

Echoes of AI Harms: A Human–LLM Synergistic Framework for Bias-Driven Harm Anticipation

NICOLETA TANTALAKI, Aristotle University, Greece

SOPHIA VEI, Aristotle University, Greece

ATHENA VAKALI, Aristotle University, Greece

The growing influence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems on decision-making in critical domains has exposed their potential to cause significant harms, often rooted in biases embedded across the AI lifecycle. While existing frameworks and taxonomies document bias or harms in isolation, they rarely establish systematic links between specific bias types and the harms they cause, particularly within real-world sociotechnical contexts. Technical fixes proposed to address AI biases are ill-equipped to address them and are typically applied after a system has been developed or deployed, offering limited preventive value. We propose ECHO, a novel framework for proactive AI harm anticipation through the systematic mapping of AI bias types to harm outcomes across diverse stakeholder and domain contexts. ECHO follows a modular workflow encompassing stakeholder identification, vignette-based presentation of biased AI systems, and dual (human–LLM) harm annotation, integrated within ethical matrices for structured interpretation. This human-centered approach enables early-stage detection of bias-to-harm pathways, guiding AI design and governance decisions from the outset. We validate ECHO in two high-stakes domains (disease diagnosis and hiring), revealing domain-specific, bias-to-harm patterns and demonstrating ECHO’s potential to support anticipatory governance of AI systems.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: AI bias, harms, harm anticipation, vignette, ethical matrix

1 Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI), a human-generated technology, has rapidly evolved as a default (semi-)autonomous decision-maker, reshaping critical domains such as hiring, finance, justice, and healthcare [26, 42]. A rich body of research has explored and improved the accuracy of AI (especially of Machine Learning [ML]) decision-making models [9, 15, 18, 62]. However, the capacity of AI to safeguard fairness has raised strong concerns, since AI outcomes have generated tangible *harms* which reinforce discrimination, restrict opportunities, or undermine well-being [9, 74, 77]. Harms caused by AI (AI harms) pose critical threats to individuals, groups of people, and society as a whole. Generative AI (with its Large Language Models [LLMs] flagship), has fueled further AI harms concerns, ranging from biased and unfair decision-making to disastrous situations (such as the suicide of a teenager following interactions with an AI chat system designed to provide emotional support) [83, 86]. LLMs’ complex architectures are prone to inherit vulnerabilities (embedded in training data, model design, or architectural assumptions), while their obscure choices prohibit AI harms anticipation [7, 39, 52, 74].

Minimizing AI harms demands that we uncover their sources and root causes, and articulating the mechanisms leading to them [5, 70]. Prior work has established that biases arising throughout an AI lifecycle constitute key sources of harm [9, 25, 71, 77] and are reflected in systematic errors in decision making during data collection, modelling, evaluation, and deployment. For instance, representation bias frequently arises during data collection due to the selection of unrepresentative samples or samples that reflect entrenched historical inequities (see Subsection 2.2 for additional bias types and relevant problematic choices) [37, 55, 77]. Although several frameworks describe where and how such biases occur across the lifecycle [46, 55, 77, 81], they remain largely disconnected from emerging harm taxonomies that categorize the negative effects of AI systems on individuals, groups, and society [1, 34, 38, 74, 83]. Consequently, the

Authors’ Contact Information: Nicoleta Tantalaki, tantalaki@csd.auth.gr, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, Greece; Sophia Vei, , Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, Greece; Athena Vakali, avakali@csd.auth.gr, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, Greece.

specific relationships and the underlying mechanisms linking biases to the harms they produce remain underexplored [35, 55, 71, 77, 81], motivating our first research question: **[RQ1: Which types of AI bias are associated with which specific AI harms, and through which mechanisms?]**

Multiple technical fixes (e.g., data re-sampling or re-weighting) have been proposed to address AI biases, and while these methods can reduce certain harmful impacts, they often fail to intervene effectively or guarantee harmless outcomes [12, 13, 18, 19, 27, 62]. Harms in AI systems arise from complex sociotechnical dynamics, and are rooted in social relations and cognitive processes, dimensions that purely technical solutions are ill-equipped to address [5, 25, 74, 78]. Moreover, such technical fixes are typically applied once model development is already underway or even after the model has been developed, when substantial resources have already been invested [16, 70]. These late-stage interventions have, in many cases, been shown to amplify existing biases or introduce new forms of harm [24, 25, 70]. These limitations have led to a growing recognition of the need to shift the locus of intervention [5]: from narrow, reactive measures to proactive and context-sensitive strategies that *anticipate harm* from the outset. Recent research emphasizes the importance of anticipating harms from the earliest stages, before the AI lifecycle formally begins [16, 64, 70, 72, 74]. While socio-technical approaches to harm anticipation are starting to emerge, most current efforts focus on documentation and risk communication, rather than offering actionable foresight rooted in the sources of harm. Furthermore, existing methods often provide domain-specific recommendations rather than systematic strategies applicable across contexts [14, 47, 67, 85].

This study contributes to this evolving body of work by advocating for *proactive harm anticipation* at the earliest stages of the ML lifecycle, prior to the development of AI solutions. Building on [RQ1], we explore how different types of bias embedded in AI systems, map onto specific harms by tracing them across the lifecycle and mapping them to concrete harmful outcomes. This forms the basis for a structured, source-level anticipation strategy that can meaningfully inform early design and governance decisions.

However, anticipating harm in practice goes far beyond detecting bias in data, models, or code. The literature highlights the importance of considering the context of use; who will interact with the system, where and under which conditions or/and institutional settings [16, 30, 59, 74]. AI is a general-purpose technology deployed across a wide array of domains and the harms it may cause are equally multifaceted and far-reaching [34]. Tackling the ethical implications of AI systems necessitates a stakeholder perspective that explicitly accounts for the roles and hierarchies among actors across the AI lifecycle. There are *active* stakeholders who function as moral agents that specify, build, and influence systems’ outcomes while *passive* stakeholders become affected by a system but do not actively contribute to its outcome. These asymmetric positions in the stakeholder landscape shape who is exposed to which harms [57] and leads us to our second research question:

[RQ2: How can we develop a robust methodology to systematically uncover the connections between AI biases and AI harms within specific contexts of use, thus allowing early source-level anticipation of harms?]

This paper introduces **ECHO** (Evidence framework for Connecting Harmful Outcomes to AI biases), a systematic framework designed to address the gaps articulated in RQ1 and RQ2. Specifically, ECHO maps AI biases to the harms they are associated with across diverse stakeholder roles and application domains, systematically uncovering the underlying mechanisms through which such associations emerge. Under a given domain-specific deployment scenario, the framework identifies potential harms by analyzing how different stakeholders may be affected when systems exhibit specific types of bias. ECHO contributes in three principal ways:

