

# Ethics in the Software Development Process: From Codes of Conduct to Ethical Deliberation

Jan Gogoll  
jan.gogoll@bidt.digital

Niina Zuber  
niina.zuber@bidt.digital

Severin Kacianka  
severin.kacianka@tum.de

Timo Greger  
timo.greger@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Alexander Pretschner  
alexander.pretschner@tum.de

Julian Nida-Rümelin  
julian.nida-ruemelin@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

January 19, 2022

## Abstract

Software systems play an ever more important role in our lives and software engineers and their companies find themselves in a position where they are held responsible for ethical issues that may arise. In this paper, we try to disentangle ethical considerations that can be performed at the level of the software engineer from those that belong in the wider domain of business ethics. The handling of ethical problems that fall into the responsibility of the engineer have traditionally been addressed by the publication of Codes of Ethics and Conduct. We argue that these Codes are barely able to provide normative orientation in software development. The main contribution of this paper is, thus, to analyze the normative features of Codes of Ethics in software engineering and to explicate how their value-based approach might prevent their usefulness from a normative perspective. Codes of Conduct cannot replace ethical deliberation because they do not and cannot offer guidance because of their underdetermined nature. This lack of orientation, we argue, triggers reactive behavior such as “cherry-picking”, “risk of indifference”, “ex-post orientation” and the “desire to rely on gut feeling”. In the light of this, we propose to implement ethical deliberation within software development teams as a way out.

## 1 Introduction

Software systems play an ever more important role in our lives. The public debate focuses in particular on systems that decide or support decisions about high-stake issues that affect third parties, e.g. probation or creditworthiness [O’Neil, 2016, Eubanks, 2018, Noble, 2018]. As our reliance on software supported decisions increases, the demand for “ethically sound” software becomes more urgent. Software engineers and their companies find themselves in a position where they are held responsible for unwanted outcomes and biases that are rooted in the use of software or its development process (or - in case of AI - the way the software “learned” (was trained) and the data that was selected for this training or “learning”

process). While it seems inappropriate and short-sighted to shift responsibility entirely to developers, software companies still feel the need to address these issues and promote ethical informed development. This is true for two main reasons: First, companies face backlashes from unethical software both in legal as well as in reputational terms. Second, companies and their employees have an intrinsic motivation to create better and ethically sound software because it is the “right” thing to do.

In this paper, we will first, briefly clarify the domain of the problem. Not every ethical challenge a software company faces should be dealt with at the software-developer level (or the development team). In fact, many possible ethical issues, for instance the question if a specific software tool should be developed at all, fall into the wider domain of business ethics. After we have specified the possibilities and the domain of influence the software engineer actually has regarding the implementation of ethical values, we analyze one common approach to assist software engineers in their ethical decision making: Codes of Ethics and Codes of Conduct. Here we will show why CoCs are insufficient to successfully guide SEs. We identify five shortcomings of CoCs that make them ill equipped to provide guidance to the engineer. Finally, we will argue that an approach built on an ethical deliberation of the software engineer may be a way to enable SEs to build software that is “ethically sound”.

## 2 The Responsibility of Ethical Decision Making in SE Companies

It is of crucial importance to define the domain, the scope and the limit of ethical considerations that can be performed by software engineers and their respective teams, before we can address the question of what ethical software development should and can do. Many issues that seem to be the result of software (its development and use) are actually the result of certain business models that are deployed under certain political, legal, and cultural conditions. Therefore, these challenges need to be addressed at the level of business ethics rather than within the development process of software engineers. Consider the implications for the housing and rent markets that stem from the adoption of services such as AirBnB. This paper is not so much concerned with these questions but with a somewhat narrower domain: After a business decision has been made and ethical questions have (hopefully) been pondered on the level of management, the development teams still have some leeway in deciding how exactly to implement such a product. It is important to note that the amount of influence of both management and development teams changes over time. While the former has exclusive decision-making power in the early stages (for instance the decision whether a software should be created at all etc.), management has little control and influence in the concrete implementation of a software product. Here the developers, armed with the expertise on this concrete and very technical domain, realize the task or product within the parameters set beforehand. Naturally, these parameters will never be completely determined, thus providing the development teams with some leeway regarding the decision of implementation. If software engineers indeed have the possibility to alter the concrete product in a small but maybe ethically relevant manner, we must ask: How should they approach ethical questions and what tools may facilitate ethical considerations? It is this question the present paper focuses on. We developed an approach that aims at supporting the ethical deliberation process in software development teams and which we call “Ethical Deliberation in Agile Processes” [Zuber et al., 2020]. Figure 1 provides an overview over the different levels of ethical decision making in a company. This graph is obviously a stark simplification of reality, but it serves the purpose nonetheless. The fact that many decisions have already been made before developers are assigned with the implementation of a specific task has a great influence on the limits and the capabilities of ethical design at the level of

the software development teams.




Figure 1: The domain of EDAP and the different responsibilities.

Consider the following example which will come up again at a later point: Technological progress enables us to build a robot that offers support to the elderly which includes a potentially wide variety of tasks that may cover the entire field of geriatric care. Figure 1 illustrates the different layers of ethical decision making (pertaining to manufacturing said robot). Every organization is embedded into a web of social expectations, legal requirements and cultural norms. In our example it is politics and a societal discourse that establish if nursing robots are desirable at all. The eventually reached consensus is influenced by developments such as demographic transition in developed nations, the political goal of providing care for every senior citizen, and the overall burden of the healthcare system. Once it has been established that it is legal to build a specific product or artifact and a societal consensus has more or less been achieved, the technology may be tested (and introduced) and the management of a company can then decide to actually manufacture such a product (for an extreme example, consider the weapon industry). Next, a project team within the company will decide on the exact specifications of that specific product. The nursing robot's design can focus on different geriatric aspects, e.g. to only assist human care workers, to be fully autonomous in its care for an elderly human or to be deployed in specific places only such as hospitals where the robot's activity is subject to strict limitations and under constant human supervision. This initial requirements elicitation phase already addresses and decides several ethical questions. It is then only within the narrow confines of these

Domain	Issue	Output	Actors
1. Politics	Should the elderly be taken care of by robots?	Legal framework, societal and cultural conditions	Society
2. Strategy/ Business Ethics; Corporate Social Responsibility; Corporate Digital Responsibility	Should we build a robot that supports and cares for the elderly? What is the business model?	Project (approved)	Company/ Institution
3. Product Conceptualization (e.g. Design Thinking)	What capability should the robot possess?	(concrete) Requirements	Project Team, Sub division etc.
4. Development Process (e.g. Scrum)	How do we implement concrete features considering the given (above) parameters?	Product	Development Team

Table 1: Locating ethical questions.

specifications that a developer can and should influence the product’s design. Developers can, for example, choose a technology that protects the user’s privacy but still ensures the achieving of established business objectives. Our care robot might use video to interact with a patient, but it is perhaps possible to store the data in a privacy preserving way, or even to design the robot in such a way that the data does not need to be stored at all. Of course, if the software engineer realizes that a major higher-level ethical issue might have been overlooked and not taken into consideration, she has a duty to clarify and check whether the issue has indeed been overlooked. Table 1 provides an overview of different ethical questions as well as which actors make decisions and where ethical deliberation should be located.

