



JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY, POLICY AND STRATEGIC STUDIES

Volume 2, Number 4 (September, 2026)

ISSN: 1595-9457 (online); 3043-4211 (print)

Website: <https://jppssuniuyo.com/> Email: jppssuniuyo@gmail.com

Received: August 21, 2026 Accepted: September 14, 2026 Published: September 30, 2026

Citation: Oriwoh, Victoria E. & Abam, Michael E. (2026). "Research Ethics and the Utilization of Artificial Intelligence in Conflict Studies." *Journal of Philosophy, Policy and Strategic Studies*, 2 (4): 122-132.

Article

Open Access

RESEARCH ETHICS AND THE UTILIZATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN CONFLICT STUDIES

Victoria Ebosetale Oriwoh¹ & Michael E. Abam²

Department of Political Science, Edo University, Iyamo, Edo State¹

Department of Political Science/General Studies, Western Delta University, Oghara, Delta State²

Corresponding Email: mikeabam@gmail.com²

Abstract

This paper examined the ethical implications of the utilization of artificial intelligence (AI) in conflict studies research. In recent years, AI has increasingly been adopted in conflict research to enhance data collection, analysis, prediction, and early warning systems. However, the sensitive nature of conflict studies raises concerns about whether existing research ethics frameworks are adequate to regulate the ethical challenges introduced by AI. The paper was guided by three objectives: to examine how the utilization of AI raises ethical challenges in conflict studies research; to identify the forms of AI currently utilized and their analytical purposes; and to assess the adequacy of existing research ethics frameworks in addressing AI-related ethical concerns. The paper adopted a descriptive research design, and relied on secondary sources of data, which were presented and analyzed thematically. Findings revealed that while AI significantly improves the analytical depth and predictive capacity of conflict research, its utilization raises major ethical concerns such as lack of transparency and explainability, algorithmic bias, data privacy and ownership issues, and weak accountability mechanisms. The study further found that machine learning, natural language processing, and big data analytics are the major forms of AI currently utilized in conflict studies for pattern recognition, predictive modelling, and scenario simulation. However, existing ethical frameworks were found to be only partially adequate, as they do not sufficiently address AI-specific ethical complexities in conflict-sensitive environments. The paper therefore recommended the development of context-sensitive and enforceable

ethical guidelines to ensure responsible, transparent, and accountable utilization of AI in conflict studies research.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Conflict Research, Ethical Guidelines, Research Ethics, ChatGPT.

Introduction

In recent years, scholars have argued that Artificial Intelligence (AI) has grown to become an important tool in the conduct of academic research, including peace and conflict studies. However, due to the sensitivity surrounding conflict studies, research ethical standards such as confidentiality, informed consent, and accurate information are very necessary in the field of study (Fujii, 2018). These ethical obligations are further emphasized in conflict situations where misinformation, misrepresentation, or misuse of data can escalate tensions or endanger lives. In line with this, Wood (2016) asserted that new methodological tools and designs introduced into conflict research must be analyzed through a strong ethical lens. The introduction of Artificial Intelligence into the delicate research space of conflict studies raises new questions about the efficiency of existing ethical frameworks. Fjelde and Hultman (2014) highlighted that AI techniques such as machine learning, big data analytics, and natural language processing are now introduced to analyze conflict patterns, make predictions, and support early warning signs. Bode and Huelss (2018) argued that with these new technologies, researchers are able to conveniently process large volumes of conflict-related data derived from news reports, social media platforms, satellite imagery, or policy documents. These are tasks that were previously time-consuming and difficult to solve using earlier methodological approaches. In conflict studies, where data is required to be accurate and timely, artificial intelligence has become a welcome means of improving the analytical depth and predictive capacity of conflict research (Bode and Huelss, 2018). Regardless of this, scholars and researchers in the field of conflict studies have raised concerns about the need to critically examine the ethical implications of the use of AI in conflict research, as AI in research introduces ethical challenges that traditional research ethics frameworks were not properly designed to address. According to Resnik and Hosseini (2024), the use of AI techniques for analytical tasks and critical research work in conflict studies raises concerns about who is accountable for flawed or harmful research outcomes. In line with this, Floridi *et al.* (2018) further stated that, considering the fact that most research in conflict studies is delicate and sensitive, as its outcomes often address vulnerable and affected populations, the wrong use of AI can create misleading and incorrect conflict narratives or rely on opaque algorithms, which can in turn lead to the marginalization of vulnerable groups and the creation of biased datasets.