- **Bias-to-Harm Source Mapping:** Addressing RQ1, ECHO introduces an actionable bias-to-harm source mapping that traces harms back to the specific AI biases that are associated with them [9, 25, 71, 77]. This moves beyond existing documentation-centric approaches that merely describe risks or list potential impacts: instead, ECHO provides a mechanism for identifying which harms are likely to emerge from which bias sources and the lifecycle actions that instantiate them. The framework employs domain-specific vignettes, i.e. short descriptive scenarios widely used in the social sciences to illustrate how biased behavior becomes evident in real-world contexts [10, 16, 40, 48, 50]. It leverages LLMs (GPT-4) to assist in the authoring of vignettes to depict realistic, domain-specific instances of biased AI behavior. The use of LLMs enables the generation of diverse, candidate scenarios that closely mirror real-world settings while maintaining experimental control [16]. These vignettes are then annotated with possible harms, thereby operationalizing the mapping from bias *origins* to harm outcomes.
- **Proactive, Lifecycle-level Harm Tracing and Anticipation:** ECHO adopts a ML lifecycle perspective to trace harms back to their underlying biases and, in turn, to the specific decisions and actions taken throughout the lifecycle that often give rise to these biases [78]. This strategic orientation shifts the focus from post-hoc harm documentation to proactive steering of design, development, and deployment processes, enabling active stakeholders to anticipate and mitigate harms before systems are built. In practice, this supports the integration of harm-awareness into governance, risk management, and conformity assessment workflows, an approach that aligns with the demands of the EU AI Act [23].
- **Context-sensitive Sociotechnical Integration:** Addressing RQ2, ECHO moves beyond treating bias as a purely technical issue by examining how different biases tend to give rise to distinct harms for different stakeholder groups within their contextual settings. It adopts a stakeholder role-sensitive perspective, essential for determining *which* harms fall on *whom*, since stakeholder exposure varies across roles in the AI lifecycle [57]. To complement the LLM-generated vignettes, the framework combines LLM and crowd-sourced judgments. This hybrid approach captures both LLM-assisted foresight and lived-experience insights that AI tools alone cannot fully anticipate [14, 16, 44, 67, 86]. Finally, ECHO incorporates ethical matrices (EMs) [16, 30, 86] to structure how lifecycle biases translate into stakeholder-specific harms in a specific application domain. These domain-specific matrices support a wide range of actors, including developers, designers, practitioners, auditors, and policymakers, in anticipating harms that may emerge from bias-driven decisions across the AI lifecycle. Taken together, these elements deepen the framework’s sociotechnical grounding by integrating contextual, human-centered perspectives into the identification and management of harms across the AI lifecycle based on the roles and vulnerabilities of the actors involved.

To demonstrate the framework’s *applicability* and validate its uptake potential, ECHO is applied to two distinct domains, showing how different combinations of bias types, stakeholders, and domain characteristics give rise to specific harms. The evaluation highlights bias-harm patterns across domains while also acknowledging exceptions, including cases in which harms are not directly attributable to bias. Importantly, ECHO’s modular architecture, underpinned by a clear mathematical formulation, ensures that the entire workflow is *reproducible* and *adaptable* across domains, stakeholder roles, and evolving bias and harm taxonomies. This design aligns with ECHO’s broader aim of offering a *generalizable* framework that can be easily extended to different domains and entity types.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the most relevant related work. Section 3 introduces the foundational concepts and notation underlying ECHO to present its modules. Section 4 describes the

experimental setup used to apply ECHO in practice. Section 5 reports the results and key observations, and Section 6 concludes with a discussion of contributions.

2 Related work

Our work builds on a broad body of Responsible AI (RAI) [63] research that spans conceptual frameworks and methodological tools for understanding and anticipating AI harms. This includes foundational works on harm taxonomies in AI, AI bias frameworks, ethical matrix approaches for structuring stakeholder-impact relations, and vignette-based experimental designs for systematically probing contextual factors through factorial manipulations. In this section, we review the most relevant strands of related work that inspire the design of ECHO.

2.1 AI Harms taxonomies

Understanding the potential harms arising from AI technology is essential towards anticipating and preventing real-world consequences. Mapping how harms materialize through the interaction of technological mechanisms with social and cultural contexts enables practitioners to anticipate harms early and incorporate safeguards to minimize them [74]. Recent research has proposed various harm taxonomies to systematically identify and classify these systems’ effects [28, 29, 34, 36, 74, 83]. Many existing frameworks, however, have a limited scope: some concentrate on specific technologies (e.g., LLMs) [36, 83], others focus on particular application domains (e.g., healthcare, privacy) [28, 29], and some are tailored to specific audiences (e.g., policy analysis [34]), thereby limiting their generalizability.

In this work, we adopt the prominent and highly cited Shelby et al. [74] harms taxonomy which provides broad coverage of known harms across multiple contexts and serves as a practical reference for both developers and practitioners. This taxonomy distinguishes four primary harm types, along with a fifth, that includes more systemic harm types [74]:

- **Allocative harms** occur when individuals lose access to information, opportunities, or essential supports (e.g., employment, housing, healthcare, finance). These include *opportunity loss* and *economic loss*.
- **Quality-of-service harms** arise when systems perform inconsistently or inadequately based on users’ identity characteristics (e.g. race, gender, disability, or ethnicity). This can cause *alienation*, require *increased labor* to use the system, or lead to *lost services or benefits*.
- **Interpersonal harms** occur when algorithmic systems adversely shape relationships between individuals or communities, often by undermining autonomy, dignity, or emotional well-being. They include experiences such as *loss of agency or control*, *privacy violations*, and *technology-facilitated violence* or impacts on users’ *health and well-being*.
- **Representational harms** result when systems *reinforce stereotypes*, *demean groups* or even *erase their identities*. These harms shape how **groups** are perceived and valued by both AI systems and broader society, contributing to cultural exclusion and *alienation*. Specific dimensions of representational harm also include *denying people the opportunity to self-identify*, and *reifying essentialist social categories*.
- **Social system harms** emerge at the macro level and refer to broad, systemic effects such as the reinforcement of institutional inequities or environmental degradation. These harms arise through the interaction of algorithmic systems with existing power structures and long-term social dynamics.

Categorizing harms, however, is not sufficient on its own, since preventing AI harms requires prompt understanding of their origins [16, 70]. Biases arising at different stages of the AI lifecycle have been widely recognized as a major source of harm [9, 25, 71, 77]. These biases encode, propagate, and amplify existing inequities, ultimately shaping

the kinds of harms that emerge across application domains and usage contexts [16]. Therefore, minimizing AI harms demands a comprehensive examination of biases as underlying sources and mechanisms throughout the entire AI lifecycle.

2.2 AI bias in a project’s lifecycle: Types and mitigation pathways

AI systems can exhibit computational (AI) biases that distort model behaviour and lead to unfair and harmful outcomes. AI biases rise at different stages of the ML lifecycle, during data collection, model design, or deployment, and have been widely examined in the literature on algorithmic fairness in AI [25, 46, 55, 77, 81]. Building on these studies, we focus on five foundational bias types that are the most prominent and widely studied in the literature [78]:

- **Representation bias** arises from data quality issues when datasets fail to adequately capture the diversity of the population, often excluding underrepresented groups and thereby limiting a model’s generalizability. Closely related, **historical bias** reflects the pre-existing inequities embedded in data-generating processes: even if data are sampled flawlessly, the underlying social and institutional patterns they mirror may already privilege some groups while disadvantaging or excluding others [15, 71, 77, 81].
- **Measurement bias** arises from the use of features or labels as proxies for complex constructs when these proxies either poorly capture the intended construct or are computed inconsistently across groups, leading to inaccurate or misleading outputs [41, 46, 77].
- **Algorithmic bias** results from model design choices (e.g., architecture, functions, or hyperparameters) that inadvertently produce uneven error rates across different groups, especially those underrepresented in the data [35, 81].
- **Evaluation bias** occurs when benchmark datasets used to assess model performance are not representative of the intended user population, or when inappropriate performance metrics are applied, leading to unnoticed or uncorrected disparities [46, 81].
- **Deployment bias** arises when a model is used in a different context than it was designed for, often shifting from assistive to autonomous use, which can lead to misuse and overreliance on the system’s outputs [43, 77].

Numerous approaches have been proposed to minimize AI harms by tackling bias at different stages of the lifecycle. Technical interventions, including fairness toolkits [12, 13, 22] and de-biasing methods such as data re-sampling and re-weighting [18, 19, 35] provide useful mechanisms to detect and mitigate bias but remain largely confined to statistical operations within the ML pipeline or rest on unrealistic assumptions [35]. *Fairness metrics* usually reduce complex sociotechnical harms to narrow statistical measures [55, 62]. Process-oriented efforts have sought to improve validation and evaluation practices, yet they often emphasize accuracy over fairness, overlooking real-world disparities and sociotechnical harms [76]. While these approaches have advanced the field, most are applied post hoc (when harmful effects have already manifested and resources have been committed [16, 70]) or rely solely on technical interventions that fail to capture the complexity of human behavior and decision-making. Yet, harms in AI systems emerge through intricate sociotechnical processes, deeply rooted in social relations, institutional practices, and contextual norms, dimensions that purely technical fixes cannot address [5, 16, 25, 70, 74, 78].