Once we reach step 4, the decision to build the robot has already been made, the business model has been chosen and concrete demands have been outlined. Any remaining ethical questions must be dealt with by the software engineer or the development team. Of course there are differences between companies and corporate culture which in turn influences the degree of management’s involvement and to what extent it fosters ethical decision making at the development level. Yet, the developer usually has the greatest influence in translating ethical considerations into the product, when it comes to the concrete implementation of the task into software. If, as should be the case in agile organizations, teams are given high-level problems, e.g., “Find a way to keep birds off some property”, an ethical deliberation at engineer level will help to make explicit different options and weigh them in terms of ethical considerations, such as:

- A team member with a background in construction might suggest using spikes on rims and poles where birds like to sit.
- One with a background as a falconer might suggest getting a falcon to scare off other birds.
- A sound engineer might suggest using high pitched noises.

- An environmental activist will suggest catching and relocating the birds.

This example illustrates the possibilities and the sphere of influence of the engineer. It cannot and should not be the case that the engineer in this example has to decide whether it is ethically justifiable to limit the movement of birds at all. Rather, given the constraints set at higher levels and through decisions made earlier in the process, the engineer should focus on ethical considerations that are in her domain and where she can assert influence. Now that we have established the domain in which software engineers have “ethical” influence over an outcome, the question is then: How do we enable engineers to build software ethically and how do we adequately consider potential ethical issues and find solutions to these questions?

We have to acknowledge the fact that software engineers are usually not specifically educated in ethics and have not had intensive training or other experience in this domain. A prominent method to address the mismatch between the lack of ethical training and the impact a product might have and therefore the ethical attention it should receive has been the publication of Codes of Ethics and Codes of Conduct. In the following chapter we argue that this approach is ill equipped to achieve its intended purpose of being a useful guideline for software engineers. Even more, we argue that ethical deliberation cannot be delegated: neither to a machine nor by working off requirements as set by a checklist. Consequently, we must think and weigh up ethical issues for ourselves. Finally, we offer a proposal of how we might integrate ethical deliberation into the very process of software development.

### 3 Codes of Conducts and Codes of Ethics

One way of helping software engineers to detect and to deliberate ethical questions is to establish orientation through Codes of Ethics and Codes of Conduct (in the following the terms will be used interchangeably or simply referred to as CoCs) in order to give ethical guidance to engineers and management. CoCs, for instance published by institutions such as IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers), the ACM (Association of Computer Machinery), supranational institutions such as the EU High Level Expert Group on AI and UNDP, or the tech industry [Whittlestone et al., 2019] have a central, (self-)regulatory function in the discourse on the development of ethically appropriate software systems. They represent a more or less sufficiently complete and mature surrogate of various normative positions, values or declarations of intent, which ought to be implemented in an adequate form in the process of software development.

The main contribution of this paper is to analyze the normative features of CoCs in software engineering and to explicate how their value-based approach might prevent their usefulness from a normative perspective. To this end, we identify the most prominent kinds of values and principles in these codes, what kind of normative guidance they can provide, and what problems might arise from those CoCs that uphold a plethora of abstract values.

#### 3.1 Codes of Conducts, Values and Principles in AI and Software Engineering

Codes of Ethics (CoEs) or Codes of Conduct (CoCs) are intended to provide guidance to engineers that face ethically relevant issues and provide them with an overview of desirable values and principles. The ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct - for example - declares that:

“Computing professionals’ actions change the world. To act responsibly, they should reflect upon the wider impacts of their work, consistently supporting the public good. The ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (“the Code”) expresses the conscience of the profession. The Code is designed to inspire and guide the ethical conduct of all computing

professionals, including current and aspiring practitioners, instructors, students, influencers, and anyone who uses computing technology in an impactful way.” [Gotterbarn et al., 2018] Further, the ACM Code demands that computer professionals act in accordance to their general principles. The normative character of rules in the code suggest that engineers should behave as indicated by them and are judged according to these rules. Partly they are designed to be a self-commitment and partly they include legally binding obligations which are punishable. Of course, codes of conduct address a specific professional area and therefore remain specific in their formulation of certain values. Nevertheless, when we consider the nominative function of codes, the specification loses urgency, i.e. when we want to consider the normative requirements that codes should fulfill. We find the same normative requirements across all industries: “They are guiding principles designed to maintain values that inspire trust, confidence and integrity in the discharge of public services” [Secretariat, 2003]. The more precisely a range of handling can be defined, the more precise instructions can be given: Ethics Codes of Public Relations for example are even more blurred due unclear nature of the Public Relation domain than a specific medical ethics.

There exists a plethora of CoCs that are addressed to software engineers in general and developers working with artificial intelligence in particular. Initially, CoCs were introduced by businesses as a response to growing problems of corruption and misbehavior in business dealings. Over the years, the adoption of CoCs has spread to many other domains, especially engineering and medicine but also business. [Davis, 1998] has argued that “a code of professional ethics is central to advising individual engineers how to conduct themselves, to judging their conduct, and ultimately to understanding engineering as a profession”. CoCs would thus serve three main purposes: Firstly, they guide the individual engineer and help to avoid misbehavior. Secondly, they serve as a benchmark for other actors in a profession to judge potential behavior as “unethical” and thereby contributing to the reputation of the profession as a whole. Finally, they help to define the self-image of a profession by setting a rulebook for what a professional actor should or should not do - this might be particularly relevant for a comparatively young field such as software engineering. [Schwartz, 2001] outlines eight metaphors that describe how individuals may interpret CoCs: as a rulebook, a signpost, a mirror, a magnifying glass, a shield, a smoke detector, a fire alarm, or a club (ibid.). Questions of the CoCs’ effectiveness, however, have been raised early on. [Schwartz, 2001] conducted 57 interviews in the domain of business ethics and reported that less than half of the codes actually influence people’s behavior. [Kaptein and Schwartz, 2008] find mixed results regarding the relationship between CoCs and Corporate Social Responsibility performance of companies. More recently and specifically targeting CoCs aimed at software engineers, [McNamara et al., 2018] have conducted a vignette experiment to test the influence of CoCs on developers to no avail, stating that “explicitly instructing participants to consider the ACM code of ethics in their decision making had no observed effect when compared with a control group” (ibid.). While the jury is still out on the empirical effectiveness of CoCs, this paper is not overly concerned with answering this issue directly. Rather, this article attempts to show that CoCs conceptually fail in various ways when it comes to their main goal: Providing ethical guidance to software engineers who find themselves in uncertain situations.