Mittelstadt *et al.* (2016) identified lack of transparency, algorithmic bias, inaccurate information, unclear data ownership, and lack of accountability for AI-generated data and outputs, as some of the ethical issues researchers tend to face in the utilization of AI for critical research work. These ethical concerns are particularly significant in conflict studies, where research outputs often influence policy decisions, security responses, and peace-building interventions affecting vulnerable populations. Scholars have argued that non-transparent and unexplained AI systems make it difficult for researchers to identify how conclusions are reached, thereby limiting the ability to verify findings or identify biases within datasets (Floridi *et al.*, 2018; Jobin, Ienca and Vayena, 2019). Furthermore, the absence of clear accountability mechanisms for AI-assisted research raises questions about responsibility when there is a flaw in data interpretation, or harmful research

recommendations (Resnik and Hosseini, 2024). In conflict research, such shortcomings may contribute to the marginalization of affected communities, or misrepresentation of complex conflict dynamics. This supports the claim that, as much as the introduction of AI offers numerous methodological advantages, it simultaneously introduces ethical concerns that challenges conventional research practices and existing ethical frameworks in conflict studies.

There have been various arguments on how newly introduced AI techniques and frameworks require localization to reflect communal values and conflict dynamics within specific regions, particularly in contexts such as Nigeria, where the adoption of AI in research is advancing faster than the development of context-specific ethical guidelines (Abebe *et al.*, 2020; Ewuoso and Hall, 2023). International bodies such as the OECD (2019) and UNESCO (2021) have also supported this position. In Nigeria, where complex conflict situations ranging from insurgency to banditry persist, the absence of clear ethical guidance for AI utilization increases the risk of data exploitation or policy decisions that may further worsen insecurity. By examining how AI is utilized in conflict studies and assessing the ethical implications of its use, research can be conducted in a more responsible, transparent, and context-sensitive manner. It is against this backdrop that this study examines research ethics and the utilization of artificial intelligence in conflict studies, with the aim of strengthening ethical standards within peace and conflict research.

Conceptualizing Research Ethics Problematic

As a result of the increasing use of artificial intelligence in conflict studies, the methods through which conflict researchers gather, analyze, and interpret data have significantly evolved. Fjelde and Hultman (2014) supported this view by noting that the development of AI in conflict analysis has been widely documented by researchers, as AI-based methods are now frequently employed to analyze large volumes of conflict related data. Similarly, Bode and Huelss (2018), argued that AI makes it possible for researchers to collect and analyze data more efficiently and thoroughly than using existing research methods, and these advancements have greatly improved conflict studies' analytical capabilities. Artificial intelligence technologies have introduced new techniques such as machine learning, natural language processing, and also big data analytics into conflict studies research space, and these techniques are used to enhance early warning systems, conflict prediction, and also pattern recognition in complex conflict environments. Despite the methodological advantages possessed with the use of AI in conflict studies research, various studies have shown it utilization also raises significant ethical challenges that are not sufficiently solved by traditional research ethics frameworks. Scholars like Jobin, Ienca and Vayena (2019) observed that the majority of current AI ethics standards lack adequate localization and are high-level and globally oriented. In the absence of strong and context-sensitive ethical principles, AI systems may unintentionally promote dominant or biased patterns, thereby creating inaccurate results or policy recommendations that may lead to the marginalizing of vulnerable populations (Birhane, 2021). Consequently, these studies collectively show that existing research ethics frameworks are ill-suited to handle the ethical challenges associated with an AI utilized conflict research, as they were primarily designed to direct human led research processes rather than automated and data-intensive analytical systems.