In response, recent work has shifted toward *anticipatory strategies* that aim to identify potential harms early in the development process [16, 64, 70, 72, 74]. Such approaches require those involved in the design, development, and oversight of AI systems to reason about possible system behaviors within their social and organizational contexts, an inherently challenging yet essential step toward Responsible AI (RAI) [64, 70, 72]. RAI guidance calls for reflection on

the interplay between problematic system behaviors (e.g., biases), ethical principles, and the broader contexts of use, including the stakeholders involved and the domain-specific conditions in which systems operate [4, 16, 30, 59, 70, 74]. These factors are difficult to consider individually and even more challenging to address in combination. This underscores the need for human-centered, socially grounded approaches to systematically anticipate how biased system behaviors may manifest across domains and affect different stakeholders.

2.3 Human-Centered analytical structures: Ethical Matrices and Vignettes

A growing body of work emphasizes the importance of *human-centered analytical structures* for systematically reasoning about the harms of AI systems [16, 30, 70, 84]. Among these, *ethical matrices* [56] have been proposed as a structured way to identify and organize potential stakeholder concerns. Originally developed to assess biotechnologies in food production, EMs have since been adapted for use in data science contexts, demonstrating how structured representations can support systematic reflection during system design and deployment [16, 30]. They typically map problematic system behaviors or design factors -such as the use of non-representative data or bad proxies- (depicted in columns) against relevant affected stakeholders (depicted in rows), with potential concerns or harms represented in the cells. This structure provides a clear overview of *who* might be affected, *how*, and by *which* technical decisions that lead to problematic system behaviors (e.g. biases).

The *who* dimension concerns the diverse roles and social positions of stakeholders affect or/and are affected by AI systems [57, 72, 74]. Given the far-reaching consequences of many AI-based incidents [3, 53], to address the moral and ethical concerns arising with AI systems, the stakeholder perspective should identify a broad range of stakeholders when envisioning possible harms [16, 21], especially the passive ones [57, 82]. *Passive stakeholders* are those who may be substantially affected by a system but do not actively contribute to its development or operation; they include decision subjects, vulnerable groups, and local communities. *Active stakeholders*, by contrast, are those who function as moral agents that specify, build, deploy, or operate AI systems and thereby influence their outcomes. They include *clients* such as operating organisations and platform owners, *designers* such as data analysts, data engineers, software developers, and practitioners, as well as *decision-makers* such as end users and program managers [57, 82]. These asymmetric positions in the stakeholder landscape shape who is exposed to which harms [16, 21, 57, 64, 70].

The *how* dimension has been addressed through structured reflection and *envisioning methods*, which prompt those involved in system design to imagine potential harm scenarios in advance [8, 16]. Recent work leverages large language models (LLMs) to support this process by surfacing harms that even experienced developers might overlook [14, 16, 67, 86]. Yet LLMs alone cannot capture the contextual nuance and lived experiences of stakeholders, so crowdsourced evaluations can be combined with LLM methods to enable a human-in-the-loop approach to harm anticipation [16, 44, 58].

Regarding the *which* dimension, problematic system behaviors (biased behaviors in our case) must be clearly defined, as they provide the basis for both crowd annotators and LLMs to envision potential downstream effects. In the social sciences, **vignettes**-short, structured, often hypothetical scenarios- are commonly used to elicit judgments about complex situations [10]. Vignette-based methods are increasingly applied to AI to examine how people perceive and reason about potential impacts [16, 40, 48, 50]. The *application domain* shapes each vignette’s salience and severity: similar biases can have very different consequences depending on the context in which they occur (e.g., medical diagnosis vs. news recommendation) [9, 16, 70, 74]. By embedding biased behaviors within realistic domain and stakeholder contexts, vignettes act as reflective instruments able to surface potential harms.

Together, these human-centered structures provide a systematic foundation for reasoning about *who* may be harmed, *how*, and by *which* system behaviors that lead to harm. Building on these structures, the following section outlines the ECHO design, which operationalizes these ideas into a structured process for harm anticipation.

3 ECHO: Preliminaries and Framework Overview

This section formally defines the fundamental entities and the computational workflow of the proposed framework. Based on the previous section, we now define a sequence of procedural functions that specify how ECHO transforms structured inputs into stakeholder-centered ethical matrices. We begin by summarizing the notation used throughout the framework, and then present a formal proposition that frames the problem that underpins ECHO’s objective of harm anticipation. Next, we describe each phase of the workflow as a sequence of well-defined steps: stakeholder generation, vignette construction, harms evaluation, and ethical matrix construction. Finally, we present the algorithmic logic of ECHO in pseudocode, which integrates all steps into a coherent algorithmic workflow.

3.1 Notation and Core Definitions

To facilitate the formal description of the ECHO framework, Table 1 summarizes the key symbols, procedural functions, and system modules used across its workflow. This notation establishes the conceptual vocabulary for defining the input space, intermediate constructs, output artifacts, and functional components of ECHO. Each function is implemented within a corresponding system module, enabling a structured and modular workflow for AI harm anticipation.

Table 1. Symbols, functions, and modules in the ECHO framework.

Symbol / Name	Description	Type
\mathcal{D}, d	List of application domains / domain instance	Input
\mathcal{B}, b_m	List of M AI bias types / bias type b_m	Input
\mathcal{H}, h_r	List of R harm types from a harm taxonomy / harm type h_r	Input
\mathcal{S}^d, s_k	List of K stakeholders for domain d / stakeholder s_k	Output
$\mathcal{V}, v_{k,m,d}$	Space of vignettes / generated vignette	Intermediate
$\hat{\mathcal{V}}, \hat{v}_{k,m,d}$	Space of augmented vignettes (with MCQ) / augmented vignette	Intermediate
$H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}$	Harm subset selected by annotator i for $v_{k,m,d}$	Intermediate
$\text{Agg}_{k,m,d}$	Aggregated harm set for vignette $v_{k,m,d}$	Intermediate
dEM^d	Descriptive Ethical matrix of size $K \times M$ for domain d	Output
iEM^d	Inferential Ethical matrix of size $K \times M$ for domain d	Output
<i>Functions</i>		
SHolderGen	Generates stakeholder set \mathcal{S}_d from domain d	
VignetteCon	Constructs vignette from (s_k, b_m, d)	
AttachMCQ	Attaches harm-based MCQ to vignette	
Annotate	Collects harm annotations from N annotators	
Aggregate	Aggregates multiple annotations into $\text{Agg}_{k,m,d}$	
<i>System Modules</i>		
StakeholderGenerator	Runs SHolderGen	
VignetteConstructor	Runs VignetteCon & AttachMCQ	
HarmsEvaluator	Runs Annotate & Aggregate	

The following proposition formally establishes the mapping problem addressed by ECHO. The rest of this section defines how procedural functions transform structured inputs into ethical matrices that encode domain and stakeholder -specific, bias-harm relationships.

Proposition 1: Given an application domain $d \in \mathcal{D}$, a list of bias types \mathcal{B} , and a list of harm types \mathcal{H} , we can construct a domain-specific ethical matrix EM^d that systematically encodes the mapping $(s_k, b_m, d) \mapsto EM_{k,m}^d$. In this matrix, rows correspond to stakeholders, columns to bias types, and the entries capture the aggregated set of harms that are most likely to arise for a given stakeholder s_k when exposed to an AI system exhibiting bias b_m within domain d .

Proof Sketch.