Some research has been conducted that compares ethical codes and their values and tries to quantify them with the goal of establishing a potential consensus. The main focus of the current literature has been on CoCs that deal with the development of artificial intelligence systems. [Zeng et al., 2018, Fjeld et al., 2020, Jobin et al., 2019, Hagendorff, 2020] have analyzed what kind of values are prominent in Codes of Ethics in the field of artificial intelligence in order to provide an overview of the ethical principles that are deemed important for software engineers in this particular field. [Jobin et al., 2019], for instance,

coded 84 documents within the domain of AI CoCs and summarized eleven main principles (ordered according to the number of documents that contain the principle, descending): Transparency, Justice/Fairness, Non-maleficence, Responsibility, Privacy, Beneficence, Freedom/Autonomy, Trust, Sustainability, Dignity, and Solidarity. With “Transparency” being mentioned in 73 out of 84 (87%) to “Solidarity” with 6 mentions (7%), [Fjeld et al., 2020] explicitly undertook the task of analyzing CoCs to “map a consensus” (on the importance of principles) within the industry and the relevant governmental and NGO players. They, too, find principles similar to Jobin et al. They structure the content of the codes along “themes” which consist of values and principles that can reasonably be subsumed under said content. They list eight themes in total: Privacy, Accountability, Safety and Security, Transparency and Explainability, Fairness and Non-discrimination, Human Control of Technology, Professional Responsibility, and Promotion of Human Values. As mentioned above, a theme, in turn, consists of a set of principles. In the case of “privacy”, for instance, these principles are “Consent, Ability to Restrict Processing, Right to Erasure, [(Recommendation of)] Data Protection Laws, Control over the Use of Data, Right to Rectification, Privacy by Design, and Privacy (Other/General)” (ibid.). [Hagendorff, 2020] comes to similar results stating that “especially the aspects of accountability, privacy or fairness appear all together in about 80% of all guidelines and seem to provide the minimum requirements for building and using an ‘ethically sound’ AI system” (ibid.).

### 3.2 Codes of Conduct and their Normative Features

Although there are overlaps in the listed values, such as privacy and fairness, the recommendations for action derived from these values are quite different: The normative concepts that are identifiable in the CoCs (henceforth: “values”) differ in their accentuation of content depending on the originator (NGOs, GOs, companies, civil and professional actors) [Zeng et al., 2018], on the addressed product (drones, social platforms, work tracking tools, ...) as well as on the target group (technical companies, technical professionals, civil society, regulators, citizens). The Tech-Producer-User-Differentiation highlights that each actor issues different CoCs targeting different interests and necessities arising from their products or users. This means that the respective CoCs always pertain to a certain perspective. Hence, analyzing and addressing ethical recommendations of actions need to take these distinctions into account: origin, product dependency, and target group. Due to this differentiation of interest and purpose it is clear that striking differences exist in the prevalence of values as well as in their quality. [Zeng et al., 2018] find that the average topic frequency differs depending on the nature of the actor (government vs. academia/NGO vs. corporations). The issue of privacy, for instance, is highly present in government issued CoCs but (statistically) significantly lower in academic actors and even lower in corporations. These divergences can explain why CoCs converge on some core values, but at the same time differ tremendously in the emphasis they put on said values as well as on the respective sub-values. Hence, CoCs range from very abstract core-values (such as justice or human dignity) to detailed definitions of technical approaches (e.g. data differentiation) (see [Jobin et al., 2019]). Governmental CoCs, for example, support general and broad moral imperatives such as “AI software and hardware systems need to be human-centric” [HLEG, 2019, p.3] without further specification. Whereas corporations tend to favor compliance issues when taking on privacy.

## 4 An Analytical Approach: Why Software Codes of Conducts Fail to Guide

The majority of CoCs agree on core-values such as privacy, transparency, and accountability. Yet, CoCs diverge as soon as this level of abstraction must be supplemented with application-specific details or precise definitions of concepts. Moreover, we also encounter significant differences in the prioritisation of values and a derivation of focal points. Given these observations, the question is then: If CoCs are in broad agreement on core values, why do they differ in their statements? One reasonable explanation is that this difference is rooted in the very nature of values, namely their underdetermination. This underdetermination is directly linked to the problem that CoCs are barely able to provide normative orientation in software development. This lack of orientation, in turn, triggers reactive behavior such as “cherry-picking”, “risk of indifference” and “ex-post orientation”, which we will discuss below. Combined, these issues result in a desire to rely on gut feeling, so-called heuristics, that seemingly support (ethical) decision making without much effort. Unfortunately, all those short-cuts cannot substitute a proper ethical deliberation and thus do not allow for a well-considered decision. In the following this criticism will be laid out in more detail. Finally, it is argued that we must accept the challenge and consider how we can “master” normativity. The final section presents a way out of this situation.

### 4.1 The Problem of Underdetermination

Numerous CoCs contain values that are central to the ethical handling of software and that can hardly be reasonably disputed, such as the respect for human dignity or the claim that technology should be developed to serve mankind (humanistic perspective, a philosophical stance that puts emphasis on the value and (moral) agency of human beings (see [Nida-Rümelin and Weidenfeld, 2018, Nida-Rümelin, 2020])). Although the normativity of these values is by no means to be questioned or relativized and these values can certainly claim normative validity, it should be obvious that a reduction of an entire value system to these central (meta-)norms is neither sufficiently determined in a theoretical sense nor does it lead to immediate useful practical implications. Moreover, it is hard or impossible to deductively derive other values from these central values. In fact, they rather take on the role of general statements, which on their own cannot provide concrete and thus practical guidance. A normative value system outlined within a CoC is therefore very often underdetermined insofar as it cannot give clear instructions on what ought to be done in any specific individual case. As a result, CoCs lack practical applicability, because they do not offer normative orientation for specific ethical challenges that occur on a regular basis - meaning: it fails to achieve what it was initially created for. To make matters worse, due to the sheer number of different values proposed in the Codes, a fitting ethical value system to justify any possible action can be easily found since no ranking of values can be presented with regard to the concrete and specific case at hand.

