VOL. 10 NO. 6,
NOVEMBER, 2025
E-ISSN 3027-1401
P-ISSN 3026-9148

African Scholar Publications & Research International
www.africanscholarpub.com

Journal of Arts and Sociological Research (JASR)

Combating the Impact of Gender-Based Violence with Algorithms: Successes and Challenges Across Sectors and Regions

***Rufus, Anthony PhD; & **Nikade Anderson Akpoabowei PhD**

*Department of Political Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State. **Department of Mass Communication, Niger Delta University

Corresponding Author: rufusanthony50@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70382/ajasr.v10i6.071

Abstract

The pervasive integration of algorithms in decision-making processes across diverse sectors has brought about profound implications for gender equality. This paper investigates the gendered impacts of algorithmic systems, with a focus on healthcare, hiring practices, education, social media, and efforts at combating gender-based violence. Employing a multidisciplinary approach grounded in feminist theory and ethical AI principles, the study examines how biases embedded in algorithmic design and data exacerbates existing global health disparities, perpetuate gender stereotypes, and widen socioeconomic inequalities. A comparative analysis of algorithmic applications across the Global North and Global South underscores regional disparities in outcomes, highlighting the influence of cultural norms and systemic inequities. Case studies from various regions revealed the successes and challenges of deploying algorithms in addressing gender-based violence and inequities in education, employment, and healthcare. The findings emphasized the need for inclusive data practices, diversified development teams, and robust policy interventions to mitigate algorithmic bias. Through providing actionable recommendations for developers, policymakers, and researchers, this study contributes to the discourse on responsible AI and underscores the urgency of promoting equity in algorithmic design and governance.

Keywords: Gender Bias, Algorithms, Global Disparities, Healthcare Systems, Social Media, Education, Violence Prevention

Introduction

Background to the Study

The rapid proliferation of algorithmic systems in recent years has redefined decision-making processes across various sectors. Algorithms which pose as the building blocks of artificial intelligence (AI), are designed to process data, identify patterns, and make predictions or decisions based on coded instructions. These systems are employed in fields ranging from healthcare diagnostics and employment recruitment to social media personalization and educational tools. While algorithms promise efficiency, scalability and objectivity, mounting evidence indicates that they can inadvertently perpetuate and amplify existing societal biases mostly concerning gender (West, Kraut, and Chew 2019).

Gender bias in algorithms is often a reflection of historical and systemic inequalities embedded in the data they are trained on or the design choices of their developers. For example, healthcare algorithms have been criticized for underdiagnosing heart attacks in women, a disparity rooted in the underrepresentation of women in medical research (Obermeyer et al. 2019). Similarly, hiring algorithms have been shown to favor male candidates, reinforcing gender disparities in the workforce (Binns et al. 2018). The implications of these biases are profound, as they not only perpetuate inequalities but also undermine trust in AI technologies.

Significance of the Topic

The significance of addressing gendered impacts in algorithms cannot be overstated. Gender bias in algorithmic systems poses a threat to achieving equitable outcomes in critical areas such as healthcare, education, and employment. The consequences are very severe in the Global South where structural inequalities are already deeply entrenched. For instance, studies show that automated decision-making systems used in welfare distribution in developing countries disproportionately disadvantage women, exacerbating economic vulnerabilities (Eubanks 2018). Also algorithmic bias has broader societal implications, including the reinforcement of harmful gender stereotypes. Social media algorithms, for instance, have been found to amplify gendered content, often perpetuating toxic narratives about gender roles and expectations (Noble 2018). These biases are not merely technological flaws but are deeply rooted in cultural and institutional contexts, hence necessitating a multidisciplinary approach to their mitigation.

Objectives and Research Questions

This paper aims to examine the gendered impacts of algorithms across various sectors and regions, focusing on uncovering the underlying causes of bias and proposing actionable strategies for redress.

The specific objectives are:

i. To analyze how algorithms perpetuate gender disparities in healthcare, employment, education, and other critical sectors.
ii. To examine regional variations in the manifestation and impacts of algorithmic gender bias.
iii. To investigate how data quality, design processes, and development

practices contribute to algorithmic bias.

Guided by these objectives, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

i. How do algorithms contribute to gender disparities across different sectors?
ii. What regional differences exist in the manifestation and impact of algorithmic gender bias?
iii. What specific factors contribute to the development and perpetuation of gender bias within algorithmic systems?

