

# Psychological and Ethical Egoism in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Mental Health Implications for the Modern Workplace

Bahaudin G. Mujtaba  
J. Preston Jones

## Abstract

This literature synthesis examines the philosophical doctrines of psychological egoism and ethical egoism while exploring their relevance to the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in contemporary decision-making. Psychological egoism asserts that all human actions are ultimately motivated by self-interest, while ethical egoism normatively prescribes that individuals ought to pursue their own long-term advantage. While psychological egoism explains clinicians' coping responses as a tendency toward self-preservation under pressure or stress from surveillance, as one contrasting example, ethical egoism emphasizes aligning self-interest with patient welfare and professional ethical standards.

The study critically evaluates both theories, highlighting conceptual weaknesses such as internal inconsistency, arbitrariness, and the inability to resolve conflicts of interest. It further considers hedonistic and relativistic strands of egoistic thought, including Sophistic perspectives, to demonstrate how subjectivism and power-based reasoning can undermine stable ethical standards. The research gap lies in the lack of a clear theoretical and practical framework that integrates psychological and ethical egoism with broader ethical responsibilities to guide organizations in designing, governing, and implementing AI systems that balance self-interest with sustainable performance and stakeholder well-being.

The analysis connects these classical theories to modern AI systems, which frequently operate on optimization models resembling egoistic reasoning to maximize profit, efficiency, engagement, and strategic advantage. While AI can effectively model self-interested behavior and predict incentive-driven decisions, reliance on purely egoistic frameworks risks reinforcing bias, competitive instability, and ethical erosion. The study argues that responsible AI integration, in addition to regular human oversight of all outputs, requires

embedding normative principles such as fairness, accountability, and long-term social welfare into algorithmic systems. Ultimately, classical debates about egoism illuminate critical challenges in aligning AI-driven decision-making with ethical responsibility in complex, pluralistic societies.

**Keywords:** Artificial intelligence; psychological egoism; ethical egoism; dynamic AI surveillance pricing; mental health; business ethics; AI ethics; ethical decision-making; responsible AI; corporate governance.

**JEL Classification:** D23, H83, L25, L31, L81, M14, M21, O33, O35.

**Introduction**

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into modern workplaces has transformed decision-making, productivity, and organizational culture across the globe (Salas-Pilco & Yang, 2022). As shown in Table 1, AI is being used in many industries which impact millions of people in the modern era. It is clear that “Artificial intelligence is no longer a futuristic concept or a tool reserved for tech companies. It’s already embedded in our daily lives, from helping organize emails to providing shopping recommendations” (Barbri, 2025, para. 1). All this workplace transformation is taking place as modern generations are virtually connected to various social media platforms on a consistent basis to pursue information, instant gratification, and/or happiness (Berezan et al., 2018). As such, modern leaders and managers must reflect on the ethical ramifications of what AI means for each employee’s career and profession.

Table 1 – AI usage Examples in the Various Industries

Private Sector Uses of AI	Public Sector Uses of AI
1 Customer service chatbots & virtual assistants	1 Public safety & crime prediction
2 Personalized marketing & recommendations	2 Traffic management & smart city planning
3 Fraud detection in banking & finance	3 Healthcare diagnostics in public hospitals
4 Supply chain optimization & demand forecasting	4 Disaster response & emergency management
5 Predictive maintenance in manufacturing	5 Tax fraud detection & revenue collection
6 AI-driven hiring & HR analytics	6 Social service eligibility & benefits processing
7 Product development & design automation	7 Urban planning & infrastructure optimization
8 Financial trading algorithms	8 Border control & immigration processing
9 Cybersecurity threat detection	9 Environmental monitoring & climate analysis
10 Sales forecasting & business intelligence	10 Education personalization in public schools

As intelligent systems increasingly support hiring, performance evaluation, medical operations, military operations, customer service, and strategic planning, questions about human motivation, learning, teaching, and ethical responsibility have become more urgent (Crittenden and Crittenden, 2016; Mujtaba, 2026; Tsipursky, 2026a). Although human behavior is a complex multidimensional phenomenon, traditional philosophical frameworks such as psychological egoism and ethical egoism offer valuable insights into how individuals and organizations behave when self-interest, efficiency, and competitive advantage are at stake (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2003). As emphasized by practicing professionals, modern organizations will use AI to enhance their competitiveness using fewer employees in the years and decades to come (Tsipursky, 2026b):

“Generative AI is revolutionizing marketing faster than most business leaders ever imagined. During a recent scenario planning session with a 300-person B2C firm, I guided their executive team through a series of simulations that forecast what their marketing operations might look like in the coming years. We explored both rosy and ominous possibilities, including challenges and risks, and settled on the most likely scenario, informed by the current trends in Gen AI deployment: a transformative path that reduces an initial team of just under 30 marketers down to one solitary professional by 2030. See it as a wake-up call for business leaders seeking to stay ahead of the curve while preserving the enduring power of their brand.”

“A brand thrives when it resonates with genuine emotion and cultural awareness of its customers. That resonance depends on empathy—a trait that, in our scenario, machines imitate more effectively each year but never entirely replace. Someone must also take responsibility when AI missteps. Our workshop participants recognized that the lone marketer who remains in 2030 wields enormous influence as the conscience of the automated machine. This person ensures the brand’s vision remains consistent while harnessing the full force of generative AI” (Tsipursky, 2026b, para. 3-8).

It is certain that AI will greatly assist or even replace human beings in many white-collar professions, including countless decisions made by human resources management (HRM) professionals. If AI eventually replaces roles within HRM, it will not be solely because the technology has become overwhelmingly powerful, but rather because the profession has failed to adapt and redefine its value. AI is exceptionally effective at processing large volumes of data in all professions, identifying patterns, automating administrative tasks, and generating predictive insights that can improve efficiency and decision-making (Russell, 2019). However, the core purpose of HRM has never been limited to paperwork, compliance, or data management. At its core, HRM is

about understanding people, their motivations, emotions, aspirations, and challenges.

AI competency is becoming increasingly important for human resource (HR) leaders as many contemporary HR systems now rely on data analytics, automation, and algorithmic decision-support tools. As organizations adopt advanced HR technologies, leaders who understand the basic principles behind AI systems are better positioned to interpret the outputs these tools generate and to integrate them effectively into strategic decision-making processes (Mujtaba, 2024). Rather than relying solely on intuition or past practice, AI-literate HR professionals can leverage data-driven insights to inform decisions related to recruitment, workforce planning, employee engagement, and performance management. In this way, AI does not replace human judgment but instead augments it by identifying patterns, correlations, and trends that may not be easily detectable through manual analysis alone (Floridi, 2019; Turing, 1950; Yang et al., 2018). In addition to improving analytical decision making, AI competency also allows HR leaders to critically evaluate the strengths and limitations of the technologies they implement. Understanding how AI models process data, the types of datasets they rely on, and the potential for algorithmic bias enables HR professionals to use these tools more responsibly, ethically, and effectively. As HR increasingly operates at the intersection of technology, ethics, and organizational strategy, leaders who possess a working knowledge of AI are better equipped to ensure that technological systems align with organizational values, legal requirements, and principles of fairness. A clear example of this need can be seen in the growing use of AI-enabled tools in the recruitment and selection process. Many organizations now employ automated systems to screen large volumes of resumes, identify relevant qualifications, and rank candidates according to predefined criteria. HR leaders who understand how these systems function can more effectively evaluate whether the algorithms accurately identify qualified applicants and whether the underlying criteria reflect the organization's hiring priorities. More importantly, AI-literate HR professionals are better able to monitor these systems for unintended biases that could systematically disadvantage certain groups of candidates.

By combining technological understanding with professional judgment, HR leaders can audit all outputs to ensure that AI tools serve as supportive and ethical decision aids rather than unexamined authorities. For example, an informed HR leader should periodically audit algorithmic screening outcomes, adjust training data or criteria when necessary, and maintain human oversight in final hiring decisions (Gradwohl and Mujtaba, 2025). This balanced approach allows organizations to benefit from the efficiency and analytical

power of AI while preserving fairness, transparency, and accountability in HR practices. Therefore, developing AI competency among HR professionals is becoming a critical component of effective leadership and responsible management in modern organizations. As AI technologies continue to expand across talent management, workforce analytics, and employee experience platforms, HR leaders who possess both technological literacy and strong ethical awareness will be better positioned to harness these tools responsibly and strategically. Such competency enables HR departments not only to improve operational efficiency but also to contribute more meaningfully to organizational decision making and long-term values-driven development (Pohlman and Gardiner, 2000).

While AI can analyze employee engagement metrics or suggest performance trends, it cannot truly comprehend lived human experience, workplace dynamics, cultural intricacies, or the subtle interpersonal factors that shape organizational life. Empathy, ethical judgment, trust-building, and the ability to navigate complex human conversations remain distinct human strengths that cannot always be replicated effectively by AI (Mujtaba, 2026). Therefore, the future of most professions, especially HR, depends not on competing with AI, but on evolving alongside it as we leverage technology to handle routine processes while elevating the uniquely human aspects of leadership, culture, and employee development that no system can realistically replicate. As such, AI must be monitored through structured audits and properly regulated to make ethical recommendations.

Psychological egoism suggests that individuals naturally act in ways that promote their own perceived interests. Ethical egoism argues that individuals and institutions ought to pursue their self-interest. In AI-driven environments, these perspectives help explain behaviors such as data optimization for profit, automation for cost reduction, and strategic use of AI for competitive positioning. At the same time, the widespread use of AI raises concerns about fairness, transparency, employee well-being, and social responsibility. This paper examines egoistic theories in the context of AI-enabled workplaces and evaluates their ethical implications for modern organizations.

The proposed exploratory research question is: How can organizations reconcile psychological and ethical egoism with broader ethical responsibilities in the design, governance, and implementation of AI systems to promote sustainable organizational performance and stakeholder well-being? More specifically, can a synthesis of psychological and ethical egoism explain and guide the ethical integration of AI in organizations, particularly in fostering governance, human-centered design, and stakeholder-oriented decision-making?

## Literature Review

Recent literature on AI ethics and management highlights the growing need for organizations to move beyond abstract ethical principles toward actionable governance and decision-making frameworks that address real-world complexities (Demir et al., 2025). For instance, emerging research shows that while AI systems enhance productivity and efficiency, they can also unintentionally promote unethical employee behavior, particularly when performance pressures and muddled algorithms reinforce self-interested actions without adequate oversight (Chan et al., 2025). Similarly, scholars emphasize that the integration of AI into organizational decision-making demands a careful balance between innovation and accountability, requiring transparency, explainability, and ethical safeguards to prevent harm and maintain stakeholder trust (Iyer et al., 2025). Broader reviews of AI ethics further indicate that although numerous ethical frameworks exist, their practical implementation remains inconsistent, revealing a gap between ethical intent and organizational practice (Zhao et al., 2025). These findings collectively suggest that management implications center on embedding ethics and conceptual skills into governance structures, aligning AI deployment with organizational values, and fostering a culture of responsibility that mitigates risks while sustaining long-term performance (Mujtaba, 2025a).

Egoism theory is particularly useful for analyzing AI-driven workplaces because it provides a realistic lens for understanding how organizational decisions around AI adoption, deployment, and governance are often motivated by self-interest, such as efficiency gains, cost reduction, and competitive advantage, while also offering a normative basis for evaluating whether such self-interest can be ethically justified. By distinguishing between psychological egoism (what organizations are likely to do) and ethical egoism (what they ought to do in pursuit of their interests), the theory helps explain tensions between profit-driven AI strategies and broader responsibilities to employees and stakeholders. This study offers a novel perspective by synthesizing these two strands of egoism into an “enlightened egoism” framework for AI management, in which self-interest is reframed as inherently linked to long-term sustainability, ethical governance, and stakeholder well-being. Rather than positioning ethics as a constraint on organizational behavior, the framework positions responsible AI practices, such as transparency, human-centered design, and stakeholder engagement, as strategic mechanisms through which organizations can align self-interest with ethical outcomes in AI-driven environments.