Many CoCs contain a variety of values, which are presented in a merely itemized fashion. Without sufficient concretization, reference, contextualisation, and explanation, software engineers are left to themselves in juggling different values and compliance with each and everyone of them. . The nature of the values puts them inevitably in tension with each other when applied to the reality of software engineering (e.g. privacy vs. transparency or autonomy/freedom vs. safety - just to name a few). More often than not, the implementation of values ultimately requires a trade-off. Consider the example of transparency and privacy: Both values are mentioned in the majority of the codes, yet, it is generally infeasible to fully comply with both values simultaneously. Figure 2 shows a graphical representation of






Figure 2: Trade-Offs between values and the efficiency frontier. [Kearns and Roth, 2019] make a similar point about trade-offs regarding accuracy and fairness in machine learning. In their case the points would be machine learning models.

possible trade-offs between them. As long as the product is located in the upper right corner of the graph, it is possible to improve the situation by either increasing compliance with one value or the other (or even both) which means moving closer towards the respective axis of the coordinate system (here: towards the origin). Once the line is reached, however, it becomes impossible to increase compliance with one value without decreasing compliance with the other. This line is known as Pareto Optimality or the efficiency frontier. While it is certainly uncontroversial that the goal of software design should be a product that is efficiently optimizing the values we wanted to consider, it is by no means clear or obvious which point on the line, that is, which one of the many possible (pareto optimal) trade-offs, should be implemented. Consider, for instance, the case of an app that enables geo-tracking. The trade-off between privacy and transparency looks completely different if this app is used to implement an anti-doping regime to monitor professional athletes or as a navigation app that is used by the average citizen to find the shortest route to her vacation destination. In the former we might agree that professional athletes should give up more of their privacy in order to fight illegal doping, while we are appalled by the fact that the regular user of a navigation app is constantly tracked and monitored.

Yet, this is exactly the point where ethical deliberation and moral decision making come into play. CoCs, thus, do not offer any help to answer this question. In fact, they remain quiet about the very reason software engineers might consult them in the first place. The joint CoC from ACM and IEEE for instance states that “[t]he Code as a whole is concerned with how fundamental ethical principles apply to a computing professional’s conduct. The

Code is not an algorithm for solving ethical problems; rather it serves as a basis for ethical decision-making. When thinking through a particular issue, a computing professional may find that multiple principles should be taken into account, and that different principles will have different relevance to the issue. Questions related to these kinds of issues can best be answered by thoughtful consideration of the fundamental ethical principles” [Gotterbarn et al., 2018]. As long as we deal with win-win situations, CoCs can be applied but are of little use. As soon as we reach the problem of weighing legitimate ethical reasons and values they become rather useless. It is therefore unclear what it means that CoCs serve as the basis for ethical decision making when in fact the normative deliberation of the software engineer herself would constitute the footing of ethical behavior.

## 4.2 Unwanted Behavior as a Result of Underdetermination

**Cherry-picking Ethics:** Once Pareto optimality is achieved, any increase of compliance with one value must result in a decrease of compliance with the opposing one. It follows that in the applied case many different actions can be justified with recourse to various values from the same CoC (e.g. individual privacy vs. societal welfare). The CoC then becomes a one-stop shop offering an array of ethical values to choose from depending on which principle or value is (arbitrarily) deemed relevant in a certain situation. Coherent ethics, however, requires that ethical theory needs to cohere externally with our moral and general experience, beliefs, and conventions. Only then can ethical theory give an account for all the diversity of daily (normative) experiences while preserving internal coherence within an ethical theory e.g. using the utilitarian principle to form a consistent system of interrelated parts [De George, 2013]. Coherent ethics cannot be realized if codes of conduct are understood as arbitrary accumulations of values, from which we can select values more or less at random. Consequently, CoCs are unhelpful for solving difficult decision situations as they almost always offer the easy way out: there will always be a value which is easy to identify or cheaply to apply and implement. That is why CoCs lack normative guidance. This is also supported by basic economic theory and experience. People usually choose the path of least resistance or the cheapest implementation [Judy, 2009]. Unfortunately, this arbitrariness and thriftiness make it virtually impossible to achieve a well-founded, coherent normative perspective.

**Risk of Indifference:** Due to the shortcomings outlined above many CoCs seem to foster attitudes of indifference. Since they are often underdetermined and offer the possibility that any one particular Code of Conduct could be used to justify different and even contradictory actions, many Codes of Conduct could foster the danger of ethical indifference [Lillehammer, 2017]: They offer neither concrete nor abstract guidance and the normative function of the Code of Conduct is anything but guaranteed. Additionally, most Code of Conducts state obvious and uncontroversial values and ethical goals. In fact, their generic nature leaves the reader with the feeling that their gut feeling and practical constraints should have the final verdict when it comes to trade-offs.

**Ex-post Orientation:** In addition to the problem of broadly stated general values lacking practical orientation (“meta-values”), it is important to understand ethics not as a restriction of an action, but as an orientation or as an objective towards which the action should be directed, so that shared ways of life can be supported [Hausman, 2011]. However, since CoCs provide values that need to be considered but which are underdetermined due to their normative character, desired ethical values in their abstraction have little influence on the development process. The reason for this is that values are not process-oriented and do not include logically the means by which they can be achieved. This very nature of values may lead to the fact that values are often considered only afterwards, and just adapt actions, but do not align action accordingly. This is especially true for the domain of software engineering

where every newly developed tool is very context specific and it might be harder to bridge from abstract principles to the concrete situation compared to other forms of engineering. It is important to stress that ethical deliberation is more than weighing conflicting values, more than assessing consequences. We need to think about the desirability of objectives as well as about the normative orientation of action contexts in which technical artifacts are integrated. We must consider normativity in the course of system development. In the course of conceptualizing technical feasibility, we must address ethics from within since “(e)thics on the laboratory floor is predicated on the assumption that ethical reflection during research and development can help to reduce the eventual societal costs of the technologies under construction and to increase their benefits.” [Van der Burg and Swierstra, 2013, p. 2]. This is precisely what we hope to achieve with our EDAP scheme.

