Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ETHICAL RISK GOVERNANCE IN FINANCIAL DECISION-MAKING: EXAMINING FAIRNESS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND POLICY ALIGNMENT

Joshua Pallapati [a], Matthew Oman-Amoako [b]
[a] *Arizona, USA*
[b] *Department of Business Administration, Accra Institute of Technology, Ghana*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra26817
DOI No: 10.36713/epra26817

ABSTRACT

The rapid adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in financial systems has revolutionized decision-making, risk management, and compliance processes. Yet, this transformation has also created profound ethical and governance dilemmas. While AI enhances accuracy and operational efficiency, it simultaneously amplifies issues of bias, opacity, and accountability, raising questions about the moral legitimacy and regulatory adequacy of algorithmic finance. The core problem this review addresses is the absence of an integrated governance framework that effectively aligns technological innovation with ethical responsibility and regulatory coherence. Existing systems remain fragmented: financial institutions adopt AI for competitive advantage, regulators struggle to keep pace, and ethical safeguards are often reactive or inconsistent. Consequently, fairness and accountability – essential principles for market integrity and social trust – are inadequately embedded across the AI lifecycle. This study harmonizes conceptual and policy perspectives by comparing key international frameworks, including the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), the U.S. NIST AI Risk Management Framework (2023), the Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights (2022), and Singapore's Model AI Governance Framework (2022). Findings reveal enduring tensions between innovation and moral oversight. The paper proposes a triadic AI Ethical Risk Governance Model integrating fairness, accountability, and policy alignment as pillars for responsible AI in finance. Ultimately, embedding these principles throughout the AI lifecycle is vital to ensuring ethical legitimacy, public trust, and sustainable digital finance.

KEYWORDS: *Ethical AI Governance, Algorithmic Fairness, Accountability and Transparency, Risk Regulation in Finance, AI Policy Alignment, Responsible Innovation.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in finance is one of the most significant changes in contemporary finance. Machines are being subsequently engaged by financial institutions to develop risk evaluation, portfolio administration, credit rating, and regulation (Cao, 2020; Giudici & Raffinetti, 2023; Bahoo et al., 2024). Financial algorithms, like algorithmic lenders, automatic compliance, and robo-advisors, have increased the scale, speed, and predictive capabilities and efficiencies of financial operations, which had not been possible in human decision-making (Lee et al., 2024; Ranjan et al., 2024). The transition to data-driven predictive analytics has changed the focus of accountability and ethical responsibility in financial systems, transforming not just the efficiency of financial systems, but also their location (Weber et al., 2024; Cao et al., 2024).

Although this technological development presents an opportunity to change, it creates ethical friction in the context of fairness, accountability, transparency, and social trust (Koneti, 2025; Camilleri, 2024; Oyasiji et al., 2023). Financial use of automated decision-making can reproduce or even increase historical bias in training data and, in such situations, provides discriminatory results to disadvantaged groups (Thiruma Valavan, 2023; Ogeawuchi et al., 2024). In addition, explainability and accountability, which are major ethical requirements of financial governance, are problematic by the fact that the viewpoint of the complex AI models, often referred to as the black box issue, is opaque (Fritz-Morgenthal et al., 2022; Hasan & Jahan, 2024). Both explainability and transparency, as pointed out by the European Banking Authority and other regulators, are not only an ethical requirement, but a regulatory requirement to preserve market integrity and protect consumers. The tension that transpires between innovation and regulation emphasizes an increasing governance dilemma: how boundaries between the potential benefits of AI-driven efficiency and moral responsibility and fairness as a social value can be struck.

The key issue of this dilemma is that a consistent framework that could unite AI ethics, financial governance, and risk regulation remains a persistent issue. Although considerable literature is written about ethical AI (Floridi et al., 2018; Jobin et al., 2019) and individual streams cover risk governance in the financial sector (Renn, 2017; OECD, 2021), there is scanty literature on the integrative approaches operationalizing fairness, accountability, and transparency in financial regulatory frameworks (Atoum, 2025; Adekunle et al., 2023). Koneti (2025) and Camilleri (2024) pose that ethical AI regulation in finance needs to shift past theoretical ideals to institutional structures, i.e., ethics boards, automated audit structures, and explainable AI-based standards that can hold accountability in automated decision pipelines. On the same note, Oyasiji et al. (2023) and Radanliev (2025) emphasize the necessity of comprehensive governance structures that have the potential to resolve the conflict between algorithmic innovation and compliance, ethical responsibility, and trustworthiness of society.

In this regard, the review aims to harmonize existing arguments, models, and policy strategies that lead to the solution of AI and ethical regulation within the financial sector. With reference to an interdisciplinary range of current literature, it methodically traces the conceptual, ethical, and institutional approaches to understand how the ideas of fairness, accountability, and risk governance are being implemented in the financial technology sector. By so doing, this review will bring a consolidated knowledge on the intersection of AI ethics and financial governance, both in terms of theoretical background and practical accountability mechanisms. To inform this synthesis, the review has been arranged according to three mutually connected research questions:
Q1: How does AI influence ethical risk governance in financial systems?
Q2: What fairness and accountability challenges emerge from AI-driven financial decision-making?
Q3: How well do existing policies and frameworks align with ethical AI principles?
The importance of this question goes beyond the discussion in academia. To regulators, it sheds light on avenues of applying ethical values in supervisory and compliance systems. In the case of financial institutions, it points to the need to introduce the principles of transparency and accountability in the practice of AI development and deployment. And to society, it strengthens the necessity of algorithmic finance being used to realise inclusive, equitable and sustainable economic results (Ridzuan et al., 2024; Bahangulu & Owusu-Berko, 2025; OLAWORE et al., 2025). This overlap between ethics, governance and technology is therefore an important understanding of how to create resilient, trustful, and socially responsible financial ecosystems in the age of intelligent automation. The following sections trace conceptual foundations, thematic developments, and emerging debates shaping the ethical governance of AI in finance.

2. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The governance of ethical artificial intelligence in finance rests upon three interconnected conceptual pillars: AI in financial decision-making, ethical AI principles, and risk governance and policy alignment. Together, these foundations provide the theoretical scaffolding through which fairness, accountability, and transparency can be operationalized across financial ecosystems.

2.1 AI in Financial Decision-Making

Financial decision-making uses artificial intelligence, a continuum of computational methods, such as machine learning, deep learning, and natural language processing, to allow systems to learn trends out of large datasets and make independent or semi-independent decisions (Cao, 2020; Giudici & Raffinetti, 2023). Such systems have become integrated into the various finance operations such as credit scoring, fraud detection, risk modeling, portfolio optimization, and regulatory compliance (Cao & Zhai, 2022; Weber et al., 2024). As one illustration, predictive algorithms in credit markets consider the non-traditional data (such as transaction history or social network, or online behavior) to evaluate creditworthiness more dynamically than more traditional statistical models (Oyasiji et al., 2023; Thiruma Valavan, 2023). Equally, robo-advisors and AI-based portfolio managers used in asset management have the ability to automate the investment advice by analyzing real-time market indicators (Lee et al., 2024; Ranjan et al., 2024).

This concept is a major innovation that replaces the rule-based decision systems with predictive analytics and overhauls the accountability framework of the finance industry (Koneti, 2025; Adekunle et al., 2023). Rule-based models' decision criteria were clear and codified, and responsibility could be easily attributed. Predictive systems, in turn, learn inductively based on historical data, usually with inaccessible statistical weights and neural network designs (Fritz-Morgenthal et al., 2022). Subsequently, accountability is made diffuse, and the ethical legitimacy of automated decisions is subject to the explainability and trackability of algorithmic reasoning.

This lack of accountability has been highlighted by financial regulators, such as the European Central Bank, with even explainable AI methods in credit scoring and risk modelling being proposed to ensure that Basel III and GDPR supervisory requirements are met. In turn, AI in finance is not merely a technological change but provides

a governance change, which will require the new methods of ethical control and accountability (Camilleri, 2024; Hasan & Jahan, 2024).

2.2 Ethical AI Principles

Ethical AI is based on normative approaches to explain the moral and social obligations of intelligent systems. Another significant meta-analysis by Jobin et al. (2019) synthesized more than 80 AI ethics guidelines around the world and found five common principles, namely: beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, autonomy, and explicability. Continuing on this, Floridi et al. (2018) suggested an integrative model of ethics that focuses on the idea that AI systems must augment human well-being, eliminate harm, be fair, respect user agency, and be intelligible in making decisions. Putting these general moral principles into financial action, however, is a difficult affair. In the credit scoring or risk pricing models, e.g., fairness cannot be operationalized because rival definitions, including demographic parity, equalized odds or predictive equality, have different policy implications (Thiruma Valavan, 2023; Ogeawuchi et al., 2024). In the same vein, proprietary interests and deep learning architecture complexity usually counteract the requirements to transparency (Fritz-Morgenthal et al., 2022). All these tensions can be understood as a more general fairness performance trade-off, in which attempting to uphold ethical integrity may decrease predictive accuracy or profitability (Oyasiji et al., 2023; Camilleri, 2024).

Responsible AI has been proposed to address these gaps by combining the ethical values with the governance of organizations and technical risk management into a single paradigm (Atoum, 2025; Radanliev, 2025). Responsible AI models promote ethics by design; entailing the inclusion of fairness, accountability, and transparency across the lifecycle of AI, including data collection to model deployment. In the context of finance, this can be converted into active practices, including bias audits, explainability dashboard, and ethical impact analysis to make sure that the algorithms used in this field correspond not only to regulatory requirements but also to societal values (Ridzuan et al., 2024; OLAWORE et al., 2025). Therefore, ethical AI principles can be considered not just as moral guidelines but as institutional standards of regulatory compliance, corporate governance and trust in AI-driven financial systems by the stakeholders.

2.3 Risk Governance and Policy Alignment

According to Renn (2017), the term risk governance is a term used to describe the overall processes through which risks are determined, appraised, controlled, and shared in the context of socio-technical systems. It goes beyond conventional risk management to include the ethical, political, as well as institutional aspects, focusing on the stakeholder's involvement and openness in the decision-making process. Within the financial field, the risk governance systems, including Basel III, OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, and Enterprise Risk Management offered by COSO, have been traditionally concerned with systemic stability, compliance, and the fiduciary duty (Stein et al., 2019; Essien et al., 2022). Nonetheless, the emergence of AI-based systems requires a re-tuning of these structures to solve the problem of algorithmic risk and digital ethics (Hasan & Jahan, 2024; Adekunle et al., 2023).

The AI risk governance thus combines the existing financial control systems with the new concepts of AI ethics with the purpose to equilibrate the innovation and responsibility (Koneti, 2025; Camilleri, 2024). Examples of institutional innovations that will make this convergence include AI ethics committees, algorithmic transparency reports, and automated compliance monitoring (OLAWORE et al., 2025; Bahangulu & Owusu-Berko, 2025). Additionally, the correspondence of the ethical development of AI with policy models is a decisive move towards regulatory consistency in a highly globalized financial systems environment.