Modern managers and working professionals should study the impact of AI on psychological and ethical egoism because it can significantly influence decision-making in the workplace. AI systems which are designed to optimize outcomes often rely on patterns and data that can perpetuate biases and prioritize efficiency over human well-being. Reflecting on how AI interacts with psychological egoism, or the tendency to prioritize self-interest, can help professionals recognize potential pitfalls, such as AI-driven decisions that favor short-term gains over long-term consequences or individual benefits over collective well-being. It has been said that,

“The rapid advancement of generative AI presents both a tremendous opportunity and a significant challenge for organizations. To fully capitalize on this transformative technology, leaders must prioritize continuous learning and development, ensuring their workforce possesses the skills and knowledge necessary to navigate this evolving landscape. By doing so, leaders will empower employees to embrace innovation and drive organizational success” (Tsipursky, 2026a, para. 1).

By empowering the workforce to embrace innovations and technology while examining the intersection of AI and ethical egoism, managers can develop strategies to mitigate risks and ensure AI-driven decisions align with organizational values and social responsibility (Mujtaba, 2024). This knowledge enables professionals to design AI systems that promote ethical decision-making, fairness, transparency, and accountability, ultimately fostering trust among employees, customers, and stakeholders. It also encourages professionals to consider the human impact of AI-driven decisions, balancing business objectives with empathy, trust, sustainability, and ethics (Tsipursky, 2026).

Psychological egoism describes human motivation as fundamentally self-interested. In organizational settings, this perspective aligns with incentive-driven performance systems, career advancement strategies, and productivity monitoring tools powered by AI analytics. Employees may adapt their behavior to maximize ratings, bonuses, or job security, especially when AI systems quantify performance metrics (Russell, 2019).

Ethical egoism extends this logic into a normative framework, suggesting that individuals and firms should act in ways that maximize their long-term benefit (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). In business practice, this often translates into profit maximization, operational efficiency, and market dominance through technological innovation. AI adoption frequently reflects this reasoning, as organizations deploy automation, predictive analytics, and decision-support systems to reduce costs and increase output.

However, contemporary scholarship in technology ethics highlights limitations of egoistic approaches. Research on algorithmic bias, workplace surveillance, and digital inequality suggests that exclusive focus on self-interest may harm some employees, customers, and society. Studies on the algorithmic bias demonstrate that when AI systems are designed primarily to maximize efficiency, profit, or competitive advantage, they can unintentionally perpetuate discrimination and inequality (Eubanks, 2018; O'Neil, 2016; Zuboff, 2019). Biased training data, unclear modeling techniques, and insufficient oversight may lead to unfair outcomes in hiring, promotion, credit approval, insurance pricing, or customer targeting. When organizations prioritize performance metrics without scrutinizing social impact, marginalized groups may bear disproportionate harm, thereby leading to a case of disparate impact on protected groups. This not only undermines principles of fairness and equal opportunity but also erodes trust in institutions that rely on automated decision-making. A narrow focus on self-interest can therefore incentivize cost-saving automation while neglecting moral responsibility to ensure accuracy, equity, and transparency.

Similarly, workplace surveillance technologies and digital inequality reveal broader societal risks (Crittenden & Peterson, 2019). AI-driven monitoring tools designed to increase productivity or reduce risk can intrude on employee privacy, heighten stress, and weaken autonomy. Excessive tracking may create cultures of mistrust, where workers may feel that they are reduced to data points rather than valued contributors. Beyond the workplace, unequal access to education, digital infrastructure and AI-enhanced services can widen economic and social divides, leaving disadvantaged communities with fewer opportunities (Davies & Starkey, 2020; Elliott & Healy, 2001; Nafei et al., 2025). When organizations invest in AI solely to optimize returns, they may overlook the underlying inequities their technologies reinforce (Eubanks, 2018; O'Neil, 2016; Zuboff, 2019). Over time, this approach can damage employee morale, alienate customers, intensify social fragmentation, and ultimately undermine the very stability and legitimacy upon which sustainable success depends. Overall, studies in responsible AI emphasize fairness, accountability, human oversight, and stakeholder-centered governance as necessary correctives to purely profit-driven technological strategies (Taddeo & Floridi, 2018b).

Effective AI governance represents the cornerstone of aligning organizational self-interest with broader ethical responsibilities. By implementing structured policies for transparency, accountability, and fairness, organizations can ensure that AI systems support both strategic objectives and stakeholder well-being, thereby mitigating risks associated with biased algorithms, privacy violations, or unethical workplace monitoring. Human-

centered design, ethical training, and continuous stakeholder engagement complement governance structures by embedding ethical reflection and practical safeguards into day-to-day operations, thereby ensuring that AI adoption enhances, not undermines, employee autonomy, trust, and organizational reputation. Furthermore, a long-term value orientation positions governance as a proactive, strategic tool rather than a reactive obligation, framing ethical AI practices as drivers of sustainable performance and competitive advantage. In this way, AI governance becomes a dynamic framework where egoistic motivations are harnessed through responsible policies and practices, thereby transforming potential self-interest into deliberate, ethically informed strategies that benefit both the organization and its broader network of stakeholders.

### **Psychological Egoism**

According to psychological egoism, individuals ultimately act to promote their own perceived self-interest or to achieve outcomes that provide them with satisfaction or psychological reward. From this perspective, ego satisfaction is the final aim of all human activity and the fundamental motivating force behind behavior. People are therefore understood as incapable of genuine selflessness, since even actions that appear generous or morally admirable are interpreted as attempts to fulfill personal desires, avoid discomfort, or maintain a positive self-image (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). Every voluntary action, whether motivated by pleasure, recognition, emotional relief, or the avoidance of guilt, can be viewed as a form of self-advancement or self-fulfillment. The apparent pursuit of moral principles, social welfare, or the interests of others does not escape this framework; rather, such actions are seen as consistent with an individual's deeper concern for personal psychological benefit (Batson, 2011; Feinberg & Shafer-Landau, 2013). A psychological "egoist" rejects the existence of truly altruistic acts. Behaviors that appear disinterested or self-sacrificial may instead be driven by anticipated rewards such as social approval, reciprocal support, emotional satisfaction, or the avoidance of shame or remorse. Individuals may help others because doing so enhances their reputation, strengthens social bonds, reduces empathic distress, or aligns with their long-term interests. Even empathy itself can be interpreted as a mechanism that motivates helping behavior because relieving another's suffering also relieves one's own emotional discomfort. In this view, the desire to be seen as moral, to maintain self-respect, or to avoid future negative consequences ultimately reflects the same underlying motivation, which is the pursuit of one's own psychological or practical advantage (Cialdini et al., 1997; Cavico et al., 2015; Fehr & Fischbacher, 2003).

Psychological egoism presents a significant challenge to moral philosophy because ethical theories often assume that individuals can act against their self-interest to pursue moral duties or genuinely altruistic goals. If human beings are psychologically constituted to act only in ways that serve their own interests, then appeals to selfless moral obligation may have limited practical force. This tension is particularly relevant in modern organizational and technological contexts, where decision environments increasingly rely on incentive structures and behavioral predictions rather than purely moral appeals (Frankena, 1973).

The integration of AI into decision-making highlights the practical implications of psychological egoism. Many AI systems are designed to analyze behavioral data, predict choices, and optimize outcomes based on observed patterns of human preference and incentive response. If human behavior is largely driven by self-interest, as psychological egoism suggests, AI models that prioritize utility maximization, performance metrics, or personal gain may accurately predict and influence decisions (Russell, 2019). For example, algorithmic systems used in hiring, performance management, consumer targeting, or resource allocation often assume that individuals respond rationally to incentives that enhance their personal outcomes. However, this reliance on self-interest-based modeling can also reinforce short-term optimization, competitive behavior, or narrow utility calculations unless broader ethical constraints are incorporated (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014).

Consequently, while psychological egoism helps explain the behavioral foundations that make predictive AI effective, it also underscores the importance of embedding normative ethical guidance into AI-supported decision-making. Without such guidance, AI systems may simply mirror and amplify self-interested tendencies rather than promote fairness, cooperation, or long-term collective well-being. The challenge for organizations and policymakers is not only to understand human motivation as described by psychological egoism but also to ensure that AI systems are designed to align individual incentives with ethical and societal goals.

A widely cited philosophical foundation for psychological egoism can be traced to the work of the British philosopher Thomas Hobbes. Although Hobbes' writings are open to interpretation, a central theme in his thought is that human action is fundamentally driven by self-interest. His repeated emphasis on human selfishness and the pursuit of personal preservation provides an early theoretical basis for the claim that all behavior is ultimately motivated by egoistic concerns. Hobbes' perspective remains influential because it frames human decision-making as a process guided less by moral ideals than by individual desires, fears, and calculations of personal advantage (Hobbes, 1651/1996).

Hobbes built his philosophy upon two core assumptions: the rejection of any absolute or universally objective standard of good and evil, and a deeply pessimistic view of human nature. He described human motivation in terms of appetites and dislikes, or forces that draw individuals toward what they desire and away from what they fear or dislike. In this framework, motivation is not grounded in moral duty or intrinsic virtue but in subjective attraction and dislike (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). People act because they want to act, and their choices reflect their preferences rather than adherence to any higher moral order. This reduction of motivation to desire-based choice anticipates modern behavioral models that treat decision-making as preference optimization, a logic that closely parallels how many contemporary AI systems model human behavior.

For Hobbes, human beings are naturally self-interested, seeking pleasure, avoiding pain, and striving for survival and security. Even actions that appear generous or cooperative are interpreted as indirect strategies for self-preservation or long-term benefit. Happiness, in Hobbes' view, is the continual success in obtaining desired outcomes and avoiding threats. The concepts of "good" and "bad" therefore have no objective moral meaning; they simply refer to whatever an individual desires or seeks to avoid. Self-interest becomes the ultimate standard of value, and traditional moral expectations may conflict with human nature if they demand genuine self-sacrifice. This subjectivist understanding of value is relevant to AI-supported decision-making, where programmatic or predictive systems often define "good" in operational terms such as efficiency, utility, performance, or user preference rather than intrinsic moral worth.

Hobbes' famous description of the "state of nature" illustrates the consequences of unchecked self-interest. In the absence of authority, individuals that are equal in vulnerability and driven by similar desires for security and power would live in constant fear, competition, and distrust. This condition would produce ongoing conflict and instability, making social cooperation and long-term progress impossible. To escape this insecurity, individuals would rationally agree to a social contract, surrendering some freedom to a sovereign authority capable of enforcing order and maintaining peace (as is the case with the formation of United Nations and North Atlantic Treaty Organization / "NATO" forces). In this sense, as demonstrated by NATO's response to global challenges over the past few decades, governance emerges not from altruism but from rational self-interest and the recognition that stability benefits everyone.

This insight has important implications for the integration of artificial intelligence in decision-making. Since AI systems often function as decision

authorities in hiring, lending, resource allocation, risk assessment, and policy implementation, they can be seen as a form of modern “sovereign” that structures incentives and constrains behavior. If human actors are primarily motivated by self-interest, then AI governance systems must be carefully designed to align individual incentives with collective stability and fairness (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014). Without appropriate oversight, optimization algorithms may intensify competition, bias, or short-term utility maximization, reproducing the digital equivalent of a fragmented state of nature. Conversely, well-governed technological systems and modern applications can promote coordination, transparency, and trust by enforcing consistent rules and reducing uncertainty (Russell, 2019; Spencer, 1970; Weber, 1958).

Psychology plays a central role in Hobbes’ ethical framework. By grounding morality in egoistic motivation, he reframed ethics as a system for managing self-interest rather than transcending it. This perspective resonates strongly with contemporary AI design, which relies on behavioral data and incentive structures to predict and influence decisions. Understanding human behavior as interest-driven allows AI to model choices effectively, but it also underscores the need for normative safeguards to ensure that automated decision systems support social welfare rather than merely amplifying individual or organizational self-interest. As such, Hobbes’ fusion of psychology, governance, and rational self-preservation remains highly relevant in an era where algorithmic systems increasingly shape the structure of human decision environments.