**The Desire for Gut Feelings:** The underlying motivation or the desired goal of a Code of Conduct or an ethical guideline in general could be to serve as a heuristic. Heuristics simplify and shorten the deliberation process in order to facilitate decisions. [Gigerenzer and Gaissmaier, 2011] describe them as “efficient cognitive processes, conscious or unconscious, that ignore part of the information. [...] using heuristics saves effort”. Yet, the use of heuristics in the moral domain seems to be distinctive to their application elsewhere, since they are based on “frequent foundation of moral judgments in the emotions, beliefs, and response tendencies that define indignation” [Sunstein, 2008]. One prominent example is the connection between disgust and moral judgement [Pizarro et al., 2011, Landy and Goodwin, 2015]. Especially, if novel situations and previously unseen problems arise there is little reason to believe that a heuristic that might have been a good fit in previous cases will also fit well into the new context. As soon as uncertainties arise because the objectives of actions are conflicting and no unerring automatic solution can be achieved by applying dispositions, conventions or moral rules, the resulting lack of normative orientation must be resolved by reflection [Dewey, 2002, Mead, 1923].

In sum, the underdetermination of values due to their universal character makes it impossible to deduce all possible specific, concrete applications of said value. Therefore, software engineers may make an rather arbitrary and impromptu choice when it comes to the values they want to comply with: picking whatever value is around or - as economists would say - in the engineer’s relevant set and which often justify actions that they want to believe to be right (this effect is called motivated reasoning, see [Kunda, 1990] and [Lodge and Taber, 2013]). And because of these two aspects - the lack of specificity as well as the resulting cherry-picking-mentality - we encounter an attitude of indifference [Spiekermann, 2015]. Furthermore, in many cases the system is only checked on normative issues at the end of the development process as some technology assessment (ex-post orientation). This tendency will most likely not lead to a change in preferences and the conceptualization of a software system is inconsistent in terms of its normative dimension as this process disregards normativity from the outset. Ultimately, this results in a desire for relying on gut feeling and not putting too much thought into it when solving all ethical vague issues. Consequently, we encounter diffuse and unjustified normative statements that are barely reliable. However, if we want to shape our world responsibly, we must deliberate rationally to understand and justify what we are doing for what cause.

### 4.3 Codes of Conduct Cannot Replace Ethical Reflection

In this paper we argue that CoCs are insufficient to ensure or enable ethical software development. At this point, we want to sketch out an alternative to the reliance on abstract values in the form of CoCs and instead relocate ethical deliberation deep within the development process. As a first step to offer reasonable and well-founded ethical guidance, the values affirmed in the CoCs must be made explicit and be classified with regard to their re-

spective context-dependent meaning as well as functional positions. Tangible conflicts must be resolved and formed into a coherent structure that guides action [DeMarco, 1997]. This process is a genuinely deliberative one which means it cannot be reasonably expected to be successful by using heuristics or detailed specifications that can be provided *ex ante*. In fact, it is not possible to classify decision-making rules with regard to individual cases, because values as such are context-independent and thus software engineers need assistance in their technical development - speaking philosophically to deliberate on issues rather casuistically than applying ethical principles [Jonsen et al., 1988]. And this is exactly what we are aiming at by implementing a systematic approach to ponder on individual cases. For instance, the value “privacy” needs to be handled differently depending on whether the context is technical or political. While privacy issues might be addressed technically (e.g., there might exist a possibility to store or process data while ensuring privacy) the political discourse about the question of what level or form of data collection itself is desirable remains unanswered. Thus, technological artefacts cannot be just evaluated from one perspective only, but need to be assessed against the backdrop of a multitude of categories such as authority, power relations, technical security, technical feasibility, and societal values (see also [Winner, 1978]). Hence, an “ethical toolbox” in this simple form can hardly exist. The ethical deliberation process can neither be externalized nor completely delegated as the example of Google and their handling of the “Right to be Forgotten” requests nicely illustrates [Corfield, 2018]. For at least some requests to delete some piece of information from the search results it ultimately came down to a software engineer who flagged it as a bug and effectively made the final decision without the legal team conducting a final review. Therefore delegation cannot be the single solution to ethical questions because oftentimes the ethical decision falls back on the engineer for very practical reasons (specialists are expensive or they face an overwhelming workload; there might even be a shortage of ethicists who possess enough domain knowledge in software engineering). On the contrary: ethical reflection and deliberation can and must be learned and practiced. It is a skill rather than a checklist (see also [Wedgwood, 2014]). Thus, the political goal of developing both a general and a specifically effective CoC cannot be methodologically separated from a practice of ethical deliberation and reflection. At least not as long as one is not willing to give up on the notions of usability and impact. This requires, from an ethical perspective, to raise awareness among all those involved therefore - software developers in particular - for ethical deliberation and its integration into the very process of the production of software systems. Especially regarding software development, the task of embedding ethical deliberations to agile environments with an emphasis on team empowerment (like SCRUM) seems to be a reasonable, worthwhile, and necessary approach (see also [López-Alcarria et al., 2019]). Although external ethical expertise can be called upon to guide the common discourse, active ethical deliberation remains irreplaceable. This is also the conclusion of the High-Level Expert Group on Ethical AI:

“Tensions may arise between [...] [ethical] principles, for which there is no fixed solution. In line with the EU fundamental commitment to democratic engagement, due process and open political participation, methods of accountable deliberation to deal with such tensions should be established.” [HLEG, 2019, p. 13]

While [McLennan et al., 2020] suggestion to staff an ethicist onto each project and every development team seems advantageous, it is hardly sensible or feasible. Not only would this produce unjustifiable costs on software companies but the increase in software development, a trend which will only grow in the future, there will probably be an actual shortage of capable ethicists with a basic understanding of software development. In order to tackle normative questions adequately, it is therefore crucial to train software engineers in ethical

issues and to implement a systematized deliberation process. This may very well be achieved by ethicists consulting on ethical deliberations in software development, yet the main goal remains: the empowerment of the individual development team regarding ethical deliberation and to implement ethics as a skill.