We support Proposition 1 through the implementation and empirical application of the ECHO framework. Specifically, for a given application domain, ECHO first generates a domain-specific stakeholder list and then constructs a vignette for each (domain, bias) pair, which is systematically combined with every stakeholder in that list. The resulting vignettes are augmented with harm-based multiple-choice questions (MCQs) and evaluated by multiple annotators, both human and LLM. The collected annotations are aggregated to populate a descriptive ethical matrix dEM^d for the given domain d . Each matrix entry $dEM_{k,m}^d$ reflects the set of harms identified for stakeholder s_k under bias b_m within domain d . This *descriptive* matrix is subsequently refined through inferential testing, yielding the *inferential* ethical matrix iEM . Our experiments across two high-stakes domains and multiple stakeholder roles demonstrate that such matrices can indeed be constructed in practice, validating the operational feasibility of the mapping defined in the proposition. While the validity of each individual matrix depends on annotation quality and sampling robustness, the overall method provides evidence-based support for the proposition.

3.2 ECHO Algorithm and Workflow

This section introduces the complete algorithmic workflow that operationalizes ECHO. Building on Proposition 1, Algorithm 1 outlines how the input space – namely, one application domain of interest, a list of bias types, and a list of harm types, $(d, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H})$ – is transformed into ECHO’s final outputs through a series of procedural functions. ECHO executes a workflow of steps that construct vignettes regarding the interaction of a stakeholder with an AI system exhibiting a specific bias within an application domain. The resulting vignette is augmented with an MCQ based on the given list of harms, and annotated by multiple human annotators and an AI agent, each selecting potential harms. The collected annotations are aggregated into the corresponding cell of an ethical matrix for this domain. This matrix summarizes how different stakeholders within a given domain perceive harms arising from biased AI systems and constitutes the descriptive Ethical Matrix dEM^d of ECHO. The dEM^d is subsequently refined through inferential statistical analysis which identifies the statistically significant bias-harm relationships and yields the inferential Ethical Matrix (iEM^d). These two matrices form the core foundation of harm anticipation in ECHO. Figure 1 depicts how each phase of the system incrementally constructs the ethical matrices dEM^d and iEM^d .

The algorithm proceeds as follows, beginning with the required inputs.

Input

ECHO operates over the following inputs:

- Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$ denote a distinct application domain of interest (e.g., hiring, healthcare),




Fig. 1. Overview of the ECHO workflow. 1. The system takes as input an application domain and generates a domain-specific list of stakeholders. 2. It then takes this list, a list of bias, and a list of harms. For each (domain, bias) pair, it constructs a vignette that is combined with every stakeholder in the domain. Each resulting vignette is then augmented with a MCQ based on the list of harms. 3. The resulting augmented vignette is then annotated by multiple human annotators and an AI agent, each selecting potential harms. The collected annotations are aggregated into a descriptive ethical matrix, where rows represent stakeholders, columns represent bias types, and each cell reflects the consensus view of perceived harms. This matrix is finally refined via inferential testing yielding the inferential ethical matrix.

- Let $\mathcal{B} = \{b_m \mid m \in \{1, \dots, M\}\}$ denote the list of M AI bias types, derived from an external bias list (e.g., representation bias, measurement bias, as discussed in subsection 2.2),
- Let $\mathcal{H} = \{h_r \mid r \in \{1, \dots, R\}\}$ denote the list of R harm types, derived from an external harm taxonomy (e.g., as the one presented in subsection 2.1)

The aforementioned bias and harm lists follow the theoretical foundations synthesized in Section 2, drawing respectively from widely used AI bias frameworks and harm taxonomies. This grounding ensures that ECHO operates over conceptually validated and broadly recognized foundations.

The system then proceeds to:

Phase 1: Stakeholder Generation

The module StakeholderGenerator is operationalized via LLM-based generation, employing a one-shot prompt regarding a specific domain to produce a candidate stakeholder list (an illustrative example is provided in Appendix A). It executes the function SHolderGen.

Algorithm 1: ECHO Workflow

Input: Domain d , Bias types \mathcal{B} , Harm taxonomy \mathcal{H}
Output: List of stakeholders \mathcal{S}^d and ethical matrix EM^d for the domain d

```

1  $\mathcal{S}^d \leftarrow \text{SHolderGen}(d);$  // Produce a stakeholder list
2 foreach  $s_k \in \mathcal{S}^d$  do
3   foreach  $b_m \in \mathcal{B}$  do
4      $v_{k,m,d} \leftarrow \text{VignetteCon}(s_k, b_m, d);$  // Construct vignette for (stakeholder, bias, domain)
5      $\hat{v}_{k,m,d} \leftarrow \text{AttachMCQ}(v_{k,m,d}, \mathcal{H});$  // Attach MCQ over  $\mathcal{H}$ 
6      $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow [];$  // Initialize an empty annotation list
7     for  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
8        $H_{k,m,d}^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{Annotate}^{(i)}(\hat{v}_{k,m,d});$  // Annotator  $i$  selects harms
9       append  $H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}$  to  $\mathcal{A};$  // Store annotation in collection
10     $\text{Agg}_{k,m,d} \leftarrow \text{Aggregate}_{\tau=0.5}(\mathcal{A});$  // Aggregate with majority threshold  $\tau=0.5$ 
11     $dEM_{k,m}^d \leftarrow \text{Agg}_{k,m,d};$  // Insert aggregated harms into domain matrix
12  $iEM^d \leftarrow \text{InferentialRefine}(dEM^d);$  // Apply inferential tests to produce the iEM
13 return  $\{\mathcal{S}^d, dEM^d, iEM^d\};$ 

```

Definition 3.1. SHolderGen is defined as a function that takes as input a domain $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and returns a set of K domain-specific stakeholders:

$$\text{SHolderGen} : \mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathcal{S}^d, \quad d \mapsto \{s_k \mid k = 1, \dots, K\}.$$

Phase 2: Vignette Construction

At this phase, the module Vignette Constructor generates vignettes through a factorial design in which each type of AI bias is instantiated as a fixed scenario and systematically combined with every stakeholder within the specified application domain. The module VignetteConstructor runs the functions VignetteCon and AttachMCQ, which are operationalized via scripted LLM calls followed by targeted refinements (see subsection 4.1 for details and Appendix B for an illustrative example).

Definition 3.2. VignetteCon is defined as a function that takes as input a stakeholder $s_k \in \mathcal{S}^d$, a bias type $b_m \in \mathcal{B}$, and a domain $d \in \mathcal{D}$, and returns a fictional scenario (vignette) regarding the interaction of the stakeholder s_k with an AI system exhibiting bias b_m within domain d :

$$\text{VignetteCon} : \mathcal{S}^d \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathcal{V}, \quad (s_k, b_m, d) \mapsto v_{k,m,d}.$$

Then, to collect judgments on specific perceived harms from both human and LLM annotations, AttachMCQ appends MCQs based on a harm taxonomy as response instruments following each vignette.

Definition 3.3. AttachMCQ is defined as a function that takes as input a vignette $v_{k,m,d} \in \mathcal{V}$ and a harm taxonomy \mathcal{H} , and returns an augmented vignette $\hat{v}_{k,m,d}$ that includes a multiple-choice questionnaire over \mathcal{H} :

$$\text{AttachMCQ} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{H} \mapsto \hat{\mathcal{V}}, \quad (v_{k,m,d}, \mathcal{H}) \mapsto \hat{v}_{k,m,d}.$$

The resulting object $\hat{v}_{k,m,d}$ constitutes the full query interface shown to annotators.

Phase 3: Harms Evaluation

The module HarmsEvaluator consequently runs a two-step workflow to elicit harm perceptions, consisting of Annotate and Aggregate. Responses are collected from both crowd annotators and an AI agent.

Definition 3.4. Annotate is defined as a function that takes as input an augmented vignette $\hat{v}_{k,m,d}$ and returns a collection of harm subsets $\{H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ for this vignette, one for each of the N annotators (human crowdworkers or LLM). Each annotation is constrained to at most two elements of the harm taxonomy \mathcal{H} :

$$\text{Annotate} : \hat{v}_{k,m,d} \mapsto \{H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N, \quad \text{where } H_{k,m,d}^{(i)} \subseteq \mathcal{H}, |H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}| \leq 2.$$

This constraint encourages annotators to report only the most salient harms, avoids noise resulting from overly large sets of allowed responses, and keeps the cognitive demands of the vignette task manageable [6]. The resulting object $H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}$ constitutes the **individual** harm selection of annotator i for vignette $\hat{v}_{k,m,d}$. The harm selections from all annotators are then aggregated into a single representative harm set for this vignette, using a predefined aggregation function.