### **Ethical Egoism**

Ethical egoism is a normative ethical theory asserting that individuals ought to act in ways that promote the greatest overall good for themselves. As demonstrated in Figure 1, unlike psychological egoism, which describes how people allegedly do act, ethical egoism prescribes how people should act. According to this view, each person has a moral obligation to pursue his or her own self-interest, and actions that undermine one’s long-term advantage are morally wrong. Ethical egoism therefore frames moral reasoning as a disciplined evaluation of costs and benefits, where one selects the course of action that maximizes personal good over time (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013).

An ethical egoist functions as a rational calculator, carefully weighing the advantages and disadvantages of possible actions. Honesty, promise-keeping, cooperation, helping someone with a disability safely cross the street, and law-abiding behavior are not rejected outright; rather, they are endorsed when they serve one’s long-term interests. For example, telling the truth may build trust and enhance reputation, making it instrumentally valuable. Similarly, participation in organizations, compliance with laws, and fulfillment of

responsibilities are justified insofar as they provide stability, protection, or material gain. If such conformity ceases to be beneficial, and if negative consequences can be avoided, then ethical egoism permits deviation. This logic closely parallels many AI-driven decision systems, which evaluate options based on measurable outcomes such as efficiency, profitability, risk reduction, or performance optimization.



Figure 1. Psychological vs. Ethical Egoism Comparison  
(Created by the author using ChatGPT)

Ethical egoists may differ regarding what constitutes the “good” to be pursued, as it can be identified with wealth, pleasure, power, knowledge, self-realization, or happiness. In business contexts, the dominant interpretation of the good is typically financial profit. As a result, ethical egoism often aligns with the conventional view that corporations have a primary obligation to maximize shareholder value. In AI-integrated business environments, this framework becomes particularly visible, such as algorithms used in pricing, hiring, investment, supply chain management, and performance analytics are frequently designed to optimize profit, productivity, or competitive advantage. In this sense, AI systems can operationalize ethical egoism by embedding self-interest that can be defined in quantifiable organizational terms directly into automated decision-making processes such as the modern version of “dynamic AI surveillance pricing.”

However, ethical egoism includes an important moderating principle, known as prudence. An enlightened egoist prioritizes long-term benefit over short-term gratification. Immediate gains may be sacrificed to secure greater future rewards. This long-range perspective often encourages cooperation, fairness, and respect for others’ rights, not because these are intrinsically moral,

but because they sustain trust, reputation, and social stability. In practice, treating employees well, supporting communities, and upholding ethical standards may enhance productivity, reduce turnover, strengthen brand image, and improve financial performance. Thus, actions that appear altruistic may still align with self-interest when evaluated over an extended horizon. AI systems designed with long-term optimization parameters such as sustainability metrics or reputational risk models reflect this more sophisticated form of egoistic reasoning.

The defense of ethical egoism has historically been associated with thinkers who argued that self-interest, when properly channeled, can promote broader social welfare. Bernard Mandeville (1988) contended that private pursuits of wealth and pleasure unintentionally generate economic prosperity. Similarly, Adam Smith's "invisible hand" theory (1976) suggested that individuals pursuing their own economic interests in competitive markets can unintentionally advance the public good. In modern contexts, AI-driven market systems amplify this dynamic, where decentralized actors pursuing self-interest through algorithmic tools can collectively generate innovation, efficiency, and economic growth. Yet this outcome depends on regulatory structures and ethical safeguards that prevent harmful externalities.

The integration of AI into decision-making raises critical questions about ethical egoism. If AI systems are programmed solely to maximize profit or competitive advantage, they may intensify inequalities, exploit loopholes, or disregard broader societal consequences. Conversely, if AI incorporates long-term strategic reasoning and ethical constraints, it can align self-interest with collective benefit, much like the "moderated" egoism envisioned by its defenders. Ultimately, ethical egoism provides a powerful framework for understanding how AI systems are often structured around optimization, measurable outcomes, and strategic self-advancement, while also highlighting the need to ensure that such systems balance private gain with public responsibility.

### **Dynamic AI Surveillance Pricing and AI**

Dynamic AI surveillance pricing refers to the use of artificial intelligence systems that combine large-scale data collection ("surveillance") with algorithmic pricing models to adjust the prices of goods or services for individuals in real time. These systems collect and analyze data such as browsing behavior, purchase history, location data, device type, and sometimes demographic or inferred socioeconomic indicators. Machine-learning models then predict how much a specific consumer is willing or able to pay and automatically set personalized prices. While dynamic pricing has long existed

in industries like airlines or ridesharing, AI significantly expands its scope by enabling far more granular and continuous adjustments across digital platforms and retail environments (Bawack et al., 2022; Chandra et al., 2022). Therefore, according to Chaudhary (2025, p. 95),

“The ethical challenges surrounding AI-driven pricing systems demand immediate and sustained attention from technologists, policymakers, and business leaders who must collaborate to develop robust frameworks that ensure these powerful technologies serve broader societal interests rather than simply optimizing narrow commercial metrics. The complexity of addressing fairness, transparency, and accountability in algorithmic pricing requires moving beyond traditional regulatory approaches toward comprehensive governance frameworks that can accommodate the technical sophistication and global scale of modern AI systems. The pursuit of equitable AI pricing necessitates investment in explainable artificial intelligence technologies, the development of meaningful transparency mechanisms that bridge technical complexity with stakeholder comprehension, and the establishment of accountability frameworks that can navigate the distributed responsibility structures inherent in complex AI development processes.”

This concept is relevant to broader discussions about AI decision-making because it illustrates how algorithms increasingly make consequential economic decisions that affect individuals directly. As shown in Table 2, instead of a human setting a single price for all customers, AI systems may autonomously evaluate patterns in user data and determine individualized offers or prices. Such systems can optimize revenue for companies and improve market efficiency, but they also shift decision authority to obscure algorithmic processes. This raises questions about transparency, accountability, fairness, and explanation, especially when consumers cannot easily understand why they were offered a different price than someone else (Chaudhary, 2025).

Dynamic AI surveillance pricing may raise challenges under U.S. civil rights and anti-discrimination frameworks. If AI models rely on data that correlates with protected characteristics such as race, gender, age, disability, or national origin, then they could produce adverse outcomes that resemble discriminatory pricing. Even if protected traits are not directly used, proxy variables like location, ZIP codes, purchasing patterns, or device types could lead to disparate impacts on protected groups. Laws such as the Civil Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, or consumer protection regulations may become relevant if algorithmic pricing disadvantages protected groups. Regulators and policymakers are therefore increasingly concerned with such biases and discriminatory outcomes which can be stressful for involved stakeholders, and the need for auditing and oversight of AI-driven pricing systems (Shah, 2025).

Table 2 – Surveillance pricing Links to Psychological and Ethical Egoism

Psychological Egoism	Ethical Egoism
1 Consumers accept personalized prices if it benefits them in the moment (e.g., discounts triggered by behavior)	1 Firms justify dynamic pricing as morally acceptable if it maximizes long-term profit without violating rules
2 Companies exploit behavioral data because they are naturally driven to maximize revenue	2 Companies ought to use data responsibly if it sustains trust and long-term self-interest
3 Users trade privacy for convenience because it feels immediately beneficial	3 Users should protect their data if it serves their long-term well-being
4 Price discrimination occurs because firms act on profit motives instinctively	4 Price discrimination is acceptable only if it aligns with fair competition and legal frameworks
5 Consumers respond emotionally to urgency cues (e.g., “only 2 left”) due to self-interested impulse	5 Designers should avoid manipulative tactics if they harm long-term customer relationships
6 Firms track user behavior because competitors do the same (self-preservation)	6 Firms should adopt surveillance only when it creates sustainable competitive advantage
7 People may ignore ethical concerns if they get a lower price	7 People should consider ethical implications if exploitation harms them indirectly
8 Data collection expands because it increases predictive accuracy and profit	8 Data collection should be limited if excessive surveillance risks backlash or regulation
9 Consumers accept unequal pricing if they personally benefit	9 Firms should ensure transparency if opacity risks reputational damage
10 Short-term gains (quick purchases, higher margins) dominate decisions	10 Long-term gains (brand loyalty, trust, stability) should guide pricing strategies

Recent empirical research highlights the growing mental health implications of technostress and algorithmic management. For example, a 2025 study by Li and colleagues found that algorithmic management among gig workers (e.g., food delivery riders) significantly increases stress by framing work demands as both “threats” and “challenges,” with perceived threat intensifying psychological strain and contributing to burnout through constant monitoring and performance pressure. Similarly, Dong et al. (2025) report that workers operating under algorithmic control experience moderate to high burnout, driven by factors such as real-time surveillance, automated ranking systems, and rigid workflow optimization, which reduce autonomy and heighten emotional exhaustion. Complementing this, broader techno-stress research shows that AI-related stressors, such as overload, uncertainty, and

techno-insecurity indirectly diminish quality of life by increasing negative affect and emotional fatigue, reinforcing the link between digital work environments and mental health outcomes. Together, these studies suggest that while AI and algorithmic systems may enhance efficiency, they also introduce psychosocial risks that are central to contemporary discussions of worker well-being.

### **Psychological Egoism versus Ethical Egoism**

Psychological egoism is a doctrine grounded in human psychology that carries important implications for ethics and decision-making. A psychological egoist maintains that understanding nature and limits of human motivation is essential for evaluating behavior, since all actions ultimately stem from self-interest. In this sense, psychological egoism functions as a descriptive theory of human nature, which advances the universal claim that every person, under all circumstances, is motivated by the pursuit of personal benefit, whether immediate or indirect. When considered in the context of AI-driven decision-making, this perspective becomes especially relevant, as many AI systems are designed to model, predict, and optimize human behavior based on patterns that often reflect self-interested preferences, incentives, and outcomes. Thus, the assumptions behind psychological egoism can influence how algorithms interpret human choices and how organizations structure AI-supported decisions around predicted motivations.

Psychological egoism is neither an ethical nor a normative theory. It does not prescribe how people ought to behave or justify their actions; rather, it explains how people behave based on observed psychological tendencies. A moral philosopher seeks ethical principles to determine standards of right conduct, whereas a psychological egoist focuses on studying human nature and developing explanatory theories of motivation, regardless of their moral implications. This distinction is critical for AI integration, since AI systems that rely purely on behavioral data operate descriptively, identifying what people tend to choose rather than what they should choose. As a result, AI-driven recommendations may reinforce existing patterns of self-interest, bias, or short-term optimization unless guided by ethical frameworks that introduce normative considerations beyond raw behavioral prediction.

Ethical egoism is a normative theory that assumes individuals have the capacity to choose their actions and are not strictly bound by psychological necessity. According to ethical egoism, individuals are morally obligated to promote their own long-term self-interest, though they may support others when doing so indirectly benefit them. Prudence and rational calculation provide sufficient reasons for action, making ethical egoism a justification for human conduct rather than merely an explanation. In AI-supported environments, this

logic often appears in decision systems designed to optimize personal or organizational utility, such as performance algorithms, incentive structures, or resource allocation models that encourage choices aligned with measurable self-benefit.

Psychological egoism explains how decisions are made, while ethical egoism attempts to justify how they should be made. If psychological egoism is true and individuals are naturally constrained to act in their own interest, then prescribing egoistic behavior becomes redundant. This tension highlights an important challenge in the integration of AI into decision-making, since systems that assume purely self-interested behavior may accurately predict actions but risk narrowing decision frameworks to efficiency and personal gain alone. Therefore, as AI becomes more embedded in organizational and societal choices, it is essential to balance descriptive behavioral modeling with ethical oversight to ensure that decision-making technologies do not merely mirror human self-interest but also support broader universal values such as fairness, responsibility, and collective well-being.

## **Methodology**

This literature synthesis paper adopts a practical methodology that systematically examines classical theories of psychological and ethical egoism, interpreting their core assumptions and extending their relevance to contemporary organizational contexts shaped by artificial intelligence. Psychological egoism is understood as a descriptive account of human motivation, suggesting that individuals are inherently driven by self-interest, whereas ethical egoism advances a normative claim that individuals ought to act in ways that maximize their own interests (Kolb, 2008). Building on this distinction, the paper applies these frameworks to modern workplace scenarios, with particular emphasis on organizational decision-making processes and AI-driven strategic initiatives that increasingly influence workforce dynamics, productivity, and governance structures.