Gender and Algorithmic Bias

In today's data-driven world, algorithms underpin decision-making across healthcare, finance, education and employment. Yet as these systems increasingly shape social outcomes, their vulnerability to bias particularly gender bias has generated deep concern. Algorithmic bias refers to systematic and repeatable errors that produce unfair results, often privileging some groups while disadvantaging others. Such bias may stem from skewed training data, limited diversity in design teams, or the unintended consequences of implementation. According to the Greenlining Institute (2021), algorithmic bias occurs when computational systems yield outcomes that disproportionately disadvantage individuals based on gender identity or expression. For instance, facial-recognition systems have shown markedly higher error rates for women, especially women of color, due to their underrepresentation in training datasets (Obermeyer et al., 2019).

Gender bias in algorithms typically emerges from three interrelated sources. First biased training data replicate historical inequalities recruitment tools trained on male-dominated datasets, for example has often undervalue women's qualifications, as seen in Amazon's AI hiring system (Women's World Banking, 2021). Then second is homogeneity within design and development teams reinforces blind spots: when developers lack gender and cultural diversity, algorithms mirror the creators' limited worldviews (Zhao et al., 2017). Third, contextual misinterpretation allows technical systems to oversimplify complex social realities; in healthcare, some diagnostic tools fail to capture gender-specific symptoms, leading to misdiagnoses or unequal treatment (Obermeyer et al., 2019).

The implications of these gendered algorithmic biases are profound. In employment, biased recruitment platforms can entrench workplace inequalities and reduce women's access to leadership positions (Kubiak et al., 2023). In healthcare, skewed diagnostic algorithms often under-diagnose conditions such as heart disease in women. Within financial services, algorithms that emphasize credit history without accounting for systemic discrimination restrict women's access to loans, perpetuating economic marginalization (Women's World Banking, 2021). In education adaptive learning systems may reinforce gender stereotypes, particularly in STEM, by distributing fewer resources to female students based on past performance trends (Zhao et al., 2017).

Mitigating these biases requires a deliberate, multi-layered response. Diverse and representative data collection is essential to capture the full range of gender identities and

experiences (Greenlining Institute, 2021). Inclusive design processes built around mixed-gender, cross-disciplinary teams can help identify blind spots and embed fairness at the developmental stage (Zhao et al., 2017). Regular algorithmic audits and transparent reporting enable external review and correction of biased systems (Women's World Banking, 2021). At the policy level governments must implement regulatory standards that mandate accountability, equity and transparency in AI design (Greenlining Institute, 2021). Public education and advocacy are crucial to building awareness and fostering a culture of ethical, gender-sensitive innovation.

Theoretical Framework

This study draws on Feminist Theory and Ethical AI principles to examine how algorithms reproduce and reinforce gender inequalities. These frameworks offer both a critical and ethical foundation for understanding the systemic nature of algorithmic bias and for developing inclusive approaches to artificial intelligence.

Feminist Theory provides the critical lens through which gendered power relations in algorithmic systems are analyzed. Rooted in subjectivist epistemology, feminist theory emphasizes lived experience and the need to challenge structures of domination that perpetuate inequality (Egbert & Sanden, 2020). As hooks (2000) asserts, feminism seeks to end sexism, exploitation, and oppression by promoting collective empowerment and social transformation. Early influences such as Engels' The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (1884) linked women's subjugation to historical and economic systems, shaping subsequent feminist critiques (Burton, 2014). Later scholars including Pincock (2018) and Earles (2017), extended these ideas to education, identity, and intersectionality, highlighting how overlapping systems of gender, race, and class reinforce exclusion. Within this context, feminist theory underscores the need for equity, inclusivity and agency principles crucial for rethinking technological design and governance. It situates algorithms within broader social power structures and calls for their transformation into tools that advance justice rather than deepen inequality.

Ethical AI on the other hand emphasizes the moral and practical imperatives of fairness, accountability, and transparency in technological systems. Floridi et al. (2018) argue that ethical reflection must guide the design, deployment, and governance of AI, ensuring that technology aligns with human values. The European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on AI (2019) outlines principles that prioritize human dignity, fairness, and the prevention of discrimination. These principles resonate with feminist commitments to social justice and equity. As Binns (2018) notes, fairness-aware machine learning techniques can help detect and mitigate biases that produce gendered harms.