The policy level can explain the potential and disintegration of AI governance through divergent international approaches. The European Union AI approach follows a risk-based regulating strategy and implements fairness, explainability, and human control as its standards of compliance with the high-risk AI systems (Jariwala, 2024). Unlike that, the United States tries to promote voluntary and sector-specific guidance including the NIST AI Risk Management Framework (AI, 2023) and the AI Bill of Rights (House, 2022) stressing innovation-friendly flexibility. And in the meantime, the Model AI Governance Framework (Batool et al., 2025) and the AI Utilization Guidelines of Japan are hybrid strategies that would integrate the soft regulation and ethical best practices to encourage responsible innovation.

All of these policy frameworks strive to reach the goal of policy alignment, that is, aligning moral values to regulatory frameworks that would make AI systems clear, equitable, and responsible and enable financial innovation. As Nastoska et al. (2025) and Pashang & Weber (2023) observe, the future concerning AI risk governance lies in dynamic and adaptive policy architectures that can adjust to emerging technological and ethical problems. These three theoretical pillars AI in financial decision-making, ethical AI principles and risk governance are the theoretical basis on which AI ethical governance in finance can be analyzed. Taken collectively they help

demonstrate that responsible innovation and innovations need not just be technically accurate, but also morally farsighted and regulated accordingly. These foundations are further developed in the following section, which tracks the theme developments and empirical discussions, which shed light on how fairness, accountability, and governance are put into practice in the various financial systems.

3. THEMATIC NARRATIVE SYNTHESIS

This chapter summarizes five themes that are interconnected that affirm the ethical governance of artificial intelligence in financial systems: fairness in algorithms, accountability and explainability, ethical risk governance, policy and regulatory alignment, and debates and gaps in research. All the themes are reflections of the co-evolution of technological structures, institutional forms, and normative frameworks in constructing the sphere of responsible AI in finance.

3.1 Algorithmic Fairness in Financial Systems

Another significant ethical concern in AI based finance has been algorithmic fairness, which is currently a major factor in deciding access to credit, insurance and investment opportunities. Biases may manifest at various levels: data-driven bias, i.e. historical inequalities that are reflected in training data; procedural bias, i.e. model architecture, feature selection; and outcome bias, i.e. the difference in effects on a group that was protected. A combination of these points of biasness explains why the financial AI systems must be carefully monitored and designed in a way that is conscious of fairness (Barocas & Selbst, 2016; Fuster et al., 2022). The results of the empirical research indicate that there have been consistent racial and gender inequalities in algorithmic lending. By way of example, Bartlett et al. (2022) discovered that the U.S. mortgage algorithms were systematically more likely to charge Black and Hispanic applicants higher interest rates, despite adjusting was a control factor on credit risk. Such inequalities demonstrate the ethical conflict in terms of efficiency and distributive justice in financial automation.

In order to correct these inequalities, researchers and policymakers have been discussing a variety of fairness metrics, such as, though not limited to, demographic parity, equal opportunity, and predictive equality, which all reflect different moral intuitions of fairness (Hardt et al., 2016; Mitchell et al., 2021). However, it is hard to operationalize equitable opaque machine-learning pipelines. According to Kleinberg et al. (2016), there is no metric of fairness that can be fulfilled at once when the base rates of different groups differ, which highlights an inherent contradiction between mathematical parity and equity in the real world. Technical interventions have developed to institutional reforms of the mitigation strategies. Algorithms can be remedied with fairness-conscious machine learning algorithms, including re-sampling, adversarial debiasing, and constraint optimization (Bilal Zafar et al., 2015). Fairness is rooted in organizational accountability frameworks through complementary governance mechanisms, which include bias audits, diversity in data governance, ethical impact assessment, and the like (Raji et al., 2020).

It is because fairness in finance using algorithms is therefore at the junction of social responsibility and technical design. It directly responds to Research Question 2 because it uncovers how issues of fairness and accountability are created by structural biases in AI-mediated decision systems.

3.2 Accountability and Explainability

The term accountability in AI is used to imply the delegation of accountability of automated decisions, including legal accountability and ethical accountability (Wieringa, 2020). The accountability of algorithmic systems is also complex in financial terms due to the distributed character of the systems: creators, sources of data, and institutions have intersecting functions.

Explainability the capacity to render algorithmic output readable by humans is an important mechanism of accountability (Doshi-Velez & Kim, 2017). In Europe, this idea was enshrined in the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which provided the so-called right to explanation, allowing people to see automated credit or insurance decisions. This principle was also expanded to model risk management by the European Banking Authority, who suggested that financial institutions should document model behavior, validation, and restrictions. Nonetheless, explainability brings about a consistent performance-interpretability dilemma. Deep-learning models are often high-dimensional, which is why they are more effective than simpler interpretable models and yet opaque even to designers (Lipton, 2018). The new approaches to eXplainable AI (XAI) SHAP values, LIME, and counterfactual reasoning aim to address this gap, but critics claim that they give post-hoc justifications instead of actual transparency (Mittelstadt et al., 2019).

The human-in-the-loop paradigm is a partial solution where human judgment is incorporated into decision nodes that represent critical choices to ensure ethical supervision (Rahwan, 2018). But in reality, human control can turn

into a matter of formality or predisposed to the results of the algorithm, which is called automation bias (Green & Chen, 2019). The governance tensions on the heart of the Research Questions 1 and 2 can be shed light by accountability and explainability. They emphasize that they are not ethically neutral products of the code but acts of the institution to which a human should interpret and be responsible.