Definition 3.5. Aggregate is defined as a function that takes the collection of individual selections $\{H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ and returns a representative harm set for the vignette:

$$\text{Aggregate} : \{H_{k,m,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N \mapsto \text{Agg}_{k,m,d}, \quad \text{where } \text{Agg}_{k,m,d} \subseteq \mathcal{H}.$$

Following best practices in corpus annotation [49, 68], aggregation applies a majority threshold of $\tau = 0.5$ to ensure reliable consensus among annotators. The choice of $\tau = 0.5$ aligns with common practice in majority-vote aggregation, where a simple majority is taken as evidence of agreement. If no harm category reached the majority threshold ($\tau = 0.5$), we retained the top-ranked harm(s). A small tolerance margin of $\pm 5\%$ was applied to capture near-ties, retaining all harms whose frequencies were within this range of the highest-ranked one.

Let $C(h)$ be the number of annotators that selected harm h and N the number of annotators for this vignette. We keep h if its proportion $C(h)/N$ meets or exceeds the majority threshold τ :

$$\text{Agg}_{k,m,d} = \{h \in \mathcal{H} : C(h)/N \geq \tau\}.$$

Otherwise, when no harm meets the threshold, we retain the top-ranked harm(s) (including those within the $\pm 5\%$ tolerance margin of the highest frequency):

$$\text{Agg}_{k,m,d} = \arg \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} C(h).$$

The aggregation summarizes crowd and LLM judgments by keeping harms endorsed by (at least) half of annotators for each vignette; when no clear majority emerges, the top-ranked harms are retained to reflect the strongest shared signals.

Phase 4: Ethical Matrices Construction

In the final phase, ECHO synthesizes the collected annotations into a structured matrix representation. For each *application domain* d , the framework constructs a domain-specific *Ethical Matrix* [30, 56]. This matrix, referred to as the *descriptive Ethical Matrix* (dEM), encodes the harm sets associated with each stakeholder–bias pair.

$$dEM^d \in \left(2^{\mathcal{H}}\right)^{K \times M}$$

where $2^{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes the power set of the R -element harm taxonomy. The matrix dEM^d has:

- K rows, each corresponding to a stakeholder s_k ,
- M columns, each corresponding to a bias type b_m ,
- Each entry (k, m) holds the set of harms perceived for stakeholder s_k under bias b_m .

Formally, each entry at position (k, m) of the matrix dEM^d stores the *consensus-based aggregated harm set* associated with the triple (s_k, b_m, d) , obtained through the sequential application of vignette construction, augmentation, annotation, and majority-based aggregation:

$$dEM_{k,m}^d = (\text{Aggregate}_\tau \circ \text{Annotate} \circ \text{AttachMCQ}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \text{VignetteCon})(s_k, b_m, d), \quad \text{with } \tau = 0.5 (\pm 5\% \text{ tolerance}).$$

This formulation ensures that each cell reflects the most consistently perceived harms across annotators for the given domain-stakeholder-bias configuration. The dEM serves as the foundation upon which inferential statistical testing is applied to produce the refined, statistically validated *inferential Ethical Matrix* (iEM).

Outputs.

For a given domain d , ECHO returns:

- A list of stakeholders \mathcal{S}^d .
- A descriptive ethical matrix dEM^d , encoding perceived harms across the (s_k, b_m) grid.
- An inferential Ethical Matrix iEM^d , obtained by applying inferential statistical tests to the harm frequencies underlying dEM^d and encoding statistically significant bias-harm relationships.

4 ECHO in practice: Experimental Setup

To evaluate the applicability of the ECHO framework, we conducted a vignette-based experiment grounded in the five types of AI bias (Subsection 2.2) and the perceived harms defined by the harm taxonomy proposed by Shelby et al. [74] (Subsection 2.1). The study was applied to two distinct domains: disease diagnosis and hiring. We selected these domains because policies such as the EU AI Act explicitly classify both as high-risk and require corresponding processes for risk management and assessment [80]. Moreover, both are widely identified in the literature as high-stakes contexts where AI systems increasingly support consequential decisions yet remain particularly vulnerable to bias [16, 33, 45, 66, 75]. Importantly, they differ in their proximity to human subjects and in the nature of their impacts. Hiring involves socio-economic judgments with potentially long-term effects on applicants' livelihoods and opportunities, whereas disease diagnosis directly affects human health and well-being, with more immediate and critical consequences. Despite these differences, both domains rely on AI to support sensitive decisions that affect people's lives, often in situations where information is incomplete or unevenly distributed. This makes them complementary settings for evaluating the framework across diverse stakeholder groups and deployment contexts.

4.1 Protocol

In this section, we detail the end-to-end protocol used to instantiate and evaluate ECHO in our two domains. We outline each phase of the framework so that the procedure can be understood and replicated.

Phase 1: Stakeholder Generation

SHolderGen. We first constructed a one-shot learning prompt for GPT-4. The prompt included a domain-specific list of stakeholders that we manually defined for a loan application scenario, drawing on relevant real-world cases and prior

studies [3, 16, 33, 57]. Based on this illustrative example, ECHO generated domain-specific stakeholder candidates, which we refined based on pilot feedback (see subsection 4.2) and on practical considerations during LLM generation (the model initially produced a large number of candidate roles). Ultimately, four stakeholders per domain were included: *patient, marginalized patient groups, developer, and healthcare institution* for disease diagnosis and *applicant, marginalized applicant groups, developer and company* for hiring. An illustration of this stakeholder generation procedure is provided in the Appendix A.

Phase 2: Vignette Construction

VignetteCon. For each domain-bias pair, ECHO generated short scenarios contextualizing abstract bias types into concrete, relatable situations using ChatGPT-4. Each vignette described an AI system exhibiting a specific bias within a domain and was completed with a targeted question addressed to a relevant stakeholder. A structured writing protocol guided the generation of each vignette and consisted of: (i) a domain-specific context anchor (e.g., recruitment process or medical consultation), (ii) an explicit and accessible instantiation of the bias type (e.g., use of a non-representative dataset or reliance on a poor proxy) making it understandable even to participants unfamiliar with AI bias terminology, and (iii) a stakeholder-centered narrative perspective. In the case of algorithmic bias, we used a single representative instantiation; overly simplistic model architectures that underfit complex patterns and may disproportionately harm certain groups [35, 77, 81]. In the case of *evaluation bias*, we used unbalanced benchmark datasets to assess model performance, reflecting how skewed validation data can conceal disparities across groups. The vignettes were refined based on psychological insights, adopting a second-person perspective to enhance participant engagement [17]. Plain, non-technical language was used throughout to ensure accessibility. A factorial design varied domain (2), bias type (5), and stakeholder roles (4), yielding 40 vignettes.

AttachMCQ. Participants (see subsection 4.2) selected perceived harms from a predefined list based on Shelby et al.’s taxonomy [74], presented as a multiple-choice questionnaire. This enabled them to indicate which harms they believed were most likely to affect the stakeholder in the given vignette. The *social system* category was excluded due to its diffuse, macro-level nature, which makes attribution to specific AI lifecycle decisions difficult. The analysis therefore focused on harms more directly linked to data, modeling, evaluation, and system use. *Representational* harms were treated separately, as they concern *groups* rather than *individuals*. Related questions were included only when the stakeholder was a group of decision subjects, since representational harms arise primarily when systems classify or frame those subjected to their decisions. An illustrative example of a resulting vignette, together with the corresponding MCQs and excerpts from the LLM-human interaction that led to its formulation, is provided in Appendix B.