Regional Dimensions of Algorithmic Impacts

Algorithms have significantly shaped regional development and often amplifying disparities while creating new opportunities. Their adoption varies by region, reflecting different levels of technological readiness, regulation, and social needs. The Open Government Partnership

(2021) notes wide disparities in algorithmic transparency and accountability. High-income regions such as North America and Europe exhibit stronger accountability frameworks that improve public service delivery, while low-resource regions struggle to implement safeguards, deepening inequalities. Rossi-Hansberg et al. (2019) also emphasize that algorithmic productivity shifts influence regional trade and resilience automation in U.S. manufacturing hubs boosts efficiency but also displaces jobs, revealing the complex economic trade-offs of algorithmic innovation.

Sectoral Dimensions of Algorithmic Impacts

Across sectors, algorithms exert varying influence depending on their reliance on data and automation. In healthcare, algorithmic tools enhance diagnostic accuracy and efficiency but risk reinforcing bias from unbalanced datasets. Obermeyer et al. (2019) showed that cost-driven algorithms often reduce equity in access, especially among minority communities. In education Ahn and McEachin (2017) found that algorithmic learning systems support personalized learning but may widen socio-economic gaps. Heeks et al. (2020) observed that algorithmic management in logistics and retail improves productivity but undermines worker autonomy, raising ethical concerns.

Regional and Sectoral Intersections

Regional and sectoral intersections further expose the complexity of algorithmic governance. Heeks et al. (2020) found that progressive labor laws in Nordic countries mitigate some harms of algorithmic management, while weaker protections elsewhere heighten worker exploitation. Van Dijk (2020) adds that developing regions face unique obstacles such as limited data infrastructure and dependence on external technologies, restricting innovation and deepening global inequality.

Sectoral Analysis: Gendered Impacts Across Sectors

Global Health Disparities and Algorithmic Bias

Algorithms now play a central role in global healthcare by improving diagnosis, resource allocation, and service delivery (Ahn & McEachin, 2017). Yet they also risk entrenching existing inequities. Obermeyer et al. (2019) identified racial bias in widely used healthcare algorithms that resulted in unequal resource distribution, while the Open Government Partnership (2021) emphasized the need for fairness and accountability in algorithmic systems. Gender bias is particularly evident in healthcare outcomes. Van Dijk (2020) and Heeks et al. (2020) show that male-centered datasets often fail to capture women's physiological differences, leading to misdiagnoses and inadequate treatment. In maternal health, AI models can improve outcomes by detecting early risks (Cureus, 2024), yet the embedded data bias may limit these benefits. Ethical and inclusive algorithm design is therefore essential.

AI applications in disease diagnosis and healthcare access also illustrate both promise and peril. Studies have shown that AI-powered decision support systems enhance maternal outcomes (Frontiers in AI, 2023) and improve care delivery in resource-limited regions

(JAMA Network, 2023). Still yet Obermeyer et al. (2019) caution that algorithmic tools can reinforce inequities if inclusivity and fairness are not built into their design. These findings highlight the urgent need for ethical AI frameworks that ensure equitable healthcare for all.

Gender Bias in Algorithmic Hiring Practices

Algorithms in hiring are often trained on historical data that reflect existing inequalities. Raghavan et al. (2020) show that biased datasets can exclude women from male-dominated fields like technology and engineering. Obermeyer et al. (2019) found that recruitment algorithms often favor male candidates due to implicit gendered assumptions in their data. A notable example is Amazon's AI recruiting tool, which reportedly downgraded resumes containing the word "women" (e.g., "women's chess club captain"), exposing systemic bias in its training data (Smith & Neupane, 2021). These findings highlight the need for careful evaluation of training data and parameters in algorithmic hiring systems.

The manifestation of gender bias in algorithmic hiring differs across regions. In the Global North, debates focus on ethics and sophistication, yet corporations often neglect dataset diversity (Binns, 2018). In the Global South algorithmic hiring remains nascent but mirrors entrenched social hierarchies. Osoba and Welser (2017) note that patriarchal structures amplify bias, while limited regulation allows companies to deploy untested algorithms further marginalizing underrepresented groups (Alozie et al., 2020).