3.3 Ethical Risk Governance Models

Ethical risk governance models are aimed at entrenching moral control in AI-operated financial systems. Continuing the works by Mittelstadt (2019) and Morley et al. (2020), two ideas can be presented to conceptualize governance models: the top-down regulatory and the bottom-up organizational strategies. Top-down models focus on regulatory requirements and compliance systems and include the AI risk management principles of the Basel Committee and the OECD guidelines on Responsible Business conduct. These tools foster transparency, accountability of data and ethical culture as part and parcel of the systemic risk management (Renn, 2017).

The bottom-up mechanisms are instead concerned with internal governance mechanisms in firms, including AI ethics boards, risk committees, and model validation units, which codify ethical norms into institutional routines (Morley et al., 2021; Camilleri, 2024). The use of AI Ethics Councils by large banks, such as ING and HSBC, to review model risks, or fintech firms such as ZestFinance to conduct model interpretability audits (PwC, 2023) are examples of AI use to address model risks. These institutional systems reflect the ethics by design principle, which puts the aspect of moral deliberation across the AI lifecycle. Successful ethical risk management should therefore involve repeated adjustment of an algorithm design, organizational ethics and regulatory expectations (Koneti, 2025; Hasan and Jahan, 2024). Ethical risk governance develops Research Question 1 by showing how AI transforms the financial oversight institutional architecture. It draws attention to the models of governance that harmonize normative accountability and incentives of innovation.

3.4 Policy and Regulatory Alignment

The alignment of policies describes how the regulatory frameworks integrate and enshrine the ethical AI principles within the jurisdictions. The AI Act of the European Union creates a risk-based framework according to which the financial AI systems should be considered as having a high level of risk and must address the transparency, human control, and fairness requirements. In addition to this, the GDPR enshrines data minimization, lawful processing, and auditability, which are all aspects that are directly related to algorithmic accountability (Pizzi et al., 2021).

In comparison, the US is more decentralized and voluntary with the NIST AI Risk Management Framework (AI, 2023) and the AI Bill of Rights (2022), which focuses on innovation and market freedom (Whittlestone et al., 2021). In the meantime, Asian regulators, in particular, Singapore and Japan, have adopted hybrid governance systems that combine ethical principles with sandboxes, which promote experimentation under supervision.

Examples of cross-sector collaboration between regulators and banks, as well as technologists, include Supervisory bodies, including the AI Public-Private Forum of the Bank of England and the Veritas Initiative of the Monetary Authority of Singapore. These efforts are indicative of a new polycentric governance ecosystem, in which compliance, innovation, and ethics have a negotiated level of coexistence (Ahmad et al., 2025). There are fragmentation and convergence in the regional contrasts. The alignment of policies directly leads to the Research Question 3 to establish how the concept of ethical AI is embedded in global regulatory frameworks inconsistently.

Table 1: Key Domains and Conceptual Foundations for AI Governance

Domain	Key Concepts	Representative Author	Implications for AI Governance
AI in Finance	Predictive analytics, automation	McAfee & Brynjolfsson (2017)	Efficiency vs. opacity
Ethical AI	Fairness, accountability, transparency	Floridi et al. (2018); Jobin et al. (2019)	Normative grounding
Risk Governance	Risk culture, control, oversight	Renn (2017); OECD (2021)	Institutional adaptation
Policy Alignment	Regulation, compliance, trust	Jariwala (2024)	Policy harmonization

Table 1 summarizes the major domains that inform contemporary discussions on AI governance, particularly in financial contexts. The AI in Finance domain highlights how predictive analytics and automation discussed by scholars such as Brynjolfsson & McAfee (2017) create a tension between efficiency gains and increased system opacity. Ethical AI brings together concepts of fairness, accountability, and transparency, with authors like Floridi et al. (2018) and Jobin et al. (2019) offering the normative foundations needed to guide responsible AI development. The Risk Governance domain, supported by thinkers such as Renn (2017) and organizations like

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

the OECD (2021), emphasizes the need for strong risk cultures and oversight mechanisms as institutions integrate AI into high-stakes decision-making. Finally, Policy Alignment, reflected in initiatives like the Jariwala (2024), underscores the importance of harmonized regulatory frameworks to ensure compliance, foster public trust, and support the safe deployment of AI systems across sectors.

3.5 Gaps, Contradictions and Emerging Debates

Though there is a growing agreement that ethical AI is required in the field of finance, gaps and contradictions remain crucial. To begin with, frameworks are not standardized in terms of jurisdiction as they lack uniformity of enforcement (Jobin et al., 2019). Second, the fact that fairness can be measured and explainability can be evaluated does not allow empirical validation of ethical claims due to methodological problems (Mitchell et al., 2021). Third, there are ethical trade-offs experienced between transparency and competitive secrecy, where model logic disclosure may compromise proprietary advantage (Martinez, 2023).

New controversies are also influenced by interdisciplinary tensions. Economists focus on efficiency and aligning incentives whereas ethicists lay much emphases on accountability and justice. According to legal scholars, rules should be adaptively and principles-based regulated instead of adherence to checklists (Veale & Binns, 2017). This discussion highlights the need to have hybrid forms of governance that combine law, data science, and behavioral finance (Radanliev, 2025). It is necessary to reform these inconsistencies to create a consistent paradigm of governance that supports ethical demands and financial innovation, which is at the forefront to answer all the three research questions. In order to bring together the findings of the themes, the table presented below provides an overview of major ethical and governance aspects, their theoretical foundation, and policy into the implications.