## 5 Ethical Deliberation Leads to Good Normative Design

Applied normative deliberation requires a structured, guided, and systematic approach to the assessment of values, their trade-offs as well as their implementation [Zuber et al., 2020]. Reflecting ethically upon technical artefacts to justify which features are reasonable is not a simple task since technology is neither only a means to a given end, nor is it an end in itself. It is also a practice that structures our social life. However, as [Mulvenna et al., 2017] point out, “[w]hile most agree that ethics in design is crucial, there is little effective guidance that enables a broader approach to help guide and signpost people when developing or considering solutions, regardless of the area, market, their own expertise.” This is also due to the fact that there is no such thing as one ethical approach that offers a strict principle or line of thought that is applicable to all normative questions with regard to information technological objects (e.g., this is one of the main problems with the question of fully autonomous driving: There is no single ethical principle that fully satisfies all normative positions and could be implemented). The field of digital ethics already covers many different questions, ranging from computer ethics discussing normative features of the professional ethos to machine ethics covering questions of how to design moral machines. Moreover, in applied ethics deontological or utilitarian principles are often used for a case evaluation. Yet, designing objects requires identifying moral issues and to react to said issues without limiting oneself to an in-detail argumentation that covers only a single ethical perspective. Take our daily routines and actions: we rarely evaluate all our options only in terms of their consequences or if they fit some universality test as Kant suggested. Making virtues the sole basis of our actions is also insufficient as some cases require reflection of the effects of our actions (c.f. [Ross, 1930, Nida-Rümelin, 2002, Nida-Rümelin, 2020]). What is more, it is not possible to deduce all its applications logically or analytically from a single (meta-)value. Therefore, the more software systems affect aspects of our daily lives, the greater the demand for thoughtful engineering practice in the form of a guided process to ensure ethically sound software. Instead of focusing on the search for a single ethical theory that is universally applicable, we need to introduce a practice of ethical engineering that is founded in theory. Expertise in ethical deliberation is pivotal for identifying potential ethical issues and addressing them properly, throughout the software development process. However, this is not to be confounded by an understanding of ethics as a theory or as a pure science, but rather as a type of dealing with normative matters.

This is what we intend to do in our framework “Ethical Deliberation in Agile Software Processes” (EDAP) [Zuber et al., 2020]. This approach seeks to normatively align technical objects in a targeted manner since it enables a goal-oriented, rational handling of values in technology design. Thus, we focus on the identification of values, their desirability and, finally, their integration into software systems. We try to achieve this in three steps: (1) descriptive ethics, (2) normative ethics and (3) applied ethics. Each step must be considered in relation to the concrete software application to be constructed.

1. Descriptive ethics should facilitate access to the world of values: which values serve as orientation? Descriptive value analysis, which has emerged from the CoCs, is thus integrated into the deliberation process and serves primarily as guidance. Software developers become aware of the relevant topics within the industry in particular and

society in general and to identify their companies, societies as well as their own values regarding the object in question.

2. Normative ethics will scrutinize the selected values, evaluate them and subject them to an ethical analysis: Are the software features to be constructed desirable in so far as that we would like them to be applied in all (similar) situations (test of universality)? Do the benefits outweigh the costs given an uncertain environment (test of consequentialism)? Which attitudes do software developers, users or managers address explicitly and implicitly? Which dispositions should the designed software program promote? Which desirable attitudes are undermined (test of virtue ethics)? And finally, how do these answers fit into the desirable life, which means the optimization of our decision not only in regard to its consequences but also as the most choiceworthy action in regard to the way of life we favor [Rawls, 2009, DePaul, 1987, Gibbard, 1990, Wedgwood, 2014, Wedgwood, 2017, Nida-Rümelin, 2019, Nida-Rümelin, 2020].
3. Applied ethics, then, has to achieve even more: not only must one evaluate the individual case in order to reach a decision, but the final normative judgment must also account for technical possibilities and limitations - in other words: any solution must be technically implementable. The latter is the interface to value sensitive design, which is an “approach to the design of technology that accounts for human values in a principled and comprehensive manner throughout the design process” [Friedman et al., 2002, Nissenbaum, 2005, Friedman and Hendry, 2019]. It is, therefore, a form of technically implemented ethics and - at the same time - an imperative to the technician herself: Be value-sensitive! For this reason we advocate the name “normative design”.

It is of the utmost importance that if human-machine interaction allows for human values to be respected, technological artifacts must trace an image of the possible normative distortions or amplifications of attitudes, rules or behaviors that result from them: It must be made clear how artefacts structure attitudes and actions. This calls for an ethical analysis. George Herbert Mead emphasizes that ethics can only suggest the method of dealing rationally with values and that these, in turn, are dependent on specific circumstances:

“The only rule that an ethics can present is that an individual should rationally deal with all the values that are found in a specific problem. That does not mean that one has to spread before him all the social values when he approaches a problem. The problem itself defines the values. It is a specific problem and there are certain interests that are definitely involved; the individual should take into account all of those interests and then make out a plan of action which will rationally deal with those interests. That is the only method that ethics can bring to the individual.” [Mead, 1934].

To highlight the impossibility of (logical) reductiveness and thus the necessity of rational deliberation, consider again the following scenario from the beginning: A software and robotics engineering team is tasked to construct a nursing roboter for the elderly. This system is supposed to take care of individuals, i.e. help them when they fall, contact the ambulance in case of an emergency, etc. The first step is to hermeneutically understand the scenario. In order to create a normatively appropriate system, it is important to locate the essential desirable values and discuss their exclusivity. To this end, one must identify normatively desirable “anchor points” and consequently examine them in regard to their relationality. Values and their interconnectedness cannot simply be logically derived from the description of the situation. In the nursing-robot case, we are concerned with the desirable objective of being able to lead a self-determined life for as long as possible. Regarding technical features,