Transparency and fairness are essential for mitigating bias. Selbst et al. (2019) argue that fairness should encompass both outcomes and the processes behind them. Incorporating explainability helps ensure accountability by exposing where bias occurs (Doshi-Velez & Kim, 2017). However, in the Global South such initiatives face challenges due to weak infrastructure, poor data quality, and limited regulation. Eubanks (2018) therefore calls for inclusive policy frameworks that address regional disparities in technological literacy and access.

Combating Gender-Based Violence with Algorithms

Gender-based violence (GBV) remains a global challenge affecting millions annually. The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) has introduced innovative methods to combat GBV through predictive analytics, digital reporting systems, and real-time support services. Predictive tools are among the most promising applications, enabling early intervention by analyzing data to forecast the likelihood of violence. For instance, "Lizzy," an AI software developed by Oxford researchers, assists law enforcement in predicting abusive relationships with 84% accuracy significantly outperforming traditional tools. It has been deployed in eight German states with plans for expansion to the UK (The Times, 2024).

AI-powered reporting systems have also reduced barriers for victims seeking help. Chatbots like "Violetta" in Mexico offer anonymous support via WhatsApp, helping over 260,000 women escape abusive relationships (El País, 2024). Then also "Sophia Chat," developed by the Swiss NGO Spring ACT, has supported more than 40,000 victims in Peru, providing culturally sensitive assistance in Spanish and Quechua (El País, 2024). These examples

highlight AI's potential to deliver scalable and accessible support services.

AI deployment in GBV prevention has achieved notable successes, particularly in improving risk assessment and resource allocation. Machine learning models outperform traditional methods by identifying high-risk cases more accurately. A study analyzing over 40,000 GBV reports demonstrated how AI enhances targeted interventions (arXiv, 2021). In Brazil, AI tools integrated into health systems identify victims through textual analysis of police reports, improving resource distribution (Medium, 2023).

However, the challenges have remained. Algorithmic bias has often arisen from incomplete or skewed datasets can reinforce inequalities and lead to discriminatory outcomes (SDDirect, 2023). Data privacy is another critical concern, as GBV data is highly sensitive. Balancing data utility with victim confidentiality is essential for ethical AI implementation (InfoSegura, 2023).

AI's impact on GBV prevention varies by region, shaped by cultural, social, and technological contexts. In the Basque Country, Spain, the EPV-R risk assessment tool aids courts in predicting severe intimate partner violence but has raised debates over potential judicial bias (arXiv, 2022). In Jamaica AI-driven data analysis enhances public understanding of GBV and informs policy interventions (Oxfam Canada, 2023). In Brazil machine learning applied to police reports has identified patterns preceding femicides, enabling earlier interventions (arXiv, 2024). These regional cases demonstrate AI's adaptability and promise in addressing GBV globally.

Social Media Algorithms and Gender Stereotypes

The pervasive influence of social media in contemporary society is significantly shaped by underlying algorithms that curate and disseminate content. These algorithms, while designed to enhance user engagement and interaction, have been critiqued for perpetuating gender stereotypes and facilitating online harassment.

1. The Role of Algorithms in Shaping Social Media Content: Algorithms are integral to Algorithms are integral to social media platforms, as they determine the visibility and reach of content. Fosch-Villaronga et al. (2021) argue that these algorithms often operate with inherent biases, especially concerning gender. Their study reveals that platforms like Twitter may misclassify users' gender, leading to content curation that reinforces traditional gender norms. Such misclassifications can result in inadvertent privacy violations and the perpetuation of social prejudices (Fosch-Villaronga et al. 2021). Schroeder (2020) reflects on the paradox wherein, despite societal shifts towards recognizing gender multiplicity, algorithms continue to enforce dualistic and hierarchical gender notions. This reinforcement occurs as algorithms, trained on historical data imbued with gender biases, perpetuate these stereotypes in content dissemination (Schroeder 2020).

2. Reinforcement of Gender Stereotypes and Online Harassment: The algorithmic reinforcement of gender stereotypes extends to online harassment. Content promoting hyper-masculinity, which is often labeled as "alpha male" culture, is algorithmically amplified, and this influences young audiences and promotes environments conducive to misogyny and online harassment (Tileah, 2024). Reports indicate that social media algorithms target boys'

insecurities, leading to increased exposure to anti-feminist and extremist content. AI-generated images and content have been found to perpetuate unrealistic and narrow standards of female beauty. Such portrayals exacerbate existing beauty standards, potentially harming self-esteem and reinforcing gender biases (Michel, 2024).