Table 2: Key thematic areas shaping ethical and governance discussions in AI-driven finance

Theme	Key Issues	Theoretical Lens	Policy Implication	Key Authors
Fairness	Bias, discrimination	Fair Machine Learning	Need for bias audits	Barocas & Selbst (2016)
Accountability	Explainability gap	Governance Theory	Shared liability frameworks	Doshi-Velez & Kim (2017)
Risk Governance	Integration of ethics	Risk Society Theory	AI risk boards	Morley et al. (2020)
Policy Alignment	Fragmented regulations	Institutional Theory	Global standards	OECD (2021)
Cross-Sector Learning	Lessons from health AI	Comparative Ethics	Adaptive governance	Ahmad et al. (2025)

Table 2 presents a structured overview of the major thematic areas that define the ethical and governance debate in AI-based finance. In the Fairness theme, it brings up the issue of bias and discrimination and uses Fair Machine Learning to stress the need for systematic bias audits, exemplified by Barocas & Selbst (2016). The Accountability theme is based on the explainability gap in AI systems, informed by the Governance Theory, to argue the shared liability frameworks that have been suggested by researchers like Doshi-Velez & Kim (2017). Risk Governance emphasizes the necessity to incorporate ethical aspects to the AI design and supervision in their finances, applying the Risk Society Theory in support of the AI risk boards creation (Morley et al., 2020). The theme of Policy Alignment deals with the disparate regulatory environments using the prism of the Institutional Theory and proposes the whole world to harmonize its standards as suggested by OECD (2021). Last but not least, Cross-Sector Learning refers to the valuable lessons of health AI, when Comparative Ethics is applied to support adaptive governance solutions, which is mentioned by Ahmad et al. (2025). Together, these themes indicate the use of theoretical lenses to guide practical policy interventions to responsible implementation of AI.

4. DISCUSSION

Altogether, the literature reviewed narrows down to one very important conclusion, the artificial intelligence (AI) governance in finance is no longer a matter of technological optimization but a coordination of ethical, institutional, and regulatory roles. The thematic synthesis above has shown that despite all these achievements that have been made to define the pillars of ethics like fairness, accountability and transparency, there is still a disconnect between theoretical terminologies and the practical outcomes of these terminologies in the financial systems. In this section, the analysis of the previous sections has been incorporated to compare them on the basis of thematic areas and highlight their implications on theory, policy, and managerial practice.

There is a general agreement among researchers that AI has disrupted the governance of financial risks by introducing automation in the decision-making pipelines and substituting most of the human judgments with data-driven algorithms (Koneti, 2025; Hasan & Jahan, 2024; Giudici & Raffinetti, 2023). It is agreed that algorithm

systems make processes more accurate and faster but add a novel ethical obscurity to other forms of governance (Fritz-Morgenthal et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2021). The urgency of implementing fairness and accountability into the governance frameworks is agreed by authors like Camilleri (2024) and Oyasiji et al. (2023) when it comes to the idea that the financial institutions must have the legitimacy to hold the consumers in the system of automated decision-making. But there are still major scandals. The inadequacy of measures of fairness is a controversial issue. Although demographic parity and equalized odds are computational measures that can be used to measure bias (Barocas & Selbst, 2016), some researchers contend that the metrics do not reflect contextual or intersectional fairness that is applicable to financial ecosystems that are historically unequal (Atoum, 2025; Ogeawuchi et al., 2024). The other controversy is associated with accountability diffusion. Doshi-Velez & Kim (2017) suggest a model of shared-liability, which allocates responsibility between the developers, auditors, and financial institutions, but other researchers argue that responsibility should be institutionally concentrated to provide legal clarity in case of algorithmic harm (Morley et al., 2020; Pashang and Weber, 2023).

Even though the world is starting to harmonize regulatory efforts in jurisdictions on the basis of ethical AI, complete policy alignment has eluded the world. The AI Act by the European Union is a prescriptive and risk-based method with a compact approach to ethics ingrained in legislation, whereas the NIST AI Risk Management Framework of the United States is self-assessive and voluntary in adoption (Renn, 2017; OECD, 2021). Alternatively, the Asian models, specifically Singapore Model AI Governance Framework, follow a pragmatic principle-based model that is aimed at balancing innovation and responsibility. These local deviations cause regulatory differences that make the compliance of multinational financial entities complex, which explains the necessity to establish globally harmonized ethical governance standards (Ridzuan et al., 2024; Bahangulu & Owusu-Berko, 2025).

Theoretically, the literature will move in the same direction of altering the theory of governance to support algorithmic risk. The old governance paradigms, based on the fixed control and obedience (Shahim et al., 2012), are becoming ineffective in adaptive learning systems where decision logic keeps on changing beyond the human foresight. In reaction, modern models focus on reflexive governance that is marked by repetitive supervision, moral deliberation, and organizational learning (Morley et al., 2020; Camilleri, 2024). The concept of a risk society by Renn (2017) offers a conceptually helpful ground, where AI-driven finance is the self-organizing form of governance where various actors constantly bargain on fairness, accountability, and compliance (Atoum, 2025). In this new paradigm, risk management is no longer built around the idea of static regulation, but dynamic supervision of ethics, which connects technical reliability to moral responsibility.

