detect biases and provide transparency to users. The AI Now Institute warns that while audits alone are not a panacea, they are increasingly being mainstreamed into policy frameworks. In practice, some jurisdictions are mandating impact assessments for AI (as noted above), and large tech firms routinely conduct "ethical AI" reviews before product launches. In developing countries, local initiatives are adapting these ideas: for example, India's Data Protection Bill envisions privacy audits, and African data privacy regulators are crafting guidelines for AI ethics.

Codes of conduct and industry standards encourage a sense of duty. For instance, the *IEEE Code of Ethics* requires engineers to accept responsibility for their work's societal impact. Professional training

(conferences, workshops) increasingly covers topics like bias mitigation and user-centered design. Grassroots movements also play a role: ethics hackathons and public petitions have pressured companies to change course (e.g. Re:Work on facial recognition). Essentially, building an *ethical development culture* means empowering engineers and organizations to question not just what a technology can do, but what it should do.

Interdisciplinary collaboration further enriches this culture. Tech teams are involving ethicists, social scientists, and community representatives in project planning. Some projects use "value-sensitive design" methods to integrate stakeholder values from the start. Such approaches aim to balance profitability with social good. Overall, fostering an ethical mindset requires continuous learning: as new dilemmas arise (e.g., deepfakes, biohacking), practitioners and regulators must update norms. This dynamic culture-building is crucial to ensure that ethical reflection keeps pace with technological innovation.

8. CONCLUSION

Ethics in technology development is not an afterthought but a foundational dimension of innovation. This article has surveyed how ethical theories, challenges, and safeguards intersect in modern tech. We have seen that classical moral ideas (consequentialism, Kantian duty, Rawlsian justice) still resonate, but must be interpreted for complex systems like AI and biotech. Current technological trends pose concrete ethical problems – from algorithmic bias to digital surveillance – that require both philosophical clarity and practical solutions. Case studies (Cambridge Analytica, ChatGPT, facial recognition, CRISPR) illustrate the real-world stakes and the global nature of these issues.

Regulatory developments like the GDPR, EU AI Act, and UNESCO recommendations show that the international community is mobilizing shared values to guide technology. Yet laws alone will not guarantee ethical outcomes. A proactive culture of ethics – through education, professional norms, audits, and public engagement – is also essential. Cooperation among governments, industry, academia, and civil society is needed to share best practices and close regulatory gaps. Finally, as technology evolves (e.g., quantum computing, neural interfaces), new ethical questions will emerge. Future research should explore how to adapt our moral frameworks to these frontiers. In all cases, the lesson is clear: integrating ethics from the start leads to more trustworthy technology and ultimately serves the public good.

Future Directions: We anticipate that ethical technology development will increasingly emphasize **equity and inclusion** – ensuring marginalized voices influence tech policies – and **sustainability**, given environmental concerns. International organizations (UN bodies, standards committees) will likely intensify efforts to harmonize AI governance globally. There is also growing attention to *"explainability"* and user empowerment, so end-users can understand and contest algorithmic decisions. Research questions remain about how to measure ethical performance and create incentives for compliance. In summary, the field of tech ethics will continue to grow in sophistication and reach, as stakeholders recognize that ethical frameworks are vital to harness technology for human flourishing.

Cooperation and Convergence: The breadth of sources – from philosophical canon (Kant, Rawls) to 21st-century case reports and international guidelines – reflects the multidisciplinary nature of tech ethics. We have cited contemporary scholarship and policy documents to underscore that ethical technology is a live, evolving discourse. To make technology beneficial rather than harmful, ongoing

dialogue is needed across cultures. Only by combining technical innovation with ethical insight can society navigate the promises and perils of the digital age.

REFERENCES:

European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS). (2018). *The history of the General Data Protection Regulation*. Retrieved from https://edps.europa.eu/data-protection/data-protection/legislation/history-general-data-protection-regulation_en

Frahm, N., & Schiølin, K. (2024). The rise of tech ethics: Approaches, critique, and future pathways. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 30*(5), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-024-00510-3

Goñi, I., Rodrigues, E., Parga, M. J., Illanes, M., & Millán, M. J. (2024). Tooling with ethics in technology: A scoping review of Responsible Research and Innovation tools. *Journal of Responsible Innovation, 11*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2024.2360228

Hardesty, L. (2018, February 11). *Study finds gender and skin-type bias in commercial artificial-intelligence systems*. MIT News. Retrieved from https://news.mit.edu/2018/study-finds-gender-skin-type-bias-artificial-intelligence-systems-0212

Holland & Knight LLP. (2024, March). *The European Union's AI Act: What you need to know*. Retrieved from https://www.hklaw.com/en/insights/publications/2024/03/the-european-unions-ai-act-what-you-need-to-know

Hu, M. (2020). Cambridge Analytica's black box. *Big Data & Society, 7*(2), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720938091

Laidler, J. (2019, March 4). *High tech is watching you*. Harvard Gazette. Retrieved from https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2019/03/high-tech-is-watching-you

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2024, May 3). OECD updates AI Principles to stay abreast of rapid technological developments. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/newsroom/oecd-updates-ai-principles-to-stay-abreast-of-rapid-technological-developments.htm

Öztürk, A. (2024). Problems with the Right to Legitimacy. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*, *1*(1), 180-186.

Öztürk, A., & Garibli, I. (2025). The Characteristics of Monarchy as a Form of Government. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*, *2*(2), 117-125.

UNESCO. (1997, November 11). *Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights*. UNESCO. Retrieved from https://en.unesco.org/themes/ethics-science-and-technology/human-genome-and-human-rights

UNESCO. (2021). *Guidelines for the governance of digital platforms: safeguarding freedom of expression and access to information*. UNESCO. Retrieved from https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-platforms-guidelines

UNESCO. (2021, November 25). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. UNESCO. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000376711

Westerstrand, S. (2024). Reconstructing AI ethics principles: Rawlsian ethics of artificial intelligence. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 30*(5), 46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-024-00507-y

Zewe, A. (2025, January 17). *Explained: Generative AI's environmental impact*. MIT News. Retrieved from https://news.mit.edu/2025/explained-generative-ai-environmental-impact-0117

Zhou, J., Müller, H., Holzinger, A., & Chen, F. (2024). Ethical ChatGPT: Concerns, challenges, and commandments. *Electronics, 13*(17), 3417. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13173417