3. Regional Perspectives on Social Media Regulation: In response to these challenges, various regions have adopted regulatory measures to mitigate the negative impacts of social media algorithms. Školkay (2020) provides insights into the regulatory policies of the Visegrád Group countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia), highlighting the diverse approaches and challenges faced by National Regulatory Authorities in addressing social media content regulation (Školkay 2020). Several countries have implemented or proposed regulations to protect vulnerable populations, most especially the minors from harmful content. For instance Australia has introduced a social media ban for children under 16, with significant fines for non-compliance, set to commence in January 2025. Other nations, including the United Kingdom and various European Union member states, have enacted or are considering similar measures to enforce age restrictions and enhance online safety (Reuters, 2024).

Educational Technologies and Gender

The integration of educational technologies (EdTech) has transformed learning globally, but its benefits are uneven, with disparities emerging along gender lines. Algorithmic bias systematic errors that produce unfair outcomes, can perpetuate inequality in education. Baker et al. (2023) describe this as the embedding of societal prejudices into algorithms, leading to discriminatory predictions that often disadvantage women and marginalized groups. Then the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2022) also warns that algorithms trained on biased data can reinforce discrimination, emphasizing the need for transparency and accountability in their design.

The digital divide also shapes access to EdTech with the gender remaining a major factor. Women and girls often face barriers to accessing and effectively using technology, resulting in unequal educational opportunities. While the OECD (2023) notes that gender gaps in digital access are narrowing in OECD countries, challenges persist in developing regions. Gillwald (2022) highlights that women's digital inclusion varies widely even within countries, influenced by geography, education, age, and business formalization.

EdTech adoption in developing countries, brings both opportunities and risks. Rodriguez-Segura (2023) finds that while technology can help address educational challenges, it may also widen inequalities if local contexts and gender disparities are ignored. In developed regions, algorithmic bias and digital inclusion remain pressing issues. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2022) underscores the need for policies that ensure fairness, inclusivity, and equity in educational technologies.

Regional Analysis of Algorithmic Impacts

1. A Comparative Overview of Global North vs. Global South: The evolution and deployment of algorithmic systems have produced contrasting outcomes across regions. In the Global North, advanced economies use AI to enhance industrial productivity, healthcare, and

governance (Selbst, 2023). In contrast, in the Global South, these technologies often deepen inequalities due to limited infrastructure and context-insensitive designs (CARE International, 2024). Vijayakumar (2024) notes that AI ethics frameworks developed in the North rarely translate effectively to the South because of cultural and institutional disparities.

A key concern is the "algorithmic divide," mirroring the digital divide. Okolo et al. (2024) argue that systems trained on Northern datasets frequently fail in different socioeconomic contexts, creating a "transferability gap" that perpetuates inequities (Li et al., 2023). For example, healthcare algorithms developed in the North often overlook genetic, environmental, and cultural variations present in Southern populations (Ehsan et al., 2024), leading to poor performance and exclusionary outcomes.

The exportation of opaque "black-box" algorithms further compounds these issues. Predictive policing models imported from the North, for instance, have disproportionately targeted marginalized groups in developing regions (Open Government Partnership, 2021). Such cases highlight the need for transparency, local accountability, and contextual adaptation. While AI in the North is largely profit-driven, the South requires technologies tailored to development priorities like poverty reduction, healthcare, and education (International Development Research Centre, 2024). Vijayakumar (2024) emphasizes co-creating AI systems with Global South stakeholders to ensure alignment with local realities and ethical principles.

International collaborations, though promising, often reinforce existing power imbalances. Funding from Northern partners frequently comes with conditionalities that privilege donor interests, resulting in unequal benefits from joint AI initiatives (CARE International, 2024). Moreover, the Global North's control over datasets and cloud infrastructure raises concerns about data sovereignty. Data extracted from the South is often exploited without fair returns or consent, perpetuating economic and ethical inequities (Okolo et al., 2024).

2. Regional Disparities in Algorithmic Design and Implementation: Algorithmic design and implementation differ significantly across regions due to varying regulatory priorities, resources, and governance structures. In Europe, strict frameworks such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) emphasize privacy and accountability (Open Government Partnership, 2021). This approach sets a global standard for algorithmic transparency but has also slowed innovation compared to regions with more flexible rules (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2022).