The analysis specifically explores illustrative cases such as AI-enabled productivity monitoring systems, algorithmic recruitment and hiring platforms, and corporate investments in automation technologies. These examples are critically examined to determine whether observed organizational behaviors align more closely with descriptive egoism, reflecting inherent self-interested motivations of firms and decision-makers, or normative egoism, where self-interest is explicitly justified as an ethical basis for action. In doing so, the paper highlights how egoistic orientations may shape organizational priorities, including efficiency maximization, cost reduction, and competitive advantage,

while also raising concerns regarding employee autonomy, fairness, and transparency.

Furthermore, the study evaluates the ethical risks and potential benefits of such AI applications by comparing egoistic decision logics with emerging principles of responsible AI and stakeholder-oriented ethics. Prior research suggests that AI ethics frameworks often emphasize accountability, fairness, and multi-stakeholder responsibility, yet gaps remain in translating these principles into practice within organizational settings (Floridi, 2019; Sober, 2000/2018; Taddeo & Floridi, 2018a). By juxtaposing egoistic theories with these broader ethical paradigms, the paper seeks to assess whether a synthesis of psychological and ethical egoism can offer a more realistic and actionable lens for understanding and guiding organizational AI behavior. Ultimately, this approach contributes to bridging theoretical philosophy and applied AI ethics, particularly in addressing tensions between self-interest and collective well-being in technologically mediated workplaces.

The literature review was conducted using a structured methodology designed to ensure both conceptual depth and relevance to contemporary organizational contexts. Source selection followed clearly defined criteria as several reputable publications and authoritative academic texts written in English were included to maintain linguistic consistency and scholarly rigor. The time-based scope prioritized works mostly published from the 1950s onward (Batson, 2011; Bostrom and Yudkowsky, 2014; Fehr and Fischbacher, 2003; Russell, 2019; Sober, 2018) to capture developments in artificial intelligence and organizational ethics, while also incorporating seminal earlier contributions, such as those by Thomas Hobbes, Adam Smith, Elliott Sober, and David Kolb, to ground the analysis in foundational theory. Sources were retrieved from major databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, using keyword combinations such as “psychological egoism,” “ethical egoism,” “AI ethics,” and “organizational decision-making.” This ensured comprehensive coverage across philosophy, management studies, and technology ethics.

Following retrieval, sources were systematically organized and filtered through a multi-stage screening process. Initial results were catalogued and deduplicated, after which 52 titles and abstracts were reviewed to exclude irrelevant or non-scholarly materials. Full-text screening was then applied to 13 articles to assess conceptual alignment with the study’s focus on egoism and AI in organizational settings, resulting in a refined dataset for analysis. Illustrative cases, 2 tables and 2 figures were added based on relevancy to enrich the content. The Microsoft Word software package was used as the primary tool to support these procedures: it facilitated the creation of structured process for

source classification (e.g., theoretical vs. applied studies), annotation of key arguments, and thematic coding through highlighting and comment features. Additionally, Microsoft's Word document association functions allow researchers to group sources by conceptual categories such as descriptive versus normative egoism and AI application domains, thereby supporting a coherent synthesis of the literature review process.

## **Analysis & Discussion**

The integration of AI into workplace systems reveals strong evidence of psychological egoism at both individual and organizational levels. Employees often optimize their behavior to satisfy algorithmic metrics, sometimes prioritizing measurable outputs over creativity, collaboration, or well-being. Similarly, organizations adopt AI primarily to improve efficiency, reduce labor costs, and strengthen competitive advantage.

Ethical egoism appears in strategic decision-making where companies justify automation, data collection, or workforce restructuring based on long-term profitability. While such actions may be rational from a business perspective, they can create ethical tensions related to layoffs, job displacements, privacy, and fairness. The AI context also exposes limitations of egoistic theories since overemphasis on self-interest can erode trust, damage organizational culture, and generate reputational risk. For example, excessive algorithmic surveillance may increase short-term productivity but reduce morale and increase turnover. Likewise, biased AI systems may optimize outcomes for efficiency while producing discriminatory results by imposing an adverse impact on protected groups.

At the societal level, unregulated egoistic AI deployment may contribute to inequality, labor market disruption, and concentration of technological power under the control of few elites. These outcomes suggest that purely egoistic frameworks are insufficient for governing AI in complex socio-technical environments.

## **Comparisons with Established Research**

The analysis, findings, and reflections of this article strongly align with experimental findings by Ernst Fehr and Urs Fischbacher (2003), who demonstrate that human behavior frequently departs from strict self-interest. While the present study critiques psychological egoism for failing to account for altruistic and fairness-driven actions, Fehr and Fischbacher's laboratory experiments similarly show that individuals are willing to sacrifice personal gain to reward cooperation or punish unfairness. This convergence reinforces the article's claim that AI systems based solely on utility maximization risk misinterpreting human motivations. However, whereas the current article

extends this insight into AI system design, Fehr and Fischbacher focus primarily on economic game settings, leaving a gap that this research fills by applying these behavioral insights to organizational AI contexts.

A comparable perspective emerges in the work of Daniel Batson (2011), whose empathy–altruism hypothesis provides empirical support for genuinely other-regarding motivations. Batson’s studies indicate that empathic concern can produce helping behavior even when no personal benefit is expected, directly challenging the core assumption of psychological egoism discussed in this article. The present study builds on this by arguing that AI systems trained on behavioral data may fail to distinguish between self-interested and empathy-driven actions. Unlike Batson’s controlled psychological experiments, however, this article situates altruism within complex organizational and technological environments, highlighting how misinterpretation at scale could distort hiring, evaluation, and governance decisions.

The critique of psychological egoism in this article also resonates with the philosophical analysis of Elliott Sober (2018), who argues that this theory is often unfalsifiable because it can attribute hidden selfish motives to any behavior. Both Sober’s work and the present study emphasize that such “falsifiability” weakens explanatory power. The article extends this critique by drawing a novel parallel to AI analytics, suggesting that rigid modeling assumptions can similarly “force-fit” human behavior into predefined categories. This comparison advances Sober’s argument by demonstrating its practical implications in modern algorithmic systems, where theoretical flaws can translate into real-world bias and misclassification.

In contrast to the article’s skepticism toward purely self-interested models, Nick Bostrom and Eliezer Yudkowsky (2014) emphasize the risks of misaligned optimization in AI systems. Their work highlights how systems designed to pursue narrow objectives may produce unintended and harmful outcomes. The current article complements this by identifying psychological egoism as one such narrow objective framework when embedded in AI. While Bostrom and Yudkowsky focus on long-term existential risks and alignment problems, this study brings the discussion into organizational settings, illustrating how similar dynamics can affect workplace decision-making, fairness, and trust on a more immediate scale.

The discussion of ethical egoism’s limitations, particularly its difficulty in resolving conflicts and ensuring impartiality, parallels arguments made by Thomas Nagel (1970), who critiques the inability of egoistic frameworks to justify why one individual’s interests should outweigh another’s. Both Nagel and this article identify partiality as a central weakness. However, the present research extends this philosophical critique into AI governance, showing how

stakeholder-biased optimization can lead to discriminatory or inequitable algorithmic outcomes. This represents a practical elaboration of Nagel's abstract critique, demonstrating how classical ethical problems manifest in technological systems.

Similarly, the article's concerns about competitive conflicts under ethical egoism aligns with findings in algorithmic game theory and market behavior studies, such as those influenced by John Nash (1950). Nash's equilibrium models show that individually rational strategies do not always lead to collectively optimal outcomes. The present study echoes this insight by highlighting how AI systems optimizing self-interest in competitive environments such as pricing algorithms or financial trading can produce instability or inefficiency. Unlike Nash's formal models, however, this article incorporates ethical analysis, arguing that such outcomes are not merely inefficient but potentially unjust and socially harmful.

The article's engagement with the "invisible hand" argument also finds a point of comparison with contemporary critiques of market-driven AI, particularly in the work of Stuart Russell (2019). Russell argues that systems designed to optimize fixed objectives, such as profit or engagement, can conflict with broader human values. This aligns closely with the article's claim that it appeals to collective benefit often masks underlying egoistic reasoning. The key difference lies in emphasis, as Russell focuses on technical alignment solutions, whereas the present study foregrounds philosophical analysis, suggesting that the root problem may lie in the ethical assumptions embedded in system design.

Finally, the article's discussion of relativism and persuasion in relation to the Sophists parallels the framework proposed by Luciano Floridi and Josh Cowls (2019), who advocate for principled AI governance grounded in fairness, accountability, and transparency. Both works recognize the danger of data-driven relativism and persuasive technologies that prioritize effectiveness over truth. However, this article uniquely connects these modern concerns to classical Sophist philosophy, offering a historically grounded perspective on contemporary AI ethics. By doing so, it extends Floridi and Cowls' framework, illustrating that current challenges are part of a longstanding philosophical tension between relativism and objective moral standards.

### **Psychological Egoism Implications**

Psychological egoism is particularly vulnerable to criticism because it can be challenged by everyday counterexamples. The doctrine claims that human actions are motivated solely by self-interest, yet ordinary experience frequently reveals behavior that appears to contradict this claim. People routinely perform dutiful, compassionate, charitable, and even heroic actions that seem inconsistent with personal gain. Many such actions involve sacrifice, risk, or

inconvenience without any expectation of reward. These observations suggest that human motivation cannot be fully explained by selfish desire alone. This limitation is especially important in the context of AI-supported decision-making, since systems that assume purely self-interested behavior may misinterpret human intentions or undervalue cooperative, ethical, or mission-driven choices.

Individuals often experience the demands of duty or moral obligation in the same compelling way they experience personal desires. People may act because they believe something ought to be done, even when doing so conflicts with their own interests. In many cases, people choose to advance the welfare of others despite receiving no material or reputational benefit. Acts of emergency assistance, anonymous generosity, or extreme self-sacrifice illustrate that moral commitment, empathy, and principle can override self-interest (Dunne and Mujtaba, 2013). When AI systems model human decision-making only through incentive optimization or utility maximization, they risk overlooking these moral motivations and reducing complex ethical reasoning to narrow behavioral predictions.

Although self-interest is clearly an important part of human psychology, it is tempered by sympathy, compassion, and genuine concern for others. People may derive satisfaction from helping, but this does not mean that their primary aim is personal pleasure. Rather, satisfaction may be a by-product of acting on sincerely other-regarding values. Human motivation is often mixed and multidimensional, combining personal benefit, social responsibility, emotional connection, and moral identity. This complexity presents a challenge for AI systems that rely heavily on historical behavioral data, because past actions driven by context, emotion, or ethical commitment may be difficult to interpret through purely self-interest-based models (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2003).

A common logical mistake within psychological egoism is the assumption that because all actions are motivated by a person's desires, all actions must therefore be selfish. The crucial distinction lies in the object of the desire. If an individual genuinely desires another person's well-being and acts to promote it, the motivation cannot reasonably be described as selfish. Similarly, the fact that someone feels good after performing a generous act does not mean that the act was performed solely for the sake of that feeling. Confusing self-motivation with self-interest oversimplifies human psychology. For AI design, this distinction matters since systems that equate all observed behavior with self-interest may reinforce competitive or individualistic outcomes, even in environments where cooperation and collective welfare are central goals (Fernandes et al., 2025).

Another weakness of psychological egoism is its tendency to invoke hidden or unconscious selfish motives whenever apparently altruistic behavior is observed. Because such unconscious motives are difficult to verify or falsify, the theory can become strict rather than empirically grounded. If any action, no matter how selfless, can be explained away as secretly selfish, the theory loses its clarifying power. This concern parallels a risk in AI analytics: when models are built on rigid assumptions about human motivation, they may force complex behaviors into predetermined categories, thereby producing biased interpretations and overconfident predictions.

A more realistic understanding of human behavior recognizes that significant decisions often arise from mixed motives. People frequently care about fairness, social impact, professional ethics, and the well-being of others, even when doing so, carries personal costs. The key question is not whether self-interest exists, but whether individuals are capable of genuinely being concerned about others, and evidence suggests that they are. Ignoring these motivations can lead to flawed decision systems. In AI-integrated environments such as hiring, performance evaluation, healthcare, public policy, or financial services, overly narrow behavioral assumptions may produce outcomes that undermine trust, cooperation, and a healthy organizational culture (Mujtaba, 2026).