When combined with wisdoms in these contributions, we begin to envision a theoretical and articulated triangular structure of AI Ethical Risk Governance, a triadic organization that incorporates in its formulation three mutually supportive dimensions: fairness, accountability, and policy alignment. The normative base of fairness is the guarantee of non-discrimination and equity during algorithmic decisions. The accountability is the institutional mechanism that gives responsibility and provides traceability through the AI lifecycle. Policy alignment acts as the system level linking the ethics within the organization with the external regulation to uphold societal expectations. Through combination, these dimensions depict how AI ethical governance can help stabilize algorithmic risk in financial ecosystems and put the abstract principles into enforceable practices.

These findings have far-reaching implications on policy. The researchers unanimously indicate that it is essential to introduce the concept of algorithmic accountability regulation through which ethical auditing, certification of the models, and open reporting would become part of financial regulation (Lee et al., 2021; Adekunle et al., 2023). Cross-sector partnerships are also being proactive with regulatory agencies like the European Banking Authority and the Bank of England initiating the assessment of model explainability and bias auditing processes (Koneti, 2025; OLAWORE et al., 2025). Nevertheless, regulation is not typically applied consistently, which points to the disjuction between the theoretical agreement and the implementation of the regulations (Ridzuan et al., 2024). On the organizational level, it is advised to implement internal ethics audits, algorithm certification systems, and consistent staff training on AI ethics by the financial institutions to enhance the capacity to govern (Hasan & Jahan, 2024; Ogeawuchi et al., 2024; Farinu, 2025). These managerial innovations indicate the shift in the approach to compliance that is reactive to the proactive ethical stewardship, consistent with the larger push toward responsible AI (Camilleri, 2024).

In the process of literature synthesis, it is evident that, in the context of AI, ethics, risk management, and financial governance domains are converging and simultaneously becoming fragmented. Although the work towards a clear and responsible financial ecosystem is a global goal, differences still exist in the implementation of normative ethics in empirical governance results. The AI Ethical Risk Governance Triangle suggested herein presents a conceptual framework by which these tensions can be achieved; fairness as a moral anchor, accountability as an

institutional channel, and alignment as a systemic stabilizer. With the continuing blur of technology and regulation, the incorporation of these principles into financial AI is not only the consequence of the regulatory necessity but it is also the strategic prerequisite to maintain trust, legitimacy, and long-term sustainability of digital finance.

6. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

An overview of the existing body of research into AI ethics in financial systems demonstrates that there are several gap areas, which impede the achievement of fair, transparent, and responsible AI regulation. Although the conceptual literature is on the rise, empirical support of the connection between ethical practices of AI and the financial performance results is still missing. Whereas theoretical debates focus on equity and responsibility, there is a shortage of quantitative research, which evaluates the direct impact of ethical principles implementation on the firm value, market stability, or customer trust. This loophole limits the capacity of regulators and institutes to justify investments in ethical compliance both normative and economic views.

The second important limitation is related to the low cross-national harmonization of policy frameworks. Despite the fact that the AI Act of the European Union has a solid regulatory model, the relative comparison between the United States, Asia, and emerging economies demonstrates a high degree of fragmentation. These discrepancies make it difficult to formulate global financial frameworks that rely on cross-border data streams, algorithmic trading, and risk infrastructures that are shared. In the absence of policy coherence, the multinational financial institutions will be subjected to the uncertainty of compliance, and ethics standards will be localized instead of being universal.

Third, the present-day scholarship is characterized by excessive focus on fairness over accountability. Whereas such fairness metrics as demographic parity or equality of opportunity have existed in the technical literature, less attention has been paid to institutional accountability mechanisms that hold liable the decisions made by AI. The lack of this balance prevents the application of ethical AI principles to the enforceable governance mechanisms. Specifically, the research on the functioning of human supervision, algorithm audit, and shared liability in a real-world financial setting is urgently needed.

Lastly, literature identifies the lack of hybrid governance models that combine the knowledge in law, data science, and behavioural finance. Current frameworks are mostly siloed and ethics policies are made by the philosophers or the regulators whereas, implementation issues are addressed by the technologists. The only solution to such divides is a multidisciplinary approach, which integrates legal enforceability, technical auditability, and behavioural insights into the reactions of financial actors to AI-driven risk.

In the future, there are a number of promising ways. To start with, researchers ought to implement interdisciplinary approaches that combine AI law, behavioural economics, and computational ethics in order to explore the impact of ethical norms when making decisions in algorithmic finance. Second, ethics impact assessments must be established as a normal pre-deployment instrument in financial institutions- just like environmental impact assessments- in which an organization is able to anticipate any ethical risks prior to implementation. Lastly, researchers and policy makers must come up with strong assessment tools to determine the effectiveness of the policy alignment process. These metrics can be used to monitor compliance levels as well as public trust, inclusiveness, and resilience of long-term governance.

All these future directions require the change in favor of proactive, evidence-based, and adaptive governance instead of reactive regulation. The future research can go beyond the abstract ethics ambition of AI-financial systems by integrating interdisciplinary knowledge and empirical rigor, and lead to quantifiable improvements in responsible and sustainable algorithmic finance.

7. CONCLUSION

The review finds that it is both a moral and a financial requirement that ethical AI governance exists in financial systems. With the ongoing use of artificial intelligence to transform the landscape of financial decision-making, the need to ensure the maintenance of fairness, accountability, and transparency is intertwined with the task of preserving the integrity of the markets and trust among the population. The above discussion has shown that although AI implementation in the financial sector introduces efficiency and innovation, it also increases the threat of bias, obscurity, and institutional irresponsibility, these problems that the current framework frameworks failed to address yet.