Asia presents a dual model balancing innovation and oversight. China's AI systems primarily serve state objectives especially the surveillance and social control supported by vast data and computational power. Conversely, India uses algorithms to enhance public service delivery through systems like Aadhaar, which streamlines access to welfare programs. However such systems have also deepened exclusion for marginalized groups (International Development Research Centre, 2024).

Disparities stem from limited data and infrastructure in Africa leading to biased outcomes that reinforce inequality (Okolo et al., 2024). Predictive healthcare algorithms, for example, often ignore local epidemiological trends, resulting in misdiagnoses and poor resource allocation (Greenlining Institute, 2021). Latin America faces similar challenges, compounded by public mistrust and reliance on imported systems poorly adapted to local conditions (Ehsan et al., 2024; Rittenhouse, 2024).

Despite these gaps, regional initiatives are emerging. Africa's AI4D program develops context-specific datasets and builds local capacity, while several Latin American countries are experimenting with participatory governance to ensure transparency and inclusion (Open Government Partnership, 2021). Okolo et al. (2024) highlight that engaging local stakeholders in algorithmic design is essential to mitigate bias and ensure systems align with regional needs. Equitable international collaboration and capacity-building remain central to closing the global algorithmic divide.

3. Examples from Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas: In Africa, AI in agriculture shows both promise and constraint. Predictive models for weather and crop yields in countries like Kenya and Nigeria demonstrate potential but often suffer from poor-quality data, limiting accuracy and scalability (CARE International, 2024). Initiatives such as AI4D aim to close this gap by developing local expertise and context-specific datasets.

Across Asia, disparities are evident. Japan and South Korea lead in robotics and manufacturing, with Japan pioneering AI-driven eldercare to address an aging population (Vijayakumar, 2024). Meanwhile, developing nations like Bangladesh struggle with limited infrastructure, and India's Aadhaar system though enhancing service delivery raises concerns about privacy and exclusion (International Development Research Centre, 2024).

Europe's emphasis on transparency and accountability has inspired tools like algorithmic impact assessments, ensuring societal implications are evaluated before deployment (Selbst, 2023). The GDPR remains a global benchmark for data protection, while European initiatives increasingly prioritize fairness and ethical design (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2022).

In America the regional contrasts are stark. North America especially the United States leads in AI research and autonomous systems, yet faces ongoing debates over bias and surveillance (Li et al., 2023). Latin American adoption has been slower, limited by resources and mistrust. Chile's AI-driven education programs highlight efforts to improve learning outcomes amid inequality, while Brazil's predictive policing systems face criticism for reinforcing systemic bias (Open Government Partnership, 2021; Rittenhouse, 2024).

Conclusion

The study underscores that algorithms while transformative can replicate and intensify existing gender inequalities if left unchecked. From healthcare to education, employment and social media, algorithmic systems often inherit the biases embedded in their data and design, thereby reinforcing structural inequities. The findings reveal that although algorithms have the potential to advance fairness, their misuse or uncritical deployment exacerbates disparities, particularly in the Global South where infrastructural and contextual challenges persist. To harness the positive potential of algorithms, there is an urgent need to integrate ethical, inclusive, and regionally adaptive design principles. Developers and policymakers must recognize that algorithms are not neutral tools but socio-technical systems shaped by the values and assumptions of their creators. Addressing gender bias therefore requires a very holistic framework grounded in transparency, intersectionality, and accountability. As societies increasingly rely on AI, the pursuit of fairness and justice in algorithmic governance

becomes a moral and developmental imperative. True progress lies in transforming algorithms from mirrors of inequality into engines of equity technologies that reflect humanity at its most just, inclusive and conscientious.

Recommendations and Policy Implications

The global diffusion of algorithmic systems calls for coordinated strategies to address their gendered consequences. The following key recommendations offer practical and ethical guidance for developers, policymakers and institutions seeking to advance equitable algorithmic governance.

1. Strengthen Data Integrity and Representation: Strengthening data integrity and representation is crucial for mitigating algorithmic bias. Datasets used to train algorithms must be diverse, balanced and context-sensitive, reflecting variations in gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Establishing independent data audit mechanisms would help identify and correct bias or underrepresentation, while promoting data sovereignty frameworks can empower local actors especialy in the Global South to control and protect their data effectively.