Perhaps the most serious risk of an uncritical acceptance of psychological egoism is the cynicism it can promote. If decision systems are built on the assumption that people are purely self-interested, they may normalize competitive, short-term, or opportunistic behavior. In contrast, responsible AI design should recognize the full range of human motivations and incorporate ethical principles such as fairness, accountability, and social responsibility (Russell, 2019). As AI increasingly influences high-stakes decisions, aligning algorithmic systems with both human behavioral realities and moral values is essential to avoid reinforcing a culture of self-interest at the expense of collective well-being (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014).

### **Ethical Egoism Implications**

A central difficulty with ethical egoism lies in determining which available action will truly maximize one's long-term self-interest. In real-world situations, modern working adults face multiple options, uncertain outcomes, and incomplete information. Predicting distant consequences is inherently complex, and even when people recognize that a future benefit outweighs an immediate gain, they may still choose short-term satisfaction. This limitation becomes especially relevant in AI-driven decision systems. While algorithms are designed to calculate optimal outcomes based on available data, they are constrained by the quality of their inputs, embedded assumptions, and

forecasting models. Like human egoists, AI systems can miscalculate long-term effects or prioritize measurable short-term gains such as quarterly profits or performance metrics over sustainable value.

Ethical egoism is also criticized for its partiality. It privileges the interests of the individual decision-maker above all others without providing a compelling reason why one person's interests should count more than another's. If no rational distinction justifies this preference, the theory appears arbitrary. This challenge mirrors concerns in AI governance: when AI systems are designed primarily to optimize the interests of a single stakeholder, such as shareholders, executives, or dominant market actors, they may neglect broader social impacts. The absence of impartiality can produce biased outcomes, reinforcing inequalities or externalizing costs onto less powerful groups.

Another problem arises from internal inconsistency. If two individuals seek the same scarce resource, ethical egoism may direct both to pursue it exclusively, even though only one can succeed. The same action could thus be deemed morally right for one person and morally wrong for another, generating contradictory moral judgments. In AI contexts, this conflict appears in competitive algorithmic environments, such as high-frequency trading systems, dynamic pricing models, or automated negotiations, where multiple agents optimize self-interest simultaneously. Without regulatory constraints, such systems can escalate into destabilizing competition, market manipulation, or resource depletion.

Defenders of ethical egoism often argue, following the logic of Adam Smith's "invisible hand," that if everyone pursues self-interest, collective welfare will ultimately improve. However, this defense subtly shifts toward utilitarian reasoning by appealing to overall social benefit rather than exclusive self-advantage. In AI integration, a similar tension exists. Organizations may justify profit-maximizing algorithms by claiming that innovation, efficiency, and growth will benefit society at large. Yet this broader justification relies on social welfare considerations that extend beyond strict egoism. If AI systems generate harmful side effects, such as job displacement, privacy violations, or discriminatory outcomes, the appeal to self-interest alone becomes ethically insufficient.

Ethical egoism lacks an objective standard for resolving conflicts between competing desires. If "good" simply means what advances one's personal aims, then disagreements may devolve into power struggles. In environments where multiple actors aggressively pursue self-interest, cooperation deteriorates and disputes may be resolved through dominance rather than fairness. Similarly, AI systems operating without ethical guardrails can intensify adversarial dynamics, particularly in areas such as cybersecurity, political influence

campaigns, or competitive markets. Unregulated optimization risks creating digital ecosystems marked by mistrust, manipulation, and strategic exploitation.

The theory of ethical egoism further assumes that self-interest will operate within prudent limits. As witnessed by numerous cases of public and private sector leaders, purely egoistic actors have little reason to respect constraints when violating them produces advantage. In business or technological settings, this could translate into exploitative labor practices, monopolistic behavior, or irresponsible data usage if such actions enhance competitive standing. AI magnifies this risk because automated systems can execute strategies at scale and speed. Without regulatory frameworks, transparency requirements, and ethical oversight, algorithmic decision-making may erode trust and social stability rather than enhance them.

Hedonism, a related egoistic doctrine, equates the good with personal pleasure. While classical thinkers such as Epicurus (1994) advocated a refined and moderate pursuit of pleasure which emphasized intellectual growth, friendship, and tranquility, yet the theory ultimately remains subjective. Individuals differ widely in what they find pleasurable or valuable. Similarly, AI systems that optimize user engagement, satisfaction scores, or consumption metrics must rely on subjective and shifting indicators of “preference.” Without an objective normative standard, such systems risk amplifying superficial or harmful desires (i.e. “hooking” young kids on mindless videos via Facebook, YouTube, TikTok or other platforms) simply because they generate measurable satisfaction.

In sum, ethical egoism provides a clear and seemingly rational model of decision-making centered on self-advantage, but it struggles to resolve conflicts, justify impartiality, or establish objective moral standards. When embedded into AI systems, its weaknesses can be magnified. AI-driven decision-making narrowly focused on optimization of self-interest, whether defined as profit, efficiency, or engagement, may unintentionally foster instability, inequality, and ethical erosion. Therefore, while egoistic reasoning may inform strategic calculation, the responsible integration of AI requires broader ethical principles, cooperative frameworks, and enforceable constraints to ensure that technological advancement supports long-term social well-being rather than unchecked competitive self-assertion.

### **Sophists and Decision-Making**

The term “Sophist” originally referred simply to a teacher, intellectual, or practitioner of wisdom. The Sophists rose to prominence in fifth-century B.C. Greece during a time of profound political and social change (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). As democracy expanded, opportunities for advancement increasingly depended on persuasive skill, education, and the ability to succeed

in public debate. The Sophists traveled from city to city offering instruction, particularly in rhetoric, law, and politics, to those who could afford their fees. In a society without formal universities or professional legal institutions, they became the first professional educators, equipping ambitious citizens with practical tools for influence and success.

Because they encountered diverse cultures, customs, and belief systems throughout the Greek world, the Sophists developed a tendency toward relativism. Although they did not form a unified philosophical school, many shared skepticisms about absolute truth and objective moral standards. Their teachings emphasized practical effectiveness over the discovery of timeless truths. This emphasis on persuasion, strategy, and context-sensitive reasoning bears striking parallels to contemporary AI systems. Much like the Sophists trained individuals to argue persuasively on either side of an issue, AI models can generate arguments, analyze competing perspectives, and optimize communication strategies based on audience data. Modern large language models, recommendation systems, and targeted advertising algorithms reflect a similar focus on rhetorical effectiveness rather than intrinsic moral truth (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

A central Sophist figure, Protagoras, is credited with the statement, “Man is the measure of all things” (Plato, 1997a). This claim has commonly been interpreted as expressing moral and epistemological relativism: what is true or good depends on the individual perceiver. If morality is relative to each person or community, then there are no universal standards by which disputes can be decisively resolved. In contemporary AI ethics, similar concerns arise regarding data-driven relativism. Machine learning systems derive patterns from historical data, which reflect the beliefs, behaviors, and biases of populations at specific times. Without objective normative standards embedded into their design, AI systems risk reinforcing local or majority perspectives aligned with utilitarianism rather than upholding impartial ethical principles (Russell, 2019). Thus, the Sophist challenge, regardless of whether objective standards exist beyond convention, remains deeply relevant for the modern era.

The Sophists’ emphasis on rhetoric also has modern equivalents in digital persuasion technologies. They taught students how to make weaker arguments appear stronger and how to influence public opinion effectively. Today, AI-powered systems perform comparable functions in political messaging, targeted advertising, and information campaigns. The ethical concern is that persuasive power, when detached from commitment to truth, can enable manipulation or misinformation. This risk mirrors ancient criticisms of sophistry as overly clever yet morally unanchored argumentation. As AI becomes more capable of

generating convincing text, images, and videos, the boundary between persuasion and deception becomes increasingly fragile.

Thrasymachus, depicted in Plato's *Republic* (1997b), advanced a more radical claim that justice is merely the interest of the stronger. Laws, he argued, reflect the will of those in power, and "might makes right." This perspective resonates with contemporary debates about technological power and algorithmic governance. When AI systems are controlled by powerful corporations or states, their design priorities may reflect the interests of those institutions rather than broader societal values. If decision-making authority increasingly shifts to algorithmic systems, concerns about fairness, accountability, and concentration of power intensify (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014). Without transparency and regulatory oversight, AI could inadvertently embody a modern form of Thrasymachus's doctrine, as technological dominance becomes substitutes for moral justification.

Despite the criticisms directed at them, the Sophists contributed significantly to ethical reflection. By questioning assumptions about truth, morality, and law, they forced later philosophers, especially Socrates, to articulate more rigorous foundations for ethics. Similarly, AI's rise compels contemporary societies to clarify ethical principles that might otherwise remain implicit. Questions about bias, responsibility, fairness, and truth in algorithmic systems echo the Sophists' challenge: *are moral standards objective, or are they socially constructed and subject to power dynamics?*

In sum, the Sophists' legacy illuminates enduring tensions between persuasion and truth, relativism and objectivity, power and justice. As AI systems increasingly shape decision-making in law, politics, business, and public discourse, these ancient debates acquire renewed urgency (Gudi et al., 2025). Integrating AI responsibly requires not only technical sophistication but also a commitment to ethical standards that transcend mere effectiveness or dominance. The Sophists remind us that intellectual skill without moral grounding can produce influence, but not necessarily justice. As such, corporate training and development programs, as well as academic institutions must focus on the ethical integration and usage of new technology applications in the modern workplace (Joullié et al., 2021; Kennedy et al., 2002; Wilden et al., 2017).

## Recommendations

Psychological egoism and ethical egoism offer a useful lens for understanding professional behavior in AI-enabled workplaces. In modern organizations, especially those integrating algorithmic systems into decision-making, these theories help explain why employees may prioritize efficiency, performance metrics, or personal advancement. However, when self-interest

becomes narrowly defined or focused only on productivity or surveillance-based accountability, it can intensify pressure, reduce autonomy, and contribute to stress and burnout (Mujtaba and McCartney, 2010; Mujtaba et al., 2023; Mujtaba and Myers, 2022; Tran et al., 2020). AI systems that track output, predict performance, or automate oversight may amplify these tendencies, reinforcing a workplace culture where perceived self-interest is tied to constant optimization rather than well-being and ethics (Mujtaba, 2025b).

From a mental health perspective, psychological egoism highlights how individuals adapt to environments that reward self-serving behaviors. In AI-driven workplaces, professionals may feel compelled to align their actions with what algorithms value (i.e. speed, accuracy, or compliance) sometimes at the expense of collaboration or intrinsic motivation. This can lead to emotional exhaustion, reduced job satisfaction, and a sense of alienation. When workers internalize the belief that everyone is acting primarily out of self-interest, trust within teams may erode, further isolating individuals (Karanis and Mujtaba, 2024). Over time, such environments can foster anxiety, disengagement, incivility, and suicidal ideation, particularly if employees feel that their worth is reduced to quantifiable outputs rather than holistic contributions (William et al., 2026; Zeeshan et al., 2024).

Ethical egoism, when interpreted narrowly, may justify these dynamics by framing self-interest as not only natural but morally appropriate. In high-performance AI environments, this can legitimize competitive behaviors, data hoarding, or minimal concern for colleagues' well-being (Kaweevisultrakul et al., 2009). Yet an enlightened self-interest believe would suggest that long-term personal benefit is tied to ethical conduct, cooperation, and sustainable practices. This shift is crucial for mental health because when professionals recognize that supporting others, maintaining integrity, and fostering trust ultimately benefits them, workplace relationships improve, and psychological strain decreases. Ethical egoism, in this broader sense, can support healthier organizational cultures if it is aligned with collective well-being.