The growing application of artificial intelligence in conflict studies has been recognized by researchers and scholars, who have emphasized the technology's potential to improve data processing, prediction, and early warning systems. However, a large portion of the existing literature analyzed this evolution in a disjointed manner. While some literature

focused on the analytical capabilities of AI in conflict research, others discussed ethical principles in AI governance more broadly, often without sufficient attention to the specific methodological realities of conflict studies. This shows that there is little systematic investigation of how these ethical challenges explicitly manifest in conflict studies research practice, despite the widespread recognition of ethical concerns associated with the use of AI. There is a gap in knowledge about how AI-driven techniques changes research conduct, transparency, and ethical decision-making in conflict-sensitive environments because the majority of ethical discussions are either abstract or technology-focused. By carefully examining the ethical issues generated up by AI in conflict research, identifying the forms and analytical purpose of AI tools used, and critically evaluating the suitability of current research ethics frameworks in addressing ethical challenges associated with artificial intelligence in conflict studies, this paper aims to close this gap.

Conceptual Clarification Literature and Review

Artificial Intelligence: Floridi *et al.* (2018) described artificial intelligence (AI) as systems capable of processing large volumes of data, learning from experience, and producing outputs that support or automate decision-making. In other words, artificial intelligence refers to the ability for computer systems and machines to perform tasks that ordinarily require human reasoning, learning, and intelligence. These capabilities enable AI systems to generate solutions to problems, aid decision-making, and enhance pattern recognition. Similarly, Kaplan and Haenlein (2019) conceptualized AI as a system that can extract data, interpret data, learn from such data, and utilize these learnings to achieve specific goals through flexible adaptation. Contemporary studies have emphasized that AI is not a single technology but rather a collection of diverse computational techniques and tools designed to evolve, understand, and adapt human learning processes. Russell and Norvig (2021) posited that AI functions through the design of intelligent agents that perceive and analyse their environments and act in ways that maximize the achievement of specified goals. Consequently, artificial intelligence functions as an umbrella term encompassing various approaches, including machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing, and expert systems, all of which collectively aim to replicate elements and features of human intelligence through computational methods (Olojede and Polo, 2025).

Historically, Bellaby (2024) noted that artificial intelligence emerged in the mid-twentieth century when early pioneers in computer science introduced the idea that machines could perform tasks traditionally associated with human intelligence. Ever since its emergence, AI has evolved significantly, shifting from rule-based systems to data-driven machine learning models, a transition that forms the foundation of most modern AI applications (Saleh, 2019). This evolution, has further led to the data-driven machine system, having similar characteristics with the human learning process. In this regard, Olojede and Polo (2025) identified some key characteristics, including the ability to predict and adapt, make decisions independently, engage in continuous learning, adopt forward-looking analytical capabilities, and perform observation-based functions. An effective utilization of artificial intelligence enhances efficiency, speeds up analytical processes, and reduces the level of direct human intervention in research activities, thereby making AI an important aspect in our lives and society (Riedl, 2019). In the field of conflict studies, the evolution of AI has facilitated the possibility of large and diverse datasets analysis, process social media content and satellite feeds, identify emerging conflict patterns, and assess potential escalation of violence before its manifestation (Usman, 2025). As a result, AI is increasingly

embedded in conflict studies research processes relating to data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Artificial intelligence is made up diverse parts and analytical techniques, each with specific methodologies for how research is designed and conducted. One defining feature of modern AI is its capacity to learn from data rather than rely solely on fixed rules. In the context of conflict studies, this development is particularly important because conflict dynamics are complex, non-linear, and shaped by multiple interacting factors (Bellaby, 2024). Consequently, AI's ability to analyze complex datasets enhances its relevance as a research tool for understanding contemporary conflict environments, while also raising important ethical considerations.