such a system may include a built-in-camera and an audio microphone to receive voice commands to track the patient’s position in order to guarantee an adequate reaction, e.g. calling for help in case of an emergency or assisting in getting back up if no injury is detected. Additionally, the stored data may give doctors the possibility to check for progression of dementia or other illnesses or to detect potential diseases through interpretation of these images using artificial intelligence. Much else is conceivable depending on objectives, funding, technological progress, and potential legal issues. Normatively speaking, the system enhances desired core values such as autonomy and wellbeing. A nursing robot that is not only technically robust and safe, but also constructed in accordance with the relevant normative standards still classifies critical situations, but this is done in a respectful, humane manner. In order to create systems that are - at least in principle - normative adequate, we must ask which values are at risk when promoting autonomy by implementing a camera or audio-recording system. In this specific case privacy concerns seem dominant. Thus, we have to ensure privacy while enabling autonomy which means, for instance, that people may not want to be filmed naked and do not want to disclose the location of their valuables etc. Furthermore, people may want to know who has access to the data, what kind of data is stored, why and where. In a perfect scenario, access to the data is exclusively limited to doctors who may use it to predict and treat illnesses (medical prevention). Even these basic normative considerations cannot be logically derived from the premise of promoting welfare and autonomy. We need to reason normatively to understand and highlight the ethical issues at hand while simultaneously using our empirical knowledge of the world. Consequently, technical solutions such as visual or audio recording systems must be developed in such a way that they would not record certain scenes at all or in case, where recording is medically necessary, recording must ensure a fair autonomy-privacy ratio by using specific techniques such as cartooning or blurring [Padilla-López et al., 2015]. Other normative issues result from using certain techniques that may meet transparency requirements. Users want to know how recommendations are made and what reactions they can expect. A non-technical normative deliberation is whether it is desirable to live with an assistance system at home by oneself even if the system considers relevant normative aspects. These kinds of ethical concerns are not addressed within our ethical deliberation tool as we already outlined at the beginning. We focus on software development from the engineer’s perspective. Whether or not there should be a nursing robot in the first place is a question that falls into the domain of (business) ethics and cannot be decided on the level of the software developer. As mentioned at the beginning, management needs to tackle these questions, and consider the legal framework as well as other basic norms of society. The ethical deliberation of the developer, however, begins with the specific implementation of the technical object. For instance: The above-mentioned need for visual observation seems to be obvious - after all, the robot needs to “see” its surroundings in order to be a useful tool. Yet, there are many ways to implement the visual capabilities of the robot and to safeguard the privacy of individuals (cartooning, blurring etc.). At this point the software developer usually has the freedom (and therefore the responsibility) to deliberate on which specific implementation to use.

At this point we would like to take it one step further than van der [Van der Burg and Swierstra, 2013] and highlight that not only societal costs may be reduced and profits of the developing firm may be increased. Taking normative issues seriously from the very beginning of a development project may lead to more effective systems and processes - especially in the long-run. We must understand that technology transforms and systematizes our lives. And that it does so with a certain requirement for behavioral adaptation by the user or those affected by the system in order to ensure the functionality of the system. Hence, technology structures normatively the world we live in. This means we need to take normativity as we encounter it in our daily lives seriously and think about the technical artefact as being

a part of it, i.e. only then we can understand that an ethical deliberation is not only a deliberation of trade-offs. Moreover, we can highlight how the artefact can be normatively integrated into our daily routines. This means also to think about the compatibility of algorithms, data sources and inputs, such as control commands, but also front-end design, such as readability to make sure that some desired normative features are technically well met [Simon, 2012, Friedman and Hendry, 2019]. Normativity, thus, is not to be understood as some qualifier, but rather as a condition that enables specific desirable practices of daily life [Rip, 2013].

## 6 A Paradigm Shift: From CoCs to Ethical Deliberation in the Software Development Process

CoCs are difficult to use as normative guidelines for technical software development due to their underdetermined character. They may trigger behavior such as indifference or the cherry-picking of specific ethical values. Thus, they are of little immediate use during the software development processes. Since CoCs lack direct real-world applicability, ethical values may only be chosen after the product is finished depending on which values “fit” (are most compatible with the existing product). However, in order to build an ethically sound system, it is essential to consider normative issues during the development process. Only when integrating values from within the development process, engineers will be able to consciously build software systems that reflect normative values. This will foster an understanding of how technological artefacts act as normatively structuring agents and improve the chances of creating ethically informed software systems. In contrast to related work, we suggest moving from a simple application of “ethical heuristics” to a point where we treat ethical thinking as a skill that has to be practiced and can be embedded deeply into the software development process. Consequently, ethical deliberation must not be limited to ethics councils, company advisory boards or other special committees. Rather, it needs to be practiced and shaped by the software developers who create and intricately understand the technical system. This approach would lead to ethical empowerment of software engineers, as part of the empowerment trend that we see in agile software development anyway. It is important to outline that developers should only be concerned with ethical issues that belong to their field of competence and the area they can actually affect. Ethical issues outside the scope of a single developer can then be delegated to other instances of the organization. In this sense the ethical deliberation of software developers can also lead to a positive form of whistle blowing when an ethical issue is detected during the implementation process that has gone unnoticed by decision makers of the company.

## References

- [Corfield, 2018] Corfield, G. (2018). Here is how Google handles Right To Be Forgotten requests. . [https://www.theregister.com/2018/03/19/google\\_right\\_to\\_be\\_forgotten\\_request\\_proces](https://www.theregister.com/2018/03/19/google_right_to_be_forgotten_request_proces). [Online; acc. 2020-10-31].
- [Davis, 1998] Davis, M. (1998). Thinking like an engineer. *Studies in the Ethics of a Profession*, page 143.
- [De George, 2013] De George, R. T. (2013). Ethics and coherence. *The American Philosophical Association Centennial Series*, pages 717–732.
- [DeMarco, 1997] DeMarco, J. P. (1997). Coherence and applied ethics. *Journal of applied philosophy*, 14(3):289–300.