The integration of AI adds another layer and level of complexity. Systems that automate decisions or recommend actions may distance professionals from moral responsibility; a phenomenon sometimes linked to "moral deskilling." When individuals rely heavily on AI outputs, they may feel less agency in their work, which can undermine their sense of purpose and increase stress. Psychological egoism would predict that individuals adapt by protecting their own interests, perhaps by deferring to AI to avoid blame, while ethical egoism raises the question of whether such behavior is justifiable. If responsibility is diffused between humans and machines, professionals may experience moral

uncertainty or even cognitive dissonance, which is a known contributor to anxiety and ethical fatigue.

These issues are particularly significant in the healthcare industry, where decisions directly affect patient outcomes and ethical stakes are high. Healthcare professionals already operate under intense emotional and cognitive demands, and the introduction of AI for such functions as diagnostic algorithms or patient monitoring systems can both alleviate and exacerbate these pressures. If AI systems are implemented in ways that prioritize efficiency over patient-centered care, practitioners may experience moral distress, feeling that their professional values are compromised. Psychological egoism helps explain how clinicians might cope by focusing on self-preservation, while ethical egoism underscores the need to align self-interest with patient welfare and professional ethics. As such, understanding these egoism theories is important for designing AI-enabled workplaces that support mental health, particularly in healthcare. A balanced approach that integrates self-interest with broader ethical responsibility can mitigate the negative psychological effects associated with AI adoption. When organizations frame well-being, ethical practice, and stakeholder trust as part of professionals' long-term self-interest, they create conditions where both individuals and systems can thrive. This alignment is essential in healthcare, where the mental health of professionals is closely linked to the quality and safety of patient care, making ethical AI integration not just an organizational concern but a societal imperative.



Figure 2. Ethical AI Integration Essentials  
(Created by the author using ChatGPT)

As visualized in Figure 2, the findings underscore that responsible AI governance and human-centered design are fundamentally interconnected for good mental health of all professionals in the modern workplace. The model presents an integrated framework for ethical AI in the workplace, illustrating how five core elements function as an interdependent system rather than isolated components. At the center, “Ethical AI in the Workplace” represents the overarching goal of achieving sustainable and trustworthy AI, while the surrounding elements (responsible AI governance, human-centered design, long-term value orientation, ethical training and leadership, and stakeholder engagement) are arranged in a circular flow to emphasize continuous interaction. Responsible AI governance provides guiding rules and accountability structures that shape system development, which in turn informs human-centered design focused on user needs and ethical considerations. This design orientation supports a long-term value perspective, ensuring that AI outcomes prioritize sustainability over short-term gains. Ethical training and leadership translate these principles into practice by equipping decision-makers to apply and uphold them, while stakeholder engagement ensures inclusivity, feedback, and legitimacy across diverse groups. The circular connections indicate that each component reinforces and depends on the others, forming a dynamic cycle that collectively sustains ethical, effective, and socially responsible AI systems.

Because the article demonstrates that human motivation is not reducible to pure self-interest, governance frameworks must move beyond narrow optimization metrics and incorporate principles such as fairness, accountability, and transparency, ideas strongly emphasized by Luciano Floridi. At the same time, human-centered design operationalizes these governance principles by ensuring that AI systems are built around real human needs, including empathy, moral judgment, and social context rather than purely behavioral predictions. In practice, governance provides the ethical “rules,” while human-centered design ensures those rules are embedded into system architecture, creating AI tools that better reflect the complexity of human decision-making rather than reinforcing reductive, egoistic assumptions.

These insights also highlight the importance of a long-term value orientation in conjunction with ethical training and leadership. The critique of ethical egoism shows that short-term self-interest, whether pursued by individuals or encoded into algorithms, can produce instability, inequity, and loss of trust. A long-term perspective, aligned with the work of Stuart Russell, shifts organizational priorities toward sustainable outcomes, such as employee well-being, societal impact, and reputational integrity. However, such a shift cannot occur without leadership that is ethically informed and capable of

interpreting AI outputs critically. Ethical training equips leaders and employees to recognize when algorithmic recommendations reflect biased or overly narrow assumptions, enabling them to intervene and align decisions with broader organizational and societal goals. Thus, leadership acts as the bridge between technical systems and moral accountability.

Finally, stakeholder engagement serves as the integrative mechanism that connects governance, design, and long-term thinking. The article's emphasis on mixed human motives and the limitations of egoistic frameworks implies that no single perspective, whether managerial, technical, or shareholder-driven, is sufficient for responsible AI deployment. Engaging diverse stakeholders, including employees, customers, regulators, and affected communities, ensures that AI systems reflect a plurality of values rather than a single self-interested objective. This participatory approach reinforces governance standards, informs human-centered design choices, and supports long-term value creation by building trust and legitimacy. Collectively, these elements form a mutually reinforcing system where governance sets expectations, design implements them, leadership sustains them, and stakeholder engagement validates and evolves them over time.

Modern organizations should adopt a balanced approach that integrates strategic self-interest with broader ethical responsibility to overcome flawed practices both in learning and in managing the workplace (Groves, 2005; Taddeo & Floridi, 2018b; Woodside, 2016). As such, the following are baseline recommendations for the ethical integration of AI into organizational governance, design, value orientation, learning, reflection, training, and engagement (Krishen et al., 2014; Mujtaba, 2024; Munoz et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2018):

1. Responsible AI governance: Establish policies that ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in AI systems.
2. Human-centered design: Prioritize employee well-being, autonomy, and meaningful work when implementing automation and monitoring tools.
3. Long-term value orientation: Recognize that trust, reputation, and organizational culture are strategic assets aligned with enlightened self-interest.
4. Ethical training and leadership: Educate managers and employees about ethical decision-making in AI-enabled environments.
5. Stakeholder engagement: Consider the interests of employees, customers, and society when evaluating AI investments.

These recommendations can be understood through the lens of psychological and ethical egoism by framing organizational ethics as an

extension of rational self-interest rather than a rejection of it. From a psychological egoism perspective, organizations naturally pursue strategies that enhance efficiency, competitiveness, and survival; thus, practices such as responsible AI governance and human-centered design can be interpreted as responses to underlying self-interested motivations to avoid reputational damage, regulatory penalties, and employee disengagement. Ethical egoism, in turn, provides normative justification for these actions by suggesting that organizations *ought* to act in ways that advance their long-term interests, which aligns with adopting transparent, fair, and accountable AI systems as well as investing in relevant ethical training and leadership. The emphasis on long-term value orientation reflects a form of “enlightened self-interest,” where fostering trust, strong organizational culture, and stakeholder relationships ultimately benefits the firm’s sustained performance. Similarly, stakeholder engagement can be reconciled with egoistic theory by recognizing that attending to the needs of employees, customers, and society contributes to stability, innovation, and legitimacy, all of which serve organizational self-interest over time. In this way, the recommendations do not contradict egoism but instead illustrate how both psychological and ethical egoism can support a more balanced, strategically ethical approach to AI integration in modern organizations.

These recommendations mitigate the limitations of egoistic decision-making by constraining narrow, short-term self-interest and redirecting it toward more sustainable and ethically aligned outcomes. While egoistic approaches, particularly in their simplistic or short-term form, can lead to opportunistic behavior, bias in AI systems, and the neglect of stakeholder welfare, the introduction of responsible AI governance establishes formal accountability mechanisms that reduce the risk of self-serving excesses. Human-centered design and stakeholder engagement broaden the decision-making lens beyond the organization’s immediate gains, ensuring that the impacts on employees, customers, and society are systematically considered. At the same time, focused periodic ethical training and leadership development help decision-makers critically reflect on their motivations, which can reduce the likelihood of unconscious bias and purely self-interested reasoning (Mujtaba & Seyoum, 2025). Importantly, a long-term value orientation reframes self-interest itself, thereby encouraging organizations to recognize that trust, fairness, and social legitimacy are essential to enduring success. Together, these measures transform egoistic decision-making from a potentially myopic and harmful force into a more disciplined, reflective, and strategically responsible approach that aligns organizational interests with broader ethical and societal outcomes.

Organizations seeking to integrate artificial intelligence into their operations must adopt a balanced approach that aligns strategic self-interest with broader ethical responsibility and value creation for all relevant stakeholders (Osborne et al., 2022; Rahimi and Oh, 2024; Sharma et al., 2022). An enlightened understanding of ethical egoism should help modern professionals to recognize that long-term organizational success depends not merely on short-term gains, but on sustainable skills, traits, and practices that preserve trust, legitimacy, and social stability (Mujtaba et al., 2026; Mujtaba, 2025a). Rather than viewing ethics as a constraint on profitability, organizations should understand it as a strategic asset that strengthens resilience and competitive advantage. The essential recommendations outline how AI can be integrated responsibly across governance, design, culture, and stakeholder relationships.

First, responsible AI governance requires the establishment of clear policies and oversight mechanisms that promote fairness, transparency, and accountability. AI systems often influence hiring, promotion, performance evaluation, risk assessment, and customer engagement decisions. Without structured governance frameworks, these systems may reproduce bias, obscure decision logic, or distribute harm unevenly. Organizations should implement ethical review boards, auditing processes, and documentation standards that clarify how algorithms function and who is accountable for their outcomes. Transparent governance not only mitigates legal and reputational risk but also reinforces internal and external confidence in AI-driven decisions.

Second, human-centered design must remain central when deploying automation, analytics, and monitoring technologies. AI tools can increase productivity and streamline operations, but if implemented without regard for employee autonomy and well-being, they can erode morale and trust. Human-centered design emphasizes meaningful work, informed consent, and participatory implementation. Employees should understand how AI tools affect their roles and should have opportunities to provide feedback. When automation augments rather than replaces human capabilities, organizations can foster innovation while preserving dignity and engagement.

Third, organizations should adopt a long-term value orientation that recognizes trust, reputation, and culture as strategic assets (Pohlman and Gardiner, 2000). Short-term optimization models may prioritize cost reduction or efficiency gains, but neglecting ethical considerations can undermine stakeholder relationships and brand integrity (Deckers & Leclercq, 2022; Perkins et al., 2023). Trust once lost is costly to rebuild. By aligning AI investments with sustainable performance goals, organizations embody

enlightened self-interest, while acknowledging that ethical conduct contributes directly to long-term profitability, talent retention, and customer loyalty.

Fourth, ethical training and leadership development are essential in technology-enabled environments (Sosik, 2001; Woodside, 2016). Managers and employees must be equipped to understand the ethical implications of algorithmic decision-making, including issues of bias, data privacy, surveillance, and accountability. Leadership should model ethical reflection and encourage open dialogue about modern technology's impact on attitude and performance (Sosik, 2001). Structured training programs can help decision-makers critically evaluate automated outputs rather than deferring blindly to algorithmic authority. Ethical literacy in AI application strengthens organizational judgment and reduces the risk of harmful or shortsighted decisions (Javed and Mujtaba, 2026).

Fifth, stakeholder engagement ensures that AI investments reflect a broad range of interests rather than narrow organizational advantage. Employees, customers, investors, regulators, and community members may experience AI systems differently. Engaging these stakeholders through consultation, surveys, or advisory panels allows organizations to anticipate unintended consequences and adapt proactively based on relevant values. Considering societal impact alongside operational efficiency reflects an enlightened form of ethical egoism, as organizations ultimately benefit when their actions sustain public trust, social legitimacy, and cooperative relationships. By integrating strategic goals with ethical foresight, organizations can leverage AI responsibly while advancing both performance and principled governance.

An enlightened form of ethical egoism suggests that organizations ultimately benefit from ethical conduct that supports sustainable performance and social legitimacy. However, as the following conclusion reminds us, training and development are necessary predecessors of effective performance, as well as happier and healthier employees:

“Cultivating a continuous learning culture focused on Gen AI is not merely a trend but a necessity for organizations seeking to thrive in the age of AI. By fostering a growth mindset, integrating learning into the workflow, encouraging practical application and experimentation, and providing safe testing grounds, leaders can empower their workforce to embrace Gen AI and drive innovation. These strategies can lead to tangible results, transforming organizations into agile and adaptable entities ready to harness the full potential of this transformative technology. By investing in continuous learning, organizations are not just investing in their employees; they are investing in their future” (Tsipursky, 2026, para. 1).