Phase 3: Harms Evaluation

Annotate & Aggregate. After appending the MCQ based on the harm taxonomy as response instrument, participants indicated which harms they believed the described AI system might impose on the stakeholder. They were randomly assigned vignettes and asked to select up to two harms most likely to affect the stakeholder. Each evaluated two vignettes. When the stakeholder was the decision subject, an additional MCQ captured potential representational harms at the group level. ChatGPT-4 was also used as an annotator, answering the same MCQs for *all* vignettes, unlike human participants who annotated only a subset. For each domain–stakeholder–bias triplet, harm annotations were aggregated and the resulting representative harm set populated the corresponding cell of the descriptive Ethical Matrix dEM. Details about the human annotators who completed the harm–selection tasks, along with their background and briefing procedure, are provided in Subsection 4.2.

Phase 4: Ethical Matrices Construction

In the final phase, the aggregated harm selections were organized into a structured *descriptive ethical matrix* for each

application domain. Rows correspond to stakeholders, columns to bias types, and each cell contains the harm set most frequently assigned to that stakeholder under the corresponding bias condition. This (dEM) provides a domain-specific overview of how participants perceived the harms arising from biased AI behaviour. To complement this descriptive layer, we also derive an *inferential Ethical Matrix* (iEM), which incorporates the statistically significant bias-harm associations obtained through the inferential analysis. The methodology and results of this inferential stage are presented in Section 5.3.

4.2 Participants

In line with human-in-the-loop principles that leverage human judgment where automated systems fall short (see subsection 2.3)[16, 44, 58], we integrated human annotators as part of Phase 3 of the ECHO workflow. They served as the primary annotator pool, complementing the LLM-based annotations. A total of 251 university students were recruited from two major universities in Thessaloniki. Among them 114 were women (45%) and 134 were men (53%) (3 of them picked "Other"). Most participants had a STEM background, predominantly in computer science. A smaller subset from the social sciences, mainly psychology, was also included to provide complementary viewpoints. The vast majority were between 18 and 25 years old. In addition to human participants, we also included an LLM (ChatGPT-4), which was asked to anticipate harms by responding to the same MCQs that were administered to the student participants. To enhance validity, we conducted a pilot test with a small subset of 30 student participants at the early stage of the research. This process allowed us to identify potential ambiguities or weaknesses in the study design and to refine the materials (especially the vignette descriptions and MCQ options) before running the main study.

Participant Briefing. Before completing the survey, all participants attended a one-hour introductory lecture designed to clarify the key concepts of AI bias and AI harms. This session aimed to establish a common conceptual baseline, given that many participants had limited prior exposure to these topics. By ensuring a shared understanding of the core notions under examination, the briefing sought to improve the quality and consistency of their responses.

4.3 An Illustrative ECHO Instance

To concretize how the framework operates end-to-end, we provide a brief illustrative instance of ECHO applied to a single domain-bias-stakeholder combination. Consider the *hiring* domain under *representation bias*, viewed from the perspective of the *job applicant*. In Phase 1, SHolderGen identifies the relevant stakeholders for this domain as shown in Appendix A, and a subset of these is retained. In Phase 2, VignetteCon generates a scenario illustrating how the use of a non-representative sample excluded part of the population from the assessment process, as shown in Appendix B. In Phase 3, participants evaluate this vignette by selecting up to two harms they believe the applicant is most likely to experience. These annotations are then aggregated via majority vote to populate the corresponding cell of the descriptive Ethical Matrix (dEM). In Phase 4, the dEM for all bias-stakeholder combinations is constructed, and inferential analysis tests whether the observed harm selections occur at statistically significant levels, yielding the refined inferential Ethical Matrix (iEM). This example illustrates how a single (domain, bias, stakeholder) triplet is processed through the full ECHO workflow, and how both dEM and iEM are derived from the same underlying set of annotations.

5 Results and observations

This section presents the main findings of the study. We report both descriptive and inferential outcomes to provide a transparent and rigorous account of how bias-harm relationships emerge in the data. First, we introduce the EMs

Table 2. Descriptive Ethical Matrix for the Disease Diagnosis Domain (majority $\tau = 0.5$; near-ties within $\pm 5\%$ of top frequency).

Stakeholder / Bias	Representation	Measurement	Algorithmic	Evaluation	Deployment
Patient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (60%) opportunity loss (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (63%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (80%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (56%) opportunity loss (56%) service or benefit loss (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (47%) alienation (42%)
Patient group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (67%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (79%) denying self-identity (63%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (67%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alienation (44%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (42%)
Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (67%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> service or benefit loss (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased labor (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alienation (44%) diminished health and well-being (44%) loss of agency or control (44%)
Healthcare institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (68%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (61%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased labor (50%)

derived from the aggregated survey annotations, represented in two descriptive forms collectively termed the descriptive EMs (dEMs). Second, we present descriptive statistics that visualize the distribution of selected harms across bias types, stakeholders and domains. Finally, we report the inferential analyses that yields the inferential Ethical Matrix (iEM) that refines the dEM capturing the bias–harm associations that stand out statistically and form the actionable basis for harm anticipation in ECHO.

To align with the article’s contributions, this section empirically demonstrates how ECHO: (i) operationalizes bias–to–harm source mapping by grounding abstract bias types into concrete, annotated vignettes and and by statistically validating the bias–harm patterns that emerge from them (ii) supports proactive, lifecycle-oriented harm anticipation by tracing how different types of bias manifest as stakeholder-specific harms before system development and (iii) adopts a human-centered, context-sensitive approach that embeds harm identification within realistic sociotechnical settings.

5.1 Descriptive Ethical Matrix

A descriptive ethical matrix provides a structured representation of how participants intuitively perceived the harms that different stakeholders may experience under each bias type. To support both interpretability and analytical transparency, we present two complementary descriptive forms. The compact, majority-based dEM highlights only the harms that reached consensus among annotators (as described in Phase 3 of subsection 3.2). This concise format is particularly useful for stakeholders involved in the design, development, or assessment of AI systems, who need to identify the most salient and widely perceived bias–harm patterns even during early stages of the AI lifecycle, when foundational design decisions are made. In contrast, the full frequency-based dEM lists all annotated harms together with their occurrence counts, offering richer detail on the diversity and distribution of stakeholder judgments. This expanded form can be especially valuable for researchers, analysts, and auditing teams who wish to examine less dominant but recurring harm signals, explore ambiguity or variation in perceptions, or conduct fine-grained analysis across domains and stakeholder roles. Together, these descriptive representations serve as an interpretability and task-validity layer, offering *an initial snapshot of how participants distinguished among bias types and harm categories*. The resulting majority-based dEM for the Disease Diagnosis domain is presented in Table 2. The dEM for the Hiring domain, along with the full frequency-based dEMs listing all annotated harms and their counts, are provided in Appendix D.




Fig. 2. Bias x harm radar plots for (a) Patients and (b) Applicants.

5.2 Descriptive Visualization of Bias–Harm Patterns Across Stakeholders and Domains

This subsection presents the descriptive results that offer an overview of the overall distribution of responses and the prominent bias–harm patterns across stakeholders and domains. To provide an overview of the collected annotations, we visualized the distribution of responses across application domains, stakeholders, and bias types using radar plots. Each axis corresponds to a specific harm category (e.g., opportunity loss, service or benefit loss, privacy violation), and each polygon represents the relative frequency of responses for each bias type (representation, measurement, algorithmic, evaluation, deployment). These plots serve as descriptive summaries of the sample composition prior to inferential testing (Section 5.3).

5.2.1 Passive stakeholders: Decision subjects and marginalized groups. Figure 2a and Figure 2b provide descriptive radar plots summarizing the distribution of harm types associated with all bias types within the Disease Diagnosis–Patient and Hiring–Applicant contexts respectively.

Disease Diagnosis–Patient. Figure 2a depicts that the highest convergence across all bias types is observed for *diminished health and well-being*, as expected in clinical settings where erroneous inferences can directly affect patients’ health [74]. *Representation*, *measurement*, and *evaluation* biases exhibit convergent patterns, all showing similar emphasis on QoS harms (particularly *service or benefit loss*) and on allocative harms (*opportunity loss*). *Deployment* and *algorithmic* biases showed strong and exclusive associations with the harm *alienation* (along side their contribution to *diminished well-being*), with no comparable patterns observed for other bias types. Only a very small number of cases involving *privacy violation* or *technology-facilitated violence* were detected, consistent with the limited relevance of these harm categories to the scope of the scenarios examined. Overall, the harm distribution concentrates on well-being and allocative dimensions.