Concept of Research Ethics

Before making a clarification of 'research ethics.' It is pertinent we attempt a definition of the broader concept of ethics. Ethics the discipline concerned with what is morally good and bad, right and wrong. The word 'ethos' originally referred to a person's character (Valsquez, 2017). In the same vein, (Trevino, 2017) sees ethics as a set of moral principles or values that govern the conduct of an individual or a group. It is not a list of rules, but a way of making decisions about what is right or wrong. Consequently, research ethics establishes the basis upon which a researcher may conduct their research without causing harm to others, exploiting others, or contributing to injustice, or unjust outcomes. Research ethics are set of rules and guidelines established as a foundation to measure what is acceptable and how research should be conducted in its design, data collection, data analysis, as well as research reporting. According to Resnik (2020), Research Ethics is about applying moral values, such as honesty, respect, accountability, and fairness to scientific inquiry. Emanuel et al. (2004) further defined a number of core principles of ethics for research practice, including: respect for persons, beneficence, justice; informed consent, confidentiality, and scientific integrity. These ethical principles have been incorporated into various global research frameworks, and have continued to influence current academic practices across disciplines. Based on the principles of research ethics, to demonstrate respect for persons, researchers must ensure that each participant in their study has given voluntary, informed consent prior to participation, and be aware of the potential risks of participating. Researchers must also be able to maximizing benefit and minimizing risk of participation and adhere to the principle of justice and ensuring equal access to the benefits of the research. Additionally, protecting the confidentiality and sensitive data of participants protects their rights, especially in highly politicized or sensitive social settings. Resnik (2020) posited that these are the major reasons why ethics was introduced in research practice. Overall, these principles serve to not only regulate the guidelines of data collection, but it is also used for data analysis, data storage, data presentation, and the protection of participants for the research.

Research ethics is particularly important in conflict studies as most research work are often related to experiences of people affected by war, displacement, security actors, insurgents, or other politically-exposed groups. Consequently, in most conflict areas, there are high power imbalances between various actors, and this makes it difficult for researchers to remain neutral. In line with this, Fujii (2018) argued that most conflict studies research is often characterized by fear, trauma, inequalities of power, and political sensitives, especially because of the environment the research is revolved around in, and for this reason, conflict research are rarely neutral. Failure to adhere to ethical principles within this environment could result in exposing participants to significant levels of risk, distorting the narrative of conflict, or undermining peace building initiatives. The increasing use of artificial intelligence in research has created new ethical challenges that traditional frameworks were not

designed to address, and the complex nature and sensitivity of conflict environment make ethical norms increasingly demanding. Considering the fact that poor ethical judgment in conflict studies research can result in the misrepresentation of people's experiences and harm to vulnerable communities and individuals, Resnik and Hosseini (2024) further argued that current ethical guidelines are insufficient for handling AI-assisted research, particularly with regard to responsibility, accountability, and oversight (Fujii, 2018). Floridi *et al.* (2018) urged the creation of ethical frameworks that specifically and significantly address these problems because of this. As AI becomes more embedded in research practice, ethical standards must evolve to ensure that technological efficiency does not override human dignity, fairness, and social justice. For conflict studies, this evolution is essential in order to produce knowledge that is credible, socially responsible, and supportive of conflict resolution and human security.

Concept of Conflict Studies

Conflict is not merely an event, but a process shaped by political, economic, social, and historical factors. Galtung (2016), argued that conflict exists when two or more parties pursue incompatible goals, whether at the interpersonal, communal, or international level. In other words, conflict emerges when individuals or groups perceive that their interests, values, or objectives cannot be simultaneously achieved, leading to tension, competition, or confrontation. Similarly, Wallensteen (2020) explained conflict as a social situation in which at least two actors perceive their interests to be incompatible and act on the basis of this perception. In the context of conflict studies, conflict is not limited to physical violence but also includes structural and cultural forms of violence that produce inequality, marginalization, and insecurity. The term conflict studies refer to a field of study that explores the methods for managing, resolving, and promoting peace as well as the causes, dynamics, and effects of both violent and nonviolent conflicts. According to Ramsbotham *et al.* (2026), conflict studies is the interdisciplinary study of violent and non-violent conflicts and the strategies used to prevent, manage, and transform them. In other words, conflict studies are used to comprehend the causes of conflicts, how they intensify, and how they might be avoided or changed. In contemporary societies where violence is often associated with poverty, weak institutions, and marginalization, modern conflict studies is introduced. Modern conflict studies goes beyond the traditional descriptive approaches by employing systematic, data-driven, and interdisciplinary methods to analyze complex conflict environments, including the use of geographic information systems, conflict event datasets, digital media analysis, and computational tools to understand patterns of violence, escalation, and peacebuilding processes (Cederman and Weidmann, 2017; Fjelde and Hultman, 2014).