REFERENCES

1. *Act, R. (2024). REGULATION (EU) 2024/2847 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL. Regulation (eu).*
2. *Adekunle, B. I., Chukwuma-Eke, E. C., Balogun, E. D., & Ogunsola, K. O. (2023). Integrating AI-driven risk assessment frameworks in financial operations: A model for enhanced corporate governance. International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology, 9(6), 445-464.*
3. *Ahmad, S., Shahzad, S. A., & Sajid, S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Global Governance: Legal and Political Challenges in Regulating AI Across Borders. Annual Methodological Archive Research Review, 3(11), 11-39.*
4. *AI, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0). URL: https://nvlpubs. nist. gov/nistpubs/ai/nist. ai, 100-1.*
5. *Atoum, I. (2025). Revolutionizing AI Governance: Addressing Bias and Ensuring Accountability Through the Holistic AI Governance Framework. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science & Applications, 16(2).*
6. *Bahangulu, J. K., & Owusu-Berko, L. (2025). Algorithmic bias, data ethics, and governance: Ensuring fairness, transparency and compliance in AI-powered business analytics applications. World J Adv Res Rev, 25(2), 1746-63.*
7. *Bahoo, S., Cucculelli, M., Goga, X., & Mondolo, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence in Finance: a comprehensive review through bibliometric and content analysis. SN Business & Economics, 4(2), 23.*
8. *Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. Calif. L. Rev., 104, 671.*
9. *Bartlett, R., Morse, A., Stanton, R., & Wallace, N. (2022). Consumer-lending discrimination in the FinTech Era. Journal of Financial Economics, 143(1), 30-56.*
10. *Batool, A., Zowghi, D., & Bano, M. (2025). AI governance: a systematic literature review. AI and Ethics, 1-15.*
11. *Bilal Zafar, M., Valera, I., Gomez Rodriguez, M., & Gummadi, K. P. (2015). Fairness Constraints: Mechanisms for Fair Classification. arXiv e-prints, arXiv-1507.*
12. *Camilleri, M. A. (2024). Artificial intelligence governance: Ethical considerations and implications for social responsibility. Expert systems, 41(7), e13406.*
13. *Cao, L. (2020). AI in finance: A review. Available at SSRN 3647625.*
14. *Cao, S. S., Jiang, W., & Lei, L. G. (2024). Applied AI for finance and accounting: Alternative data and opportunities. Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 84, 102307.*
15. *Cao, Y., & Zhai, J. (2022). A survey of AI in finance. Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies, 20(2), 125-137.*
16. *Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608.*
17. *Essien, I. A., Cadet, E., Ajayi, J. O., Erigh, E. D., Obuse, E., Ayanbode, N., & Babatunde, L. A. (2022). Optimizing cyber risk governance using global frameworks: ISO, NIST, and COBIT alignment. Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research, 3(1), 618-629.*
18. *Farinu, U. (2025). Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in AI: Ethical Challenges in Data-Driven Decision-Making. Available at SSRN 5128174.*
19. *Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People – An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. Minds and machines, 28(4), 689-707.*
20. *Fritz-Morgenthal, S., Hein, B., & Papenbrock, J. (2022). Financial risk management and explainable, trustworthy, responsible AI. Frontiers in artificial intelligence, 5, 779799.*
21. *Fuster, A., Goldsmith-Pinkham, P., Ramadorai, T., & Walther, A. (2022). Predictably unequal? The effects of machine learning on credit markets. The Journal of Finance, 77(1), 5-47.*
22. *Giudici, P., & Raffinetti, E. (2023). SAFE Artificial Intelligence in finance. Finance Research Letters, 56, 104088.*
23. *Green, B., & Chen, Y. (2019). The principles and limits of algorithm-in-the-loop decision making. Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction, 3(CSCW), 1-24.*
24. *Hardt, M., Price, E., & Srebro, N. (2016). Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. Advances in neural information processing systems, 29.*
25. *Hasan, T., & Jahan, N. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Ethical Challenges in Financial Services: A Framework for Responsible Data Governance and Algorithmic Transparency. International Journal of Data Science, Big Data Analytics, and Predictive Modeling, 14(8), 16-36.*
26. *House, W. (2022). Blueprint for an ai bill of rights: Making automated systems work for the american people. Nimble Books.*
27. *Infocomm Media Development Authority (IMDA) & Personal Data Protection Commission (PDPC). (2022). Model AI Governance Framework (Second Edition).*
28. *Jariwala, M. (2024). A Comparative Analysis of the EU AI Act and the Colorado AI Act: Regulatory Approaches to Artificial Intelligence Governance. International Journal of Computer Applications, 975, 8887.*
29. *Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature machine intelligence, 1(9), 389-399.*
30. *Kleinberg, J., Mullainathan, S., & Raghavan, M. (2016). Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.05807.*