Hiring–Applicant. Figure 2b shows a clear convergence across almost all bias types on *opportunity loss*, as expected in hiring contexts where systems can unequally mediate access to employment and related resources [74]. *Representation*, *measurement*, and *evaluation* biases exhibit the strongest spoke toward *opportunity loss*, reflecting their dominant association with allocative harms in hiring decisions. *Algorithmic* and *deployment* biases once again converged on a QoS harm, this time on *service or benefit loss* rather than *alienation*, indicating that such biases manifest differently across domains depending on the nature of human stakes (i.e., the type of human consequence involved). In healthcare, such

biases disrupt trust and personal connection, giving rise to more affective forms of harm, whereas in hiring they translate into material disadvantage and the unequal distribution of opportunities and benefits. Several bias types additionally are associated (though less prominently than in the diagnosis domain) with *diminished health and well-being*, reflecting the psychological toll of losing a job opportunity. Overall, the distribution is strongly oriented toward allocative and QoS harms.




Fig. 3. Bias × representational harm radar plots for (a) the Patient group and (b) the Applicant group.

Disease Diagnosis-Patient group. Figure 3a displays representational harm frequencies by bias type. The most salient pattern is the concentration of responses on *stereotyping*, with nearly all bias types converging on this harm, particularly *representation*, *measurement*, and *algorithmic* biases, which exhibited the highest frequencies. Peaks in *denying self-identity* (for *measurement*) and *reifying categories* (for *algorithmic*) further highlight how biased variable definitions and modelling choices can constrain how patients are perceived and categorized, reinforcing narrow or restrictive notions of identity. *Evaluation* bias shows a distinct rise in *alienation*, as exemplified by a scenario in which a dental AI system, tested only in urban clinics with advanced imaging equipment, performed poorly in community health centers, effectively marginalizing those patients. Moreover, the frequent selection of *none* for *deployment* bias corresponds to a chatbot scenario, which focused on functional rather than representational issues. Detailed descriptions of both scenarios can be found in Appendix C.Vignette 2 and C.Vignette 4.

Hiring-Applicant group. Figure 3b shows the convergence of three bias types on *demeaning*, with *algorithmic* and *measurement* biases showing the highest frequencies. *Stereotyping* likewise emerged as a frequently observed harm across multiple bias types, peaking under *representation* bias, as skewed or selective data representations inherently reinforce generalized or reductive depictions of certain groups. *Representation* bias further leads to *erasure*: when training datasets systematically exclude certain populations, the system effectively “cannot see” these groups, rendering their characteristics invisible. The prominence of *reifying categories* for *evaluation* bias corresponds to a scenario in which a company’s hiring system was tested exclusively on data from a single urban office. This narrow evaluation context reinforced a fixed “city-office” applicant archetype, leading the system to treat this background as the default standard against which all candidates were assessed. As a result, applicants from different environments experienced a sense of *alienation*, perceiving the system as misaligned with their professional or cultural context (see Appendix C, Vignette 5).




Fig. 4. Bias \times harm radar plots for (a) the developer of the Disease Diagnosis System and (b) the developer of the Hiring System.

5.2.2 Active stakeholders: Developers. Figures 4a and 4b, illustrate that in both contexts, developers frequently reported *diminished health and well-being*, reflecting the psychological strain and mental load associated with building or maintaining complex AI systems. However, while this harm dominates the Disease diagnosis-Developer context, appearing consistently across bias types, it is less pronounced in the Hiring-Developer context, where QoS harms (such as *increased labor*) and allocative harms (notably *opportunity loss*) appear more frequently as the most common response categories across a broad range of bias types. In this domain, spokes in *alienation* for *representation* bias and in *loss of agency or control* for *deployment* bias are also observed. In the disease diagnosis domain, other harm categories appear with lower and more scattered frequencies, without clear convergence on specific bias-harm combinations.




Fig. 5. Bias \times harm radar plots for (a) the Healthcare Institution and (b) the Company.

5.2.3 Active stakeholders: Healthcare Institution and Company. Figures 5a and 5b present the distribution of harm types across bias categories for the *Healthcare Institution* (of the Disease Diagnosis domain) and the *Company* (of the Hiring domain) stakeholders. Across both contexts, we do not observe strong differentiation between bias types; instead, big spokes tend to cluster bias types around a limited number of harm categories especially in the Hiring domain. In the healthcare context, most bias types converge on *diminished health and well-being*, which in this case primarily reflects reputational damage to the healthcare institution resulting from biased or erroneous diagnostic outputs. This emphasis

on reputational harms is likely amplified by the sensitivity of the healthcare domain, where clinical failures have direct consequences for patients’ health. In the hiring context, two main poles of convergence are evident: *service or benefit loss* and *opportunity loss*, with the latter frequently highlighted in the literature as a typical downstream manifestation of QoS harms [9, 74, 77]. Here, emphasis is placed on the potential loss of qualified candidates and workforce quality due to biased decision-making. Other harm categories remain comparatively low in both contexts.

The dEMs and visualizations offer preliminary insights addressing **RQ1** and **RQ2**. The observed bias-harm distributions in context-sensitive patterns (i.e., stakeholder and application domain combinations) illustrate which types of biases are most frequently associated with particular harms (RQ1) and exemplify how the proposed mapping methodology can systematically surface such relationships within context (RQ2). The subsequent inferential analyses build on these observations by statistically testing the strength and significance of the identified associations.

5.3 Inferential Exploration of Bias–Harm Patterns Across Stakeholders and Domains

Finally, we present inferential analyses to test which bias–harm associations occur significantly more often than would be expected by chance. These results yield an evidence-based set of statistically robust bias–harm pathways, that are then used to transform the initial dEM into a statistically validated iEM that captures the bias–harm associations that stand out statistically (including both old and newly surfaced significant pathways).

To determine whether the distribution of harms differs across bias types within each domain–stakeholder combination, we first apply an omnibus χ^2 test of homogeneity to the bias \times harm contingency table. This test is standard for evaluating whether multiple categorical groups share the same distribution of outcomes, and is widely used in multilevel survey and social-science studies involving categorical vote or frequency data [54, 73]. Because our research focus is based on whether any biases are associated with specific harm patterns, the omnibus χ^2 test provides the correct global assessment before conducting cell-level follow-ups.

Omnibus χ^2 test of homogeneity

We first assess, for each domain and stakeholder separately, whether the overall distribution of harms differs across bias types. For each pair, we constructed a (bias \times harm) contingency table of annotator votes and tested the following hypotheses:

H_0 : The distribution of harms is the same across all bias types.

H_1 : At least one bias type exhibits a different harm distribution.

The results are depicted in Table 3. We report χ^2 , degrees of freedom, p-values, and Cramér’s V (effect size).

Table 3. Significant results by domain and stakeholder. Summary of χ^2 test statistics and effect sizes (Cramér’s V).

Domain	Stakeholder	n_{bias}	n_{harms}	n_{votes}	χ^2	dof	p	Cramér’s V
Diagnosis	Patient	5	9	167	44.327	32	0.072	0.257
	Patient Group	5	7	157	53.066	24	0.001	0.295
	Developer	5	9	167	41.308	32	0.125	0.248
	Healthcare Institution	5	8	169	24.956	28	0.630	0.192
Hiring	Applicant	5	9	177	44.209	32	0.073	0.249
	Applicant Group	5	7	160	33.318	24	0.097	0.228
	Developer	5	9	170	44.137	32	0.074	0.254
	Company	5	9	163	33.192	32	0.408	0.225

Given the relatively small number of responses per vignette (251 respondents evaluated 15 vignettes, yielding an average of approximately 16 responses per vignette) across multiple domain–stakeholder combinations, several contingency tables contained sparse cells with low or zero counts. In categorical analyses with sparse contingency tables, the large-sample χ^2 approximation often loses power when expected counts are small, thereby increasing the likelihood of Type II errors and potentially hiding meaningful associations [2]. In exploratory analyses with small-sample designs, where the aim is to identify patterns and gain preliminary insights rather than to confirm hypotheses, it is therefore suggested to adopt a more lenient significance threshold (e.g., $\alpha = 0.10$) to reduce the risk of overlooking genuine effects [69, 79]. This approach prioritizes sensitivity over strict error control, allowing potential bias–harm relationships to emerge for further examination.