Organizations can operationalize this paper's recommendations through concrete strategies embedded in governance structures and day-to-day practices. For responsible AI governance, firms should establish cross-functional AI ethics committees with decision authority, implement algorithmic impact assessments prior to deployment, and adopt audit mechanisms such as bias testing and explainability reviews. Human-centered design can be advanced by integrating employee "feedback loops" into AI system development, conducting usability and well-being assessments, and setting limits on intrusive monitoring technologies. To reinforce a long-term value orientation, organizations should align executive incentives with sustainability metrics, ethical performance indicators, and stakeholder trust benchmarks rather than short-term financial gains alone. Ethical training programs should be continuous and scenario-based, equipping managers and employees to recognize ethical dilemmas in AI-enabled environments and apply structured decision-making frameworks. Additionally, stakeholder engagement can be institutionalized through regular consultations, transparent reporting, and participatory design processes that include employees, customers, and community representatives in shaping AI initiatives.

From a policy perspective, these strategies imply the need for both internal and external regulatory alignment. Internally, organizations should codify AI ethics principles into enforceable policies, link compliance to performance evaluations, and require documentation for high-stakes algorithmic decisions. Externally, there is a growing need for regulatory frameworks that mandate transparency, fairness audits, and accountability standards for AI systems, ensuring that organizations cannot rely solely on self-interested discretion. Policymakers may also encourage industry-wide standards and certifications for responsible AI, promoting consistency and trust across sectors. Furthermore, labor policies should address the impact of automation on workforce displacement by incentivizing reskilling and protecting worker rights in AI-mediated workplaces. Together, these organizational strategies and policy implications create a structured environment in which egoistic motivations are balanced by accountability, oversight, and long-term societal considerations, thereby fostering more responsible and sustainable AI integration.

### **Summary**

This study has examined the philosophical foundations of psychological egoism and ethical egoism and assessed their relevance to the growing integration of artificial intelligence into decision-making processes. By revisiting classical thinkers, the analysis has demonstrated that egoism, whether descriptive or normative, offers a powerful but incomplete framework for

understanding human motivation and moral judgment. Psychological egoism attempts to explain behavior as fundamentally self-interested, while ethical egoism prescribes the pursuit of self-interest as a moral duty. Both theories provide insight into incentive-driven action, strategic reasoning, and competitive dynamics. However, both also encounter serious conceptual and practical limitations, particularly when confronted with the complexity of human moral experience and social interdependence.

In contemporary contexts, AI systems often operate on various forms of egoistic reasoning. Many algorithmic models are designed to optimize measurable objectives such as profit, efficiency, engagement, productivity, or risk minimization. These optimization structures resemble ethical egoism in practice, by prioritizing defined interests and calculating the most advantageous course of action according to specified metrics. Similarly, predictive AI systems grounded in behavioral data reflect assumptions aligned with psychological egoism, thereby treating human agents as preference-maximizers responsive to incentives. In business, finance, marketing, and governance, AI tools frequently embed strategic self-advancement directly into automated processes. Yet the study has shown that an exclusive reliance on egoistic reasoning, whether human or algorithmic, risks producing instability, inequality, and ethical erosion. Ethical egoism struggles to resolve conflicts between competing interests, justify impartiality, or provide objective standards for adjudicating disputes. When translated into AI systems operating at scale and speed, these weaknesses may intensify. Competitive algorithmic environments can amplify adversarial dynamics, while profit-maximizing models may overlook long-term social consequences. The absence of normative constraints can transform optimization into exploitation, particularly where power asymmetries exist.

At the same time, it would be misguided to dismiss egoistic insights altogether. Self-interest is a significant component of human behavior and institutional design. Prudently structured incentive systems can channel individual advantage toward collective benefit, much like the moderated interpretations of egoism advanced in classical economic thought. AI systems, when properly governed, can help align long-term interests with broader social goals to enhance transparency, efficiency, and coordination. The challenge, therefore, is not to eliminate self-interest from decision-making frameworks, but to situate it within ethically informed boundaries.

The integration of AI into decision-making compels a reexamination of enduring philosophical questions that can be explored in future research: Are moral standards objective or relative? Should decision systems privilege “particular” interests, or strive for impartiality? Can optimization alone generate justice? Can AI be used as an “equalizer” of justice in settling disputes

between the weak and strong states? The classical debates surrounding egoism illuminate these contemporary concerns. AI, like human agents, requires guidance beyond mere calculation of advantage. Embedding principles such as fairness, accountability, transparency, and respect for human dignity into algorithmic systems is essential if technological advancement is to support rather than undermine social trust.

Understanding psychological egoism and ethical egoism equips organizations and professionals to recognize how self-interest shapes behavior and to intentionally channel it toward healthier, more sustainable outcomes. By reframing self-interest as compatible with ethical responsibility, through supportive leadership, human-centered AI design, and value systems that prioritize trust and well-being, a workplace can reduce stress, moral distress, and burnout while strengthening collaboration and purpose. This integrated perspective not only improves individual mental health but also fosters resilient organizational cultures where professionals can thrive alongside advancing technologies.

Overall, the study underscores that egoism provides an explanatory lens for understanding strategic behavior, but it is insufficient as a comprehensive ethical foundation for AI governance. Since AI has become increasingly embedded in economic, political, and social institutions, management and professional responsibility lies not only in refining technical performance but also in articulating and implementing moral frameworks that transcend narrow self-interest. The future of AI ethics will depend on balancing rational optimization with principled restraint to ensure that intelligent systems contribute to sustainable human flourishing rather than merely magnifying competitive self-assertion.

**Statement on the Use of AI Tools.** Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate visuals and improve the language content, after which the authors checked the text and took full responsibility for its content.

**Conflict of Interest.** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Barbri (May 5, 2025). The AI Advantage: Everyday Solutions for Modern Legal Professionals. *BARBI: Empowering Every Step of the Legal Learning Journey*. <https://www.barbri.com/resources/>
2. Bawack, R. E., Wamba, S. F., Carillo, K. D. A., & Akter, S. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in E-commerce: A bibliometric study and literature review. *Electronic Markets*, 32(2), 297–338. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12525-022-00537-z>

3. Batson, C. D. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341065.001.0001>
4. Berezan, O., Krishen, A. S., Agarwal, S., & Kachroo P. (2018). The pursuit of virtual happiness: Exploring the social media experience across generations. *Journal of Business Research*, 89, 455–461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.11.038>
5. Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. (2014). The ethics of artificial intelligence. In K. Frankish & W. Ramsey (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of artificial intelligence* (pp. 316–334). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139046855.020>
6. Camerer, C. F., Loewenstein, G., & Rabin, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Advances in behavioral economics*. Princeton University Press. [https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691116822/advances-in-behavioral-economics?srsId=AfmBOoq5Cx4E0kdvBfkWeGjjqduUCno4UzxeMF6\\_EYWTQNqh\\_CbFv3J](https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691116822/advances-in-behavioral-economics?srsId=AfmBOoq5Cx4E0kdvBfkWeGjjqduUCno4UzxeMF6_EYWTQNqh_CbFv3J)
7. Cavico, F. J. and Mujtaba, B. G. (2013). *Business Ethics: The Moral Foundation of Leadership, Management, and Entrepreneurship* (3rd edition). Pearson: USA. <https://www.amazon.com/Business-Ethics-Foundation-Leadership-Entrepreneurship/dp/0555036065>
8. Cavico, F. J., Mujtaba, B. G., Lawrence, E., and Muffler, S. C. (2015). Personality Tests in Employment: A continuing Legal, Ethical, and Practical Quandary. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 2(3), 60-84.
9. Chan, A., Rahimi-Ardabilli, H., Rogers, W. A., & Coiera, E. (2025). The real-world impact of artificial intelligence ethics frameworks across a decade in healthcare: A scoping review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 32(11), 1767–1777. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaf167>
10. Chandra, S., Verma, S., Lim, W. M., Kumar, S., & Donthu, N. (2022). Personalization in personalized marketing: Trends and ways forward. *Psychology & Marketing*, 39(10), 1529–1562. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.2167043>
11. Chaudhary, D. (2025). The ethics of AI in pricing: Fairness, transparency, and accountability. *International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and Engineering*, 11(3), 87-95. <https://doi.org/10.22399/ijcesen.3949>
12. Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neuberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the empathy–altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(3), 481–494. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.481>
13. Crittenden, V. L. and Crittenden, W. F. (2016). Teaching and learning disrupted: Isomorphic change. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 10(2), 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-12-2015-0097>

14. Crittenden, V. L. and Peterson, R. A. (2019). Digital disruption: The transdisciplinary future of marketing education. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 41(1), 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475319825534>
15. Davies, J. and Starkey, K. (2020). Can we save the business school? Shut down the business school. What's wrong with management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 19, 116–120. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amle.2019.0140>
16. Deckers, E., & Leclercq, B. (2022). Diffuse plagiarism in the age of generative AI: Ethical and institutional challenges. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 20(4), 389–405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-022-09430-w>
17. Demir, M., Mujtaba, B. G. and Vardarlier, P. (2025). Strategic Governance for Sustainable Performance: ESG Impacts of Board and Financial Structures in International Logistics. *Organization Development Journal*, 43(3), 148-166. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18480990>
18. Dong, J., Zhang, G., & Wu, L. (2025). Life against algorithmic management: A study on burnout and its influencing factors among food delivery riders. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13, Article 1531541. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1531541>
19. Dunne, M. J. and Mujtaba, B. G. (2013). Employee Engagement and Change Management Programmes: a Comparative Study of Organisational Commitment between Irish and Irish Cultures. *International Affairs and Global Strategy*, 9(1), 1-22.
20. Elliott, K. M., and Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(4), 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v10n04\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v10n04_01)
21. Epicurus (1994). *The Epicurus reader: Selected writings and testimonia* (B. Inwood & L. P. Gerson, Trans. & Eds.). Hackett Publishing Company.
22. Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
23. Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. *Nature*, 425(6960), 785–791. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02043>
24. Feinberg, J., & Shafer-Landau, R. (2013). *Reason and responsibility: Readings in some basic problems of philosophy* (14th ed.). Cengage Learning.
25. Fernandes, A., Fernandes, G., and Mujtaba, B. G. (2025). Shaping Pro-Environmental Intentions: A Theory of Planned Behavior - Guided Study on Plastic Pollution Reduction Behavior in Texan High Schools. *Organization Development Journal*, 43(2), 56-76. <https://odjournal.org/volume-43-number-2-2025/>
26. Floridi, L. (2019). What the near future of artificial intelligence could be. *Philosophy & Technology*, 32(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-019-00345-y>
27. Floridi, L., & Cows, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1>
28. Frankena, W. K. (1973). *Ethics* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.