Kalyvas (2018) noted that modern conflict research increasingly relies on micro-level data to explain patterns of violence, civilian victimization, and armed group behaviour. This is because, contemporary conflict studies place strong emphasis on data, evidence-based analysis, and systematic research in understanding conflict dynamics. In the same vein, various studies such as Cederman and Weidmann, (2017); Fjelde and Hultman, (2014) claimed that conflict studies researchers now use quantitative, and computational methods to identify trends, predict escalation, and evaluate impacts of intervention. This methodological shift has enhanced analytical precision but also increased the complexity of conflict research. The growing alignment of artificial intelligence into conflict research has reshaped the field, causing conflict studies to be deeply concerned with the ethical principles of research, especially because it deals with human suffering, insecurity, and political

sensitivity. Fujii (2018) emphasized that ethical precautions are crucial since conflict research frequently entails speaking with traumatized groups, displaced people, and violent actors. Because conflict data often originates from victims, eyewitnesses, or contested sources, researchers must exercise caution in how information is collected, interpreted, and disseminated. Ethical challenges in conflict studies include protecting identities, avoiding retraumatization, ensuring informed consent, and preventing misuse of findings for political or military purposes. In a similar vein, Wood (2016) cautioned that badly executed conflict research may put participants in danger, alter narratives, or unknowingly give violent groups legitimacy.

According to Fjelde and Hultman (2014), conflict trends, media reports, and early warning signals are increasingly being analyzed using AI-based methods like machine learning and natural language processing. In a similar vein, Bode and Huelss (2018) pointed out that researchers can examine vast amounts of conflict-related data that would be impossible to analyze manually, with the aid of computational techniques and tools. By enabling large-scale text analysis, predictive modelling, and real-time monitoring, these technologies have broadened the field of conflict studies. However, they also restrict researchers from direct engagement with data sources, making it harder to evaluate context, bias, and reliability. As AI becomes more integrated into the field, the ethical and methodological underpinnings of conflict studies are changing, and this makes it necessary to critically examine how AI influences not only what we know about conflict but also how that knowledge is produced.

Relationship between Artificial Intelligence and Conflict Research

The relationship between artificial intelligence and conflict research is both enabling and problematic. Although scholars acknowledge the methodological benefits of AI, they are also greatly concerned that existing ethical principles and regulatory frameworks are insufficient to address AI-specific risks in conflict research (Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena, 2019; Resnik and Hosseini, 2024). Artificial intelligence has emerged as a critical methodological innovation that restructures how conflict data are collected, analyzed, and interpreted. This development reflects the growing demand within contemporary conflict studies for more advanced analytical tools capable of addressing the complexity of modern conflicts. The introduction of artificial intelligence into conflict research has significantly altered the relationship between the researcher and data, thereby reshaping methodological responsibility. In this regard, Bode and Huelss (2018) argued that the use of AI tools and techniques in data analysis reduces direct human involvement in decision-making processes, which may cause researchers to become detached from data sources and analytical procedures. Similarly, Floridi *et al.* (2018) contended that such detachment limits transparency and accountability in AI-assisted research. When AI systems increasingly shape research findings, concerns arise regarding bias, interpretability, and the difficulty of explaining how analytical outcomes are produced. Understanding the relationship between artificial intelligence and conflict research is therefore essential, as it provides a foundation for examining how ethical frameworks can be strengthened to guide responsible AI utilization in conflict studies. According to Cederman and Weidmann (2017), the evolution of AI within conflict research has transformed the field by enabling more accurate spatial and temporal analysis of conflict events. Consequently, other scholars have observed that AI techniques such as machine learning, natural language processing, and automated data extraction are widely used to analyze large datasets, identify patterns of violence, and support early warning systems (Bode and Huelss, 2018; Fjelde and Hultman, 2014).

In contrast to traditional conflict research methods, which relied heavily on field interviews, manual coding, and historical analysis, artificial intelligence enables the processing of vast amounts of structured and unstructured data while enhancing predictive and early warning capacities. Fjelde and Hultman (2014) noted that AI-driven models can analyze conflict trends, social signals, and political indicators to detect escalation risks and generate early warnings. Similarly, Ward *et al.* (2016) posited that AI techniques significantly improve the prediction of political instability and violent conflict. In summary, the relationship between artificial intelligence and conflict research reflects a significant shift in contemporary conflict research methodology. This shift demonstrates that, while the integration of AI enhances analytical capacity, it simultaneously introduces ethical and methodological challenges that reinforce the need for robust ethical principles and frameworks capable of addressing AI-specific concerns within conflict research. Without adequate ethical guidance, the methodological advantages of AI may inadvertently undermine research integrity and the broader objectives of peacebuilding and conflict prevention (Resnik & Hosseini, 2024; Bellaby, 2024).