2. Advance Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability: Advancing algorithmic transparency and accountability is equally essential. The adoption of Explainable AI (XAI) tools enables end-users and regulators to interpret algorithmic decisions, thereby fostering greater trust and fairness. Open-source or peer-review models should be encouraged to facilitate third-party bias detection, while Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIA) should be institutionalized similar to environmental reviews to ensure pre-deployment scrutiny of social and gendered impacts.

3. Foster Inclusive and Context-Sensitive Design: Promoting inclusive and context-sensitive design requires integrating intersectional analysis into algorithm development to capture the overlapping dimensions of gender, race, and class. Algorithms should be co-created with local experts and stakeholders to ensure adaptability to regional realities. Fapacity-building programs in developing regions must be strengthened to enhance local technical expertise and promote sustainable AI ecosystems.

4. Promote Ethical Frameworks and Governance: Promoting ethical frameworks and governance also remains central to fair AI deployment. Embedding ethical AI guidelines, such as the EU AI Ethics Framework, at all stages of development can ensure consistency in ethical standards. Governments should enact bias-mitigation legislation mandating regular review and correction of discriminatory outcomes. Public recognition and funding incentives can motivate organizations to demonstrate ethical leadership and inclusive AI practices.

5. Enhance Interdisciplinary Collaboration and Education: Enhancing interdisciplinary collaboration and education will deepen the understanding of bias across the AI ecosystem. Cross-sector partnerships among technologists, social scientists, gender experts, and ethicists can help detect hidden biases early in the algorithmic lifecycle. Integrating ethics and gender-sensitivity modules into AI and data science curricula would foster long-term awareness and accountability among developers. Public education campaigns should also be encouraged to

empower users especially the women to engage critically with algorithmic systems. **6. Facilitate Global Cooperation and Knowledge Sharing:** Facilitating global cooperation and knowledge sharing is imperative. North–South partnerships must prioritize equitable resource distribution and context-relevant research. Expanding global platforms such as the *AI for Good Global Summit* can further promote inclusive dialogue, transparency, and collective accountability in AI development worldwide.

References

Ahn, J., & McEachin, A. (2017). Student agency and personalized learning: Evidence from algorithms in education. Journal of Educational Technology, 28(3), 245–262.

Alozie, N., et al. (2020). Algorithmic bias in the Global South: Challenges and recommendations. Journal of Digital Ethics, 12(3), 45–60.

Baker, R. S., Hawn, M. A., & Lee, S. (2023). Algorithmic bias: The state of the situation and policy recommendations. Retrieved January 5, 2025, from https://researchgate.net/publication/379513070_Algorithmic_bias_the_state_of_the_situation_and_policy_recommendations

Bierema, L. L., & Cseh, M. (2003). Evaluating AHRD research using a feminist research framework. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 14(1), 5–26.

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 149–159).

Binns, R., et al. (2018). "It's reducing a human being to a percentage": Perceptions of justice in algorithmic decisions. In Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems.

Burton, C. (2014). Subordination: Feminism and social theory. Routledge.

CARE International. (2024). AI and the Global South: Exploring the role of civil society in AI decision-making. https://www.care-international.org

Cureus. (2024). Revolutionizing maternal health: The role of artificial intelligence in enhancing care and accessibility. https://www.cureus.com/articles/298381-revolutionizing-maternal-health-the-role-of-artificial-intelligence-in-enhancing-care-and-accessibility.pdf

Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608.

Earles, J. (2017). Reading gender: A feminist, queer approach to children's literature and children's discursive agency. Gender and Education, 29(3), 369–388.

Egbert, J., & Sanden, S. (2019). Foundations of education research: Understanding theoretical components. Taylor & Francis.

Ehsan, U., et al. (2024). The algorithmic imprint. arXiv preprint. https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.03275

Engels, F. (1884). The origin of the family, private property, and the state.

European Commission. (2021). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2022). Bias in algorithms – Artificial intelligence and discrimination. https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2022-bias-in-algorithms_en.pdf

Fosch-Villaronga, E., Poulsen, A., Søraa, R. A., & Custers, B. (2021). Gendering algorithms in social media. ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter, 23(1), 24–31.

Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence. (2023). Deep hybrid model for maternal health risk classification in pregnancy. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/artificial-intelligence/articles/10.3389/frai.2023.1213436/pdf

Gillwald, A. (2022, December). Gendered nature of digital inequality: Evidence for policy. UN Women. https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2022-12/BP.1_Alison%20Gillwald.pdf

Greenlining Institute. (2021). Algorithmic bias explained: How automated decision-making becomes automated discrimination. https://www.womensworldbanking.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/2021_Algorithmic_Bias_Report.pdf

Gutierrez, M. (2021). Algorithmic gender bias and audiovisual data: A research agenda. International Journal of Communication, 15, 439–461. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348280950_Algorithmic_Gender_Bias_and_Audiovisual_Data_A_Research_Agenda

Heeks, R., et al. (2020). Algorithmic management in Nordic workplaces: A comparative sectoral analysis. Journal of Technology in Society, 62, 101328. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101328

Hooks, B. (2000). Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics. South End Press.

International Development Research Centre. (2024). Artificial intelligence in the Global South (AI4D): Potential and risks. https://www.idrc.ca

Kubiak, E., Efremova, M. I., Baron, S., & Frasca, K. J. (2023). Gender equity in hiring: Examining the effectiveness of a personality-based algorithm. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, 1219865. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1219865

Li, X., et al. (2023). On the limits of algorithmic prediction across the globe. arXiv preprint. https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.15212

Mackie, A. (1999). Possibilities for feminism in ESL education and research. TESOL Quarterly, 33(3), 566–573.

Michel, G. (2024, June 11). The way AI uses images to define a beautiful woman can wreak havoc. Le Monde. https://www.lemonde.fr/en/opinion/article/2024/06/11/the-way-ai-uses-images-to-define-a-beautiful-woman-can-wreak-havoc_6674443_23.html

Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. NYU Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1pwt9w5

Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science, 366(6464), 447–453.

OECD. (2023). Digital equity and inclusion in education. https://one.oecd.org/document/EDU/WKP%282023%2914/en/pdf

Okolo, C. T., et al. (2024). Making AI explainable in the Global South: A systematic review. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction. https://www.adityavashistha.com

Open Government Partnership. (2021). Algorithmic accountability for the public sector. https://www.opengovpartnership.org/algorithmic-accountability-public-sector.pdf

Osoba, O., & Welser, W. IV. (2017). An intelligence in our image: The risks of bias and errors in artificial intelligence. RAND Corporation.

Pincock, K. (2018). School, sexuality and problematic girlhoods: Reframing ‘empowerment’ discourse. Third World Quarterly, 39(5), 906–919.

Raghavan, M., et al. (2020). Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring. In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 469–480).

Reuters. (2024, November 28). What countries do to regulate children's social media access. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/technology/what-countries-do-regulate-childrens-social-media-access-2024-11-28/

Rittenhouse, K. (2024). Algorithms, humans, and racial disparities in child protection. Research Paper. https://krittenh.github.io

Rodriguez-Segura, D. (2023). EdTech in developing countries: A review of the evidence. World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/6ac08b1a-d072-4727-8678-d42bbee86a8a/content

Rossi-Hansberg, E., Sarte, P.-D., & Schwartzman, F. (2019). The economic geography of regional productivity. American Economic Review, 109(2), 634–671.

Schroeder, J. E. (2020). Reinscribing gender: Social media, algorithms, bias. Journal of Marketing Management, 37(3–4), 1–3.

Selbst, A. D. (2023). An institutional view of algorithmic impact assessments. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology. https://jolt.law.harvard.edu

Selbst, A. D., et al. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. In Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 59–68).

Smith, T., & Neupane, S. (2021). Gendered impacts of AI in hiring practices. International Journal of Gender Studies, 18(2), 112–128.

Van Dijk, J. (2020). The digital divide. Polity Press.

West, S. M., Whittaker, M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Discriminating systems: Gender, race, and power in AI. AI Now Institute.

Women's World Banking. (2021). Algorithmic bias, financial inclusion, and gender. https://www.womensworldbanking.org

Zhao, J., Wang, T., Yatskar, M., Ordonez, V., & Chang, K. (2017). Men also like shopping: Reducing gender bias amplification using corpus-level constraints. In Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (pp. 2979–2989).