31. *Koneti, S. B. (2025). Regulation, Ethics and Fairness in Artificial Intelligence for Finance: Governance, Explainability and Compliance. Artificial Intelligence-Powered Finance: Algorithms, Analytics, and Automation for the Next Financial Revolution, 4, 124.*
32. *Lee, D. K. C., Guan, C., Yu, Y., & Ding, Q. (2024). A comprehensive review of generative AI in finance. FinTech, 3(3), 460-478.*
33. *Lee, M. S. A., Floridi, L., & Denev, A. (2021). Innovating with confidence: embedding AI governance and fairness in a financial services risk management framework. In Ethics, governance, and policies in artificial intelligence (pp. 353-371). Cham: Springer International Publishing.*
34. *Lipton, Z. C. (2018). The mythos of model interpretability: In machine learning, the concept of interpretability is both important and slippery. Queue, 16(3), 31-57.*
35. *Martinez, O. (2023). EXPLORING THE INTERSECTION OF GRAPH THEORY AND MACHINE LEARNING FOR SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS.*
36. *McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2017). Machine, platform, crowd: Harnessing our digital future. WW Norton & Company.*
37. *Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., ... & Gebru, T. (2019, January). Model cards for model reporting. In Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency (pp. 220-229).*
38. *Mitchell, S., Potash, E., Barocas, S., D'Amour, A., & Lum, K. (2021). Algorithmic fairness: Choices, assumptions, and definitions. Annual review of statistics and its application, 8(1), 141-163.*
39. *Mittelstadt, B. (2019). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. Nature machine intelligence, 1(11), 501-507.*
40. *Morley, J., Floridi, L., Kinsey, L., & Elhalal, A. (2020). From what to how: an initial review of publicly available AI ethics tools, methods and research to translate principles into practices. Science and engineering ethics, 26(4), 2141-2168.*
41. *Nastoska, A., Jancheska, B., Rizinski, M., & Trajanov, D. (2025). Evaluating trustworthiness in AI: Risks, metrics, and applications across industries. Electronics, 14(13), 2717.*
42. *OECD. (2021). OECD principles on artificial intelligence. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.*
43. *Ogeawuchi, J. C., Sharma, A., Adekunle, B. I., Abayomi, A. A., & Onifade, O. (2024). Ethical Frameworks for AI Deployment in Financial Decision-Making: Balancing Profitability and Social Responsibility. International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology, 10(2), 905-917.*
44. *OLAWORE, S. O., OKOLI, C., ABIMBOLA, O., SERIFAT, B. U. U. U. D., OFURUM, A., & LEO, O. (2025). AI-Driven Cybersecurity Governance in Financial Services: Enhancing Ethical Auditing, Automated Compliance Monitoring and Explainable AI for Stakeholder Trust.*
45. *Oyasiji, O., Okesiji, A., Imediegwu, C. C., Elebe, O., & Filani, O. M. (2023). Ethical AI in financial decision-making: Transparency, bias, and regulation. International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology, 9(5), 453-471.*
46. *Pashang, S., & Weber, O. (2023). AI for sustainable finance: Governance mechanisms for institutional and societal approaches. In The ethics of artificial intelligence for the sustainable development goals (pp. 203-229). Cham: Springer International Publishing.*
47. *Pizzi, G., Scarpi, D., & Pantano, E. (2021). Artificial intelligence and the new forms of interaction: Who has the control when interacting with a chatbot?. Journal of Business Research, 129, 878-890.*
48. *PwC. (2023). Responsible AI in financial services: Practical ethics for intelligent automation. PricewaterhouseCoopers Global Report.*
49. *Radanliev, P. (2025). AI ethics: Integrating transparency, fairness, and privacy in AI development. Applied Artificial Intelligence, 39(1), 2463722.*
50. *Rahwan, I. (2018). Society-in-the-loop: programming the algorithmic social contract. Ethics and information technology, 20(1), 5-14.*
51. *Raji, I. D., Smart, A., White, R. N., Mitchell, M., Gebru, T., Hutchinson, B., ... & Barnes, P. (2020, January). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. In Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency (pp. 33-44).*
52. *Ranjan, P., Dahiya, S., Khunger, A., & Pandiya, D. K. (2024). AI in Finance optimization: A review of current technologies and future potential. International Journal of Global Innovations and Solutions (IJGIS).*
53. *Renn, O. (2017). Risk governance: coping with uncertainty in a complex world. Routledge.*
54. *Ridzuan, N. N., Masri, M., Anshari, M., Fitriyani, N. L., & Syafrudin, M. (2024). AI in the financial sector: The line between innovation, regulation and ethical responsibility. Information, 15(8), 432.*
55. *Shahim, A., Batenburg, R., & Vermunt, G. (2012, September). Governance, risk and compliance: A strategic alignment perspective applied to two case studies. In IFIP International Conference on Human Choice and Computers (pp. 202-212). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.*
56. *Stein, V., Wiedemann, A., & Bouten, C. (2019). Framing risk governance. Management Research Review, 42(11), 1224-1242.*
57. *Thiruma Valavan, A. (2023). AI Ethics and Bias: Exploratory study on the ethical considerations and potential biases in ai and data-driven decision-making in banking, with a focus on fairness, transparency, and accountability. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 20(2), 197-206.*

58. *Veale, M., & Binns, R. (2017). Fairer machine learning in the real world: Mitigating discrimination without collecting sensitive data. Big Data & Society, 4(2), 2053951717743530.*
59. *Weber, P., Carl, K. V., & Hinz, O. (2024). Applications of explainable artificial intelligence in finance – a systematic review of finance, information systems, and computer science literature. Management Review Quarterly, 74(2), 867-907.*
60. *Whittlestone, J., Nyrup, R., Alexandrova, A., & Cave, S. (2019, January). The role and limits of principles in AI ethics: Towards a focus on tensions. In Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (pp. 195-200).*
61. *Wieringa, M. (2020). What to account for when accounting for algorithms: A systematic literature review on algorithmic accountability. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT2020)*, 1–18.*