Conceptual Framework on Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence

The advent of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has opened up transformative possibilities in academic research. Tools like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude hold the potential to help with idea and content development, structure and research design, literature review and synthesis, data management and analysis, as well as proofreading and editing. However, as enticing as these advancements are, they bring ethical challenges that require careful navigation.

- i. **Examine Policies and Guidelines:** Researchers must consult international, national, and institutional GenAI policies. This involves not only aligning with global GenAI ethics recommendations but also understanding the specifics of local guidelines. Adhering to these ensures compliance and fosters trust.
- ii. **Think About the Social Impacts:** GenAI can reinforce biases and perpetuate inequalities. Researchers should critically evaluate the societal consequences of using GenAI, considering both environmental sustainability and digital equity.
- iii. **Harness Understanding of the Technology:** A robust understanding of how GenAI tools operate (beyond their surface-level functionalities) is essential. Researchers must grasp the limitations and ethical implications of the technologies they use and should promote AI literacy within their academic communities.
- iv. **Indicate Use Transparently:** Transparency is key to maintaining academic integrity. Researchers should explicitly disclose where and how GenAI tools were used, documenting their role in the research process. This fosters accountability and mitigates risks related to copyright and authorship disputes.
- v. **Critically Engage with Outputs:** GenAI outputs are not infallible and require rigorous validation. Researchers bear the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that GenAI-generated content aligns with disciplinary standards and is free from inaccuracies or ethical breaches.
- vi. **Access Secure Versions:** Security and privacy are paramount when using GenAI. Free versions of tools may not offer adequate protections for sensitive data, underscoring the need for secure, institutional subscriptions or private deployments of GenAI models.
- vii. **Look at User Agreements:** Many GenAI tools have complex user agreements, which can have significant implications for data ownership and privacy. Researchers should

carefully review these terms to ensure ethical compliance and to safeguard their intellectual property.

Conclusion

The paper essentially examined whether existing research ethics frameworks are adequate to guide the utilization of artificial intelligence in conflict studies research. The findings of the paper revealed that while AI provides significant methodological benefits, such as the ability to analyze large and complex datasets, detect emerging patterns, predict conflict escalation, and support early warning systems, it also introduces new ethical challenges that existing research ethics frameworks are unprepared to address. Major challenges highlighted includes; lack of transparency and explainability, algorithmic bias, data privacy and ownership issues, and inadequate accountability measures. The paper further identified machine learning, natural language processing, and big data analytics, as various forms of artificial intelligence utilized in conflict studies research, and each form has its distinct analytical goals, ranging from pattern identification, scenario simulation, and predictive modelling. Consequently, the study further observed that in areas where conflict dynamics are complex and existing ethical frameworks are still in operation, AI tools have surpassed the context-specific ethical guidelines. In conclusion, while AI improves the analytical capabilities and predictive ability of conflict research, its application emphasizes the critical need to update, evolve, and localize ethical frameworks to address the unique challenges posed by AI, ensuring research is conducted appropriately, ethically, and contextually.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on the findings of the study

- i. Scholars, research institutions, policymakers, and international organizations should collaborate closely to develop ethical principles that explicitly address the difficulties created by AI, such as algorithmic bias, transparency, accountability, and data ownership.
- ii. Conflict studies researchers should be adequately trained on ethical and accurate use of artificial intelligence, with more focus on informed consent, ethical automated analysis, and data protection.
- iii. AI systems employed in conflict research should contain procedures for transparency, interpretability, and human oversight to guarantee that findings are valid and understood by both researchers and affected populations.
- iv. To reduce the dangers of bias, unforeseen repercussions, and harm to vulnerable populations, research institutions should continuously conduct ethical supervision of AI-driven research.