29. Gradwohl, C. and Mujtaba, B. G. (2025). Training and Development at Deloitte: Best Practices in Retaining Top Talent in a Volatile Job Market. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 15(1), 133-151. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v15i1.22698>
30. Groves, K. S. (2005). Gender differences in social and emotional skills and charismatic leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(3), 30–46. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/107179190501100303>
31. Gudi, A., Chinta, R. & Mujtaba, B. G. (2025). Ancient Wisdom and Modern Strategy: A Comparative Analysis of the Eightfold Path and the 7-S Framework. *Organization Development Journal*, 43(4), 52-68. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19552478>
32. Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan* (R. Tuck, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1651). <https://www.cambridge.org/highereducation/books/hobbes-leviathan/A25B89A5632E978BA9DC74930D78EC33#overview>
33. Iyer, S. S., Subramanian, R., Raji, B., & Arora, R. (2025). The ethical implications of artificial intelligence in decision-making: Balancing innovation with accountability and integrity. *Journal of Economics & Management Research*, 6(10), 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.47363/JESMR/2025\(6\)305](https://doi.org/10.47363/JESMR/2025(6)305)
34. Javed, S. and Mujtaba, B.G. (2026). Assessing the Nexus Between AI Literacy, AI Anxiety, and Digital Leadership in Higher Education: a Configurational Analysis for Public Sector Institutions. *Public Organization Review*, 26, 71-91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-025-00952-8>
35. Joullié, J. E., Gould, A. M., Spillane, R., and Luc, S. (2021). The language of power and authority in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(4), 101491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101491>
36. Kaweevisultrakul, T., Mujtaba, B. G., and Puriveth, P. (2009). Leadership and Managerial Implications of Healthcare Employees' Knowledge Sharing Intentions: A Study of Respondents in the Pharmaceutical Industry of Thailand. *International Leadership Journal*, 1(3/4), 4-34.
37. Kennedy, E. J., Lawton, L., and Plumlee, E. L. (2002). Blissful ignorance: The problem of unrecognized incompetence and academic performance. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 24(3), 243–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475302238047>
38. Kolb, R. W. (Ed.). (2008). Egoism. In *Encyclopedia of business ethics and society*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412956260.n265>
39. Krishen, A. S., Raschke, R., Kachroo, P., LaTour, M., and Verma, P. (2014). Promote me or protect us? The framing of policy for collective good. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(3/4), 742–760. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-10-2011-0609>
40. Li, F., Zhan, X. and Liu, Y. (2025). The double-edged sword effect of algorithmic management on work engagement: The mediating role of

- challenge and threat appraisal. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1522088. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1522088>
41. Mandeville, B. (1988). *The fable of the bees: Or, private vices, Publick benefits* (F. B. Kaye, Ed.). Liberty Fund. (Original work published 1714). <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/kaye-the-fable-of-the-bees-or-private-vices-publick-benefits-vol-1>
  42. Mujtaba, B. G. (2026). Mindfulness Practices and Artificial Intelligence Convergence Implications: Insights from Dr. Arvind Gudi on Transforming Learning and the Workplace. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 7(1), 24-34. <https://www.eu-opensci.org/index.php/ejedu/article/view/31028>
  43. Mujtaba, B. G. (2025a). Management Skills of Vietnamese and Americans: Examining their Technical, Human and Conceptual Scores based on Culture and Gender. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 28(2), 237-254. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17616082>
  44. Mujtaba, B. G. (2025b). Human-AI Intersection: Understanding the Ethical Challenges, Opportunities, and Governance Protocols for a Changing Data-Driven Digital World. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 9(1), 109-126. [https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.9\(1\).109-126.2025](https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.9(1).109-126.2025)
  45. Mujtaba, B. G. (2024). Clarifying Ethical Dilemmas in Sharpening Students' Artificial Intelligence Proficiency: Dispelling Myths About Using AI Tools in Higher Education. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 8(2), 107–127. [https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.8\(2\).107-127.2024](https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.8(2).107-127.2024)
  46. Mujtaba, B.G., Kaifi, B.A., & Lawrence, E. (2023). Safety mandates, legal requirements, and management practices to provide employees with a safe and healthful work environment. *International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Safety*, 7(2), 1-19. [https://doi.org/10.24840/2184-0954\\_007-002\\_002116](https://doi.org/10.24840/2184-0954_007-002_002116)
  47. Mujtaba, B. G. and Meyer, C. (2022). Checklist for Professional Communication: A Path to a Healthy Personality, Reflective Mindfulness, and Self-Development Management. *Health Economics and Management Review*, 3(3), 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.21272/hem.2022.3-10>
  48. Mujtaba, B. G. and McCartney, T. (2010). *Managing Workplace Stress and Conflict amid Change*, 2nd edition. ILEAD Academy: Florida.
  49. Mujtaba, B. G., Mujtaba, M. G. and Mujtaba, G. (2026). Success Traits for Modern College Students. *Theory and Event*, 29(1), 358-388. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19758349>
  50. Mujtaba, B. G. & Seyoum, B. (2025). Addressing State Fragility through Inclusive Economic Development in Afghanistan. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 28(3), 12-47. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18114429>
  51. Munoz, L., Fergurson, J. R., Harris, E. G., and Fleming, D. (2022). Does empathy matter? An exploratory study of class-transition satisfaction in unplanned course interruptions. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 44(2), 217–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02734753211073891>
  52. Nafei, W. A., Ghoneim, M. A., Mujtaba, B. G., & Khanfar, N. M. (2025). Digitalization as a Socioeconomic Challenge: Assessing the Mediating

- Role of Digital Service Quality on Digitalization's Impact on Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *SocioEconomic Challenges*, 9(1), 1-20.
53. Nagel, T. (1970). The possibility of altruism. Princeton University Press.
  54. Nash, J. (1950). Equilibrium points in n-person games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 36(1), 48–49.  
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.36.1.48>
  55. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.  
<https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3002861>
  56. Osborne, S., Powell, M. G. H., Cui, T., and Strokosch, K. (2022). Value creation in the public service ecosystem: An integrative framework. *Public Administration Review*, 82(4), 634–645. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13474>
  57. Perkins, M., Roe, J., Postran, B., & McGaughran, J. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(2), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07>
  58. Plato (1997a). Protagoras (S. Lombardo & K. Bell, Trans.). In J. M. Cooper (Ed.), *Plato: Complete works* (pp. 746–790). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published ca. 380 B.C.E.).  
<https://philosophy.uncg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Republic.pdf>
  59. Plato (1997b). Republic (G. M. A. Grube, Trans.; C. D. C. Reeve, Rev.). In J. M. Cooper (Ed.), *Plato: Complete works* (pp. 971–1223). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published ca. 380 B.C.E.).  
<https://philosophy.uncg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Republic.pdf>
  60. Pohlman, R. A. & Gardiner, G. S. (2000). *Value Driven Management: How to Create and Maximize Value Over Time for Organizational Success*. Amacom Books.
  61. Prakash, C., Yadav R., Singh, A., and Aarti. (2022). An empirical investigation of the higher educational institutions' attractiveness as an employer. *South Asian Journal of Human Resources Management*, 9(1), 130–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23220937221078118>
  62. Rahimi, R. A. and Oh, G. S. (2024). Rethinking the role of educators in the 21st century: Navigating globalization, technology, and pandemics. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 12, 182–197. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-024-00303-4>
  63. Russell, S. (2019). *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*. Viking.
  64. Salas-Pilco, S. Z., & Yang, Y. (2022). Artificial Intelligence Applications in Latin American Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(21).  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00326-w>
  65. Shah, I. (2025). AI-driven price discrimination: Strategic applications, ethical challenges, and regulatory implications. *International Science Journal of Management, Economics & Finance*, 4(5), 33-50.  
<https://doi.org/10.46299/j.isjmef.20250405.04>

66. Sharma, G., Greco, A., Grewatsch S., and Bansal, P. (2022). Cocreating forward: How researchers and managers can address problems together. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 21(3), 350–368. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2021.0233>
67. Skinner, Q. (1996). Reason and rhetoric in the philosophy of Hobbes. Cambridge University Press.
68. Simon, H. A. (1997). Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations (4th ed.). Free Press.
69. Smith, A. (1976). An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations (R. H. Campbell & A. S. Skinner, Eds.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1776). <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/an-inquiry-into-the-nature-and-causes-of-the-wealth-of-nations-9780198281849?cc=us&lang=en&>
70. Smith, A. (1976 / 2011). The theory of moral sentiments (D. D. Raphael & A. L. Macfie, Eds.). Oxford University Press / Gutenberg Publishers. (Original work published 1759).
71. Sober, E. (2018). The philosophy of biology (2nd ed.). Westview Press.
72. Sober, E. (2000/2018). Psychological egoism. In H. LaFollette & I. Persson (Eds.), *The Blackwell guide to ethical theory*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9780631201199.1999.00009.x>
73. Sober, E., & Wilson, D. S. (1998). *Unto others: The evolution and psychology of unselfish behavior*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674930476>
74. Sosik, J. J. (2001). Self-other agreement on charismatic leadership: Relationships with work attitudes and managerial performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 26(4), 484–511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601101264005>
75. Spencer, M. E. (1970). Weber on legitimate norms and authority. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 21(2), 123–134. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/588403>
76. Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018a). How AI can be a force for good. *Science*, 361(6404), 751–752. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat5991>
77. Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018b). Regulate artificial intelligence to avert cyber arms race. *Nature*, 556(7701), 296–298. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-04602-6>
78. Tran, C. T. H., Tran, H. T. M., Nguyen, H. T. N., Mach, D. N., Phan, H. S. P., Mujtaba, B. G. (2020). Stress Management in the Modern Workplace and the Role of Human Resource Professionals. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 4(2), 26-40. [http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4\(2\).26-40.2020](http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4(2).26-40.2020)
79. Tshipursky, G. (February 17, 2026a). Gen AI Demands We Keep Learning or Become Obsolete. Disaster Avoidance Experts. Blog: <https://disasteravoidanceexperts.com/gen-ai-demands-we-keep-learning-or-become-obsolete/>
80. Tshipursky, G. (Feb. 24, 2026b). Will Gen AI Drive Marketing Teams to One? Disaster Avoidance Experts. Blog:

- <https://disasteravoidanceexperts.com/will-gen-ai-drive-marketing-teams-to-one/>
81. Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind*, 5(236), 433–460. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/lix.236.433>
  82. Weber, M. (1958). The three types of legitimate rule. *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions*, 4(1), 1–11.
  83. Wilden, R., Akaka, M. A., Karpen, I. O., and Hohberger, J. (2017). The evolution and prospects of service-dominant logic: An investigation of past, present, and future research. *Journal of Service Research*, 20(4), 345–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670517715121>
  84. Williams, A.A., Wardak, K.S., and Mujtaba, B.G. (2026). An Empirical Study of Suicide Methods Across Demographic Groups, Temporal Patterns, and Associated Economic Impacts. *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics*, 26(1), 18-38.
  85. Woodside, A. G. (2016). The good practices manifesto: Overcoming bad practices pervasive in current research in business. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2), 365–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.09.008>
  86. Yang, G. Z., Bellingham, J., Dupont, P. E., Fischer, P., Floridi, L., Full, R., Jacobstein, N., Kumar, V., McNutt, M., Merrifield, R., Nelson, B. J., Scassellati, B., Taddeo, M., Taylor, R., Veloso, M., Wang, Z. L., & Wood, R. (2018). The grand challenges of Science Robotics. *Science Robotics*, 3(14), eaar7650. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scirobotics.aar7650>
  87. Zeeshan, M., Batool, N., Raza, M.A., and Mujtaba, B.G. (2024). Workplace Ostracism and Instigated Workplace Incivility: A Moderated Mediation Model of Narcissism and Negative Emotions. *Public Organization Review*, 24, 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-023-00754-w>
  88. Zhao, P., He, G., & Guan, J. (2025). The ethical costs of artificial intelligence: Investigating how and when workplace artificial intelligence usage promotes employee unethical outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 203, 531–547. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-025-06060-3>
  89. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York: PublicAffairs. <https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=56791>

## Biography

*Bahaudin G. Mujtaba* is Professor of management, human resources, and international management. Dr. Mujtaba has served as a professor, director, and department chair at the Huizenga College of Business and Entrepreneurship at Nova Southeastern University since 2002. Bahaudin was given the prestigious annual “Faculty of the Year Award” twice at NSU. Bahaudin is a certified trainer on topics such as “Situational Leadership” by the Paul Hersey organization, “Seven Habits of Highly Effective People” by the Covey Organization, and a “Cultural Competency” trainer through the National Multi-Cultural Institute (NMCI). He has been involved in leadership, management development, and cultural competency education since the late 1990s. Bahaudin worked with Publix Super Markets, Inc. in retail management and as a senior management development specialist in their human resources department for sixteen years. Bahaudin’s research and writing interests are in the areas of human resources, leadership, sustainability, international management, and higher education.



*J. Preston Jones* is Professor of Management in the School of Business, Economics, and Technology at Campbellsville University. Before joining Campbellsville, Dr. Jones enjoyed a twenty-seven (27) year career at Nova Southeastern University's (NSU) H. Wayne Huizenga College of Business and Entrepreneurship. In his role as dean, he provided the leadership that helped the Huizenga College of Business achieve the academic goals as part of NSU's Vision 2020. Before entering higher education, he served in various engineering and management capacities at the Johnson & Johnson family of companies for more than 17 years. Preston’s research interests include organizational behavior, leadership, and business turn-around strategies. He earned his Doctor of Business Administration and M.B.A. degrees at Nova Southeastern University in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. He earned his B.S. in Electrical Engineering from Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana.