- [DePaul, 1987] DePaul, M. R. (1987). Two conceptions of coherence methods in ethics. *Mind*, 96(384):463–481.
- [Dewey, 2002] Dewey, J. (2002). *Human nature and conduct*. Courier Corporation.
- [Eubanks, 2018] Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin’s Press.
- [Fjeld et al., 2020] Fjeld, J., Achten, N., Hilligoss, H., Nagy, A., and Srikumar, M. (2020). Principled artificial intelligence: Mapping consensus in ethical and rights-based approaches to principles for ai. *Berkman Klein Center Research Publication*, (2020-1).
- [Friedman and Hendry, 2019] Friedman, B. and Hendry, D. G. (2019). *Value sensitive design: Shaping technology with moral imagination*. Mit Press.
- [Friedman et al., 2002] Friedman, B., Kahn, P., and Borning, A. (2002). Value sensitive design: Theory and methods. *University of Washington technical report*, (2-12).
- [Gibbard, 1990] Gibbard, A. (1990). *Wise choices, apt feelings: A theory of normative judgment*. Harvard University Press.
- [Gigerenzer and Gaissmaier, 2011] Gigerenzer, G. and Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic decision making. *Annual review of psychology*, 62:451–482.
- [Gotterbarn et al., 2018] Gotterbarn, D., Brinkman, B., Flick, C., Kirkpatrick, M. S., Miller, K., Vazansky, K., and Wolf, M. J. (2018). Acm code of ethics and professional conduct.
- [Hagendorff, 2020] Hagendorff, T. (2020). The ethics of ai ethics: An evaluation of guidelines. *Minds and Machines*, pages 1–22.
- [Hausman, 2011] Hausman, D. M. (2011). *Preference, value, choice, and welfare*. Cambridge University Press.
- [HLEG, 2019] HLEG, A. (2019). High-level expert group on artificial intelligence. *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI*.
- [Jobin et al., 2019] Jobin, A., Ienca, M., and Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of ai ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9):389–399.
- [Jonsen et al., 1988] Jonsen, A. R., Toulmin, S., and Toulmin, S. E. (1988). *The abuse of casuistry: A history of moral reasoning*. Univ of California Press.
- [Judy, 2009] Judy, K. H. (2009). Agile principles and ethical conduct. In *2009 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- [Kaptein and Schwartz, 2008] Kaptein, M. and Schwartz, M. S. (2008). The effectiveness of business codes: A critical examination of existing studies and the development of an integrated research model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(2):111–127.
- [Kearns and Roth, 2019] Kearns, M. and Roth, A. (2019). *The ethical algorithm: The science of socially aware algorithm design*. Oxford University Press.
- [Kunda, 1990] Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated inference. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3):480–498.
- [Landy and Goodwin, 2015] Landy, J. F. and Goodwin, G. P. (2015). Does incidental disgust amplify moral judgment? a meta-analytic review of experimental evidence. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(4):518–536.

- [Lillehammer, 2017] Lillehammer, H. (2017). The nature and ethics of indifference. *The Journal of Ethics*, 21(1):17–35.
- [Lodge and Taber, 2013] Lodge, M. and Taber, C. S. (2013). *The rationalizing voter*. Cambridge University Press.
- [López-Alcarria et al., 2019] López-Alcarria, A., Olivares-Vicente, A., and Poza-Vilches, F. (2019). A systematic review of the use of agile methodologies in education to foster sustainability competencies. *Sustainability*, 11(10):2915.
- [McLennan et al., 2020] McLennan, S., Fiske, A., Celi, L. A., Müller, R., Harder, J., Ritt, K., Haddadin, S., and Buyx, A. (2020). An embedded ethics approach for ai development. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2(9):488–490.
- [McNamara et al., 2018] McNamara, A., Smith, J., and Murphy-Hill, E. (2018). Does acm’s code of ethics change ethical decision making in software development? In *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 729–733.
- [Mead, 1923] Mead, G. H. (1923). Scientific method and the moral sciences. *The International Journal of Ethics*, 33(3):229–247.
- [Mead, 1934] Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*, volume 111. Chicago University of Chicago Press.
- [Mulvenna et al., 2017] Mulvenna, M., Boger, J., and Bond, R. (2017). Ethical by design: A manifesto. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics 2017*, pages 51–54.
- [Nida-Rümelin, 2002] Nida-Rümelin, J. (2002). *Ethische essays*, volume 1565. Suhrkamp Publishers.
- [Nida-Rümelin, 2019] Nida-Rümelin, J. (2019). *Structural Rationality and Other Essays on Practical Reason*, volume 52. Springer.
- [Nida-Rümelin, 2020] Nida-Rümelin, J. (2020). *Eine Theorie praktischer Vernunft*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- [Nida-Rümelin and Weidenfeld, 2018] Nida-Rümelin, J. and Weidenfeld, N. (2018). *Digitaler Humanismus: eine Ethik für das Zeitalter der künstlichen Intelligenz*. Piper ebooks.
- [Nissenbaum, 2005] Nissenbaum, H. (2005). Values in technical design. *Encyclopedia of science, technology, and ethics*, pages 66–70.
- [Noble, 2018] Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.
- [O’Neil, 2016] O’Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Broadway Books.
- [Padilla-López et al., 2015] Padilla-López, J. R., Chaaaraoui, A. A., and Flórez-Revuelta, F. (2015). Visual privacy protection methods: A survey. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 42(9):4177–4195.
- [Pizarro et al., 2011] Pizarro, D., Inbar, Y., and Helion, C. (2011). On disgust and moral judgment. *Emotion Review*, 3(3):267–268.

- [Rawls, 2009] Rawls, J. (2009). *A theory of justice*. Harvard university press.
- [Rip, 2013] Rip, A. (2013). Pervasive normativity and emerging technologies. In *Ethics on the laboratory floor*, pages 191–212. Springer.
- [Ross, 1930] Ross, W. (1930). *The right and the good* oxford: Oxford university press.
- [Schwartz, 2001] Schwartz, M. (2001). The nature of the relationship between corporate codes of ethics and behaviour. *Journal of business ethics*, 32(3):247–262.
- [Secretariat, 2003] Secretariat, T. B. (2003). Values and ethics code for the public service. *Ottawa. Available at www.tbs-sct.gc.ca*.
- [Simon, 2012] Simon, J. (2012). E-democracy and values in design. In *Proceedings of the XXV World Congress of IVR*.
- [Spiekermann, 2015] Spiekermann, S. (2015). *Ethical IT innovation: A value-based system design approach*. CRC Press.
- [Sunstein, 2008] Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Some effects of moral indignation on law. *Vt. L. Rev.*, 33:405.
- [Van der Burg and Swierstra, 2013] Van der Burg, S. and Swierstra, T. (2013). *Ethics on the laboratory floor*. Springer.
- [Wedgwood, 2014] Wedgwood, R. (2014). Rationality as a virtue.
- [Wedgwood, 2017] Wedgwood, R. (2017). *The value of rationality*. Oxford University Press.
- [Whittlestone et al., 2019] Whittlestone, J., Nyrup, R., Alexandrova, A., and Cave, S. (2019). 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*, pages 195–200.
- [Winner, 1978] Winner, L. (1978). *Autonomous technology: Technics-out-of-control as a theme in political thought*. Mit Press.
- [Zeng et al., 2018] Zeng, Y., Lu, E., and Huangfu, C. (2018). Linking artificial intelligence principles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.04814*.
- [Zuber et al., 2020] Zuber, N., Kacianka, S., Pretschner, A., and Nida-Rümelin, N. (2020). Ethical Deliberation for Agile Software Processes: The EDAP Manual. In *Digital Transformation and Ethics*. Ecowin Verlag.