References

- Abebe, R., Birhane, Barocas, S., Kleinberg, J., Levy, K., Raghavan, M., & Robinson, D. (2020). *Roles for computing in social change*. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 252–260. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372871>
- Bellaby, R. (2024). *The ethical problems of 'intelligence-AI'*. International Affairs, 100(6), 2525–2542. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iaae227>
- Birhane, A. (2021). *Algorithmic injustice: A relational ethics approach*. Patterns, 2(2).
- Bode, I., & Huelss, H. (2018). *Autonomous weapons systems and changing norms in international security*. Review of International Studies, 44(3), 393–413. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210517000614>
- Cederman, L.-E., & Weidmann, N. B. (2017). *Predicting armed conflict: Time to adjust our expectations?* Science, 355(6324), 474–476. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal4483>

- Emanuel, E. J., Wendler, D., Killen, J., & Grady, C. (2004). *What makes clinical research in Developing Countries Ethical? The Benchmarks of Ethical Research*. The Journal of Infectious Diseases, 189(5), 930–937. <https://doi.org/10.1086/381709>
- Ewuoso, C., & Hall, M. (2023). *Ethical AI in Africa: Challenges and policy directions*. Journal of African Research Ethics, 12(1), 45–63.
- Fjelde, H., & Hultman, L. (2014). *Weakening the enemy: A disaggregated study of violence against civilians in Africa*. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 64(7–8), 1230–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002713492648>
- Floridi, L., Cows, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Fujii, L. A. (2018). *Interviewing in social science research: A relational approach*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Interviewing-in-Social-Science-Research-A-Relational-Approach/Fujii/p/book/9780415843744>
- Galtung, J. (2016). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446221631>
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). *The Global Landscape of AI Ethics Guidelines*. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- Kalyvas, S. N. (2018). *The logic of violence in civil war*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2019). Siri, Siri, in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations, illustrations, and implications of artificial intelligence. Business Horizons, 62(1), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.08.004>
- Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). *The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate*. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>
- OECD. (2019). *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence*. OECD Legal Instruments. <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/oecd-legal-0449>
- Olojede, H., & Polo, E. (2025). *In Praise of Normative Science: Arts and Humanities in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 11(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5100929>
- Pretorius, L. (2025). *The Ethical Framework for Responsible Generative AI Use*. https://www.lynettepretorius.com/the_scholars_way_blog/ethical-framework-for-generative-ai-use/
- Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2016). *Contemporary conflict resolution: The Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts* (4th ed.). Polity Press.
- Resnik, D. B. (2020). *The ethics of science: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Resnik, D. B., & Hosseini, M. (2024). Disclosing artificial intelligence use in scientific research and publication: When should disclosure be mandatory, optional, or unnecessary? Accountability in Research, 31(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2265973>
- Riedl, M. O. (2019). *Human-centered artificial intelligence and machine learning*. Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 1, 33-36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.117>
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson Education. <https://www.amazon.com/Artificial-Intelligence-A-Modern-Approach/dp/0134610997>

- Saleh, Z. (2019). *Artificial intelligence definition, ethics and standards*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332548325_Artificial_Intelligence_Definition_Ethics_and_Standards.
- Trevino, L. K. and Nelson, K. A. (2017). *Managing Business Ethics: Straight Talk About How to do it Right*. London. Wiley.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373434>
- UsmanUllah, M., Saleem, S., & Munir, A. (2025). *Artificial Intelligence in Conflict Prediction and Prevention: Opportunities and Risks*. Global Social Sciences Review [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2025\(X-1\).17](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2025(X-1).17)
- Wallensteen, P. (2020). *Understanding conflict resolution* (6th ed.). Sage. <https://study.sagepub.com/wallensteen6e/student-resources/annotated-further-readings/chapter-1-understanding-conflict>
- Ward, M. D., Greenhill, B. D., & Bakke, K. M. (2016). *The perils of policy by p-value: Predicting civil conflicts*. Journal of Peace Research, 47(4), 363–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343309356491>
- Wood, E. J. (2016). *Ethical challenges in conflict research*. Qualitative Sociology, 39(3), 373–386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-016-9335-2>
- Velasquez, M. G. (2017). *Business Ethics: Concepts and Cases* 8th ed. London. Pearson Prentice Hall.