The results illustrate one domain–stakeholder combination (*Disease diagnosis–Patient group*, $p = 0.001$) where harm distributions differed significantly across bias types, and several additional combinations that reached significance at the 0.10 level—*Disease Diagnosis–Patient* ($p = 0.072$), *Hiring–Applicant* ($p = 0.073$), *Hiring–Applicant Group* ($p = 0.097$), and *Hiring–Developer* ($p = 0.074$), warranting closer examination. All statistically significant cases exhibited a Cramér’s V above 0.20, indicating moderate and non-trivial associations between bias and harm types.

While the omnibus χ^2 test assesses whether the overall distribution of harms differs across bias types within each domain–stakeholder table, it does not indicate which specific bias–harm combinations contribute to these differences. To obtain cell-level insight, we compute adjusted standardized residuals, the recommended post-hoc technique for decomposing significant χ^2 results in contingency-table analyses [11, 31]. Adjusted residuals quantify whether a given cell contains more or fewer responses than expected under the independence model, thereby identifying which bias–harm associations are disproportionately represented. This methodological approach is widely used in behavioral and survey-based research—particularly when analysing questionnaire-derived categorical data—where contingency tables may be moderately sparse and loglinear models may be unstable or biased [20]. The resulting residuals therefore provide interpretable, exploratory evidence about the specific patterns driving the global χ^2 findings.

Adjusted standardized residual analysis.

This method compares the observed and expected frequencies for each bias–harm pair, expressing their difference as a standardized z-score. Positive residuals ($z > 0$) indicate overrepresented combinations, whereas negative residuals ($z < 0$) indicate underrepresentation. This allows us to identify which biases most frequently co-occur with particular harms across the contexts identified in the omnibus χ^2 test; (Diagnosis–Patient, Patient group, Hiring–Applicant, Applicant group, Developer). Cells with $z > 1.64$ ($p < 0.10$) are considered significantly overrepresented, meaning that these bias–harm relationships appear more often than expected by chance. Table 4 presents the statistically significant bias–harm association patterns that recur across domains and are likely to manifest in real-world contexts.

Table 4. Significant adjusted standardized residuals by context (domain-stakeholder), bias, and harm type.

Domain-Stakeholder	Bias Type	Harm Type	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Disease Diagnosis – Patient	Deployment	Alienation	2.790	0.005
	Evaluation	Service or benefit loss	2.369	0.017
	Deployment	Increased labor	2.178	0.029
	Algorithmic	Alienation	2.059	0.039
Disease Diagnosis – Patient group	Evaluation	Alienation	3.158	0.001
	Measurement	Denying self-identity	2.736	0.006
	Evaluation	None	2.357	0.018
	Deployment	None	2.357	0.018
	Algorithmic	Reifying categories	2.007	0.044
	Measurement	Stereotyping	1.652	0.098
Hiring – Applicant	Representation	Loss of agency or control	2.162	0.030
	Algorithmic	Service or benefit loss	2.057	0.039
	Deployment	Technology-facilitated violence	2.057	0.039
	Deployment	Alienation	2.045	0.040
	Evaluation	Economic loss	1.701	0.088
	Algorithmic	Increased labor	1.690	0.091
	Measurement	Diminished health and well-being	1.656	0.097
Hiring – Applicant group	Evaluation	Reifying categories	3.669	0.003
	Representation	Erasure	1.699	0.089
Hiring – Developer	Representation	Technology-facilitated violence	2.899	0.004
	Deployment	Loss of agency or control	2.103	0.035
	Representation	Alienation	2.038	0.041
	Measurement	Economic loss	1.869	0.061

5.4 Inferential Ethical Matrix

The inferential statistics are now used to sharpen and refine the descriptive patterns identified in the dEM. Some relationships observed descriptively are confirmed as statistically robust, others are ruled out as non-significant, and several new bias–harm pathways emerge, cases where harms with low descriptive frequency nonetheless appear significantly overrepresented relative to their expected baseline levels. While the dEM reflects participants’ intuitive judgments, the inferential Ethical Matrix (iEM) presents the *statistically reliable* bias–harm pathways. *These are the diagnostic associations that form the actionable foundation for harm anticipation in ECHO.* Tables 5 and 6 present the final iEMs for both domains. Associations confirmed both descriptively and inferentially are shown in regular font; newly surfaced statistically significant relationships (not present in the dEM) appear in **bold**. For expository clarity, the iEM retains in pale font the descriptive majority associations that did not reach statistical significance, allowing readers to see at a glance which pathways were validated and which were not. This integrated view makes it easy to see where participant intuitions align with statistically validated patterns, and where the inferential analysis contributes additional, evidence-based insight.

These findings address RQ1 by identifying which biases are associated with which specific harms in the two examined domains, and by outlining the mechanisms through which these associations manifest—namely systematic distortions

Table 5. Inferential Ethical Matrix for the Disease Diagnosis Domain.

Stakeholder / Bias	Representation	Measurement	Algorithmic	Evaluation	Deployment
Patient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (60%) opportunity loss (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (63%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (80%) alienation (40%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being opportunity loss service or benefit loss (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being alienation (42%) increased labor (16%)
Patient group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (67%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (79%) denying self-identity (63%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (67%) reifying categories (40%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alienation (44%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (42%)
Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (67%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> service or benefit loss (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased labor (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alienation (44%) diminished health and well-being (44%) loss of agency or control (44%)
Healthcare institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (53%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (68%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (61%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased labor (50%)

Table 6. Inferential Ethical Matrix for the Hiring Domain

Stakeholder / Bias	Representation	Measurement	Algorithmic	Evaluation	Deployment
Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (58%) loss of agency or control (37%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (72%) diminished health and well-being (44%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> service or benefit loss (47%) opportunity loss (42%) increased labor (32%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (72%) economic loss (44%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (44%) service or benefit loss (39%) technology-facilitated violence (0.06%) alienation (28%)
Applicant group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (47%) erasure (37%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demeaning (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demeaning (47%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reifying categories (56%) demeaning (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demeaning (33%) stereotyping (33%) erasure (33%)
Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (41%) alienation (41%) diminished health and well-being (41%) tech-facilitated violence (12%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (44%) economic loss (38%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (44%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased labor (47%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of agency or control (56%)
Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (68%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> service or benefit loss (57%) opportunity loss (57%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (94%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (61%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opportunity loss (53%)

in data representation, measurement, implementation, evaluation, and deployment processes that translate technical disparities into harmful outcomes. They also advance RQ2 by adding a statistically grounded validation layer that systematically uncovers significant bias–harm connections within realistic contexts of use. Importantly, the statistically validated iEM^d formalizes these insights into an actionable representation of the bias–harm pathways for each domain. This matrix constitutes the core analytic output of ECHO and provides the foundation for proactive, source-level harm anticipation.

5.5 Discussion of Main Findings

ECHO produces two complementary ethical matrices—a descriptive Ethical Matrix (dEM) and an inferential Ethical Matrix (iEM)—each serving a distinct purpose. The dEM provides a structured, stakeholder-driven view of how participants intuitively perceived the relationships between bias types and potential harms. This descriptive layer is valuable for those involved in the design, development, and governance of AI systems, who require an *interpretable, user-centered snapshot of perceived vulnerabilities* early in the design and development process. It also serves as a *validity and interpretability check*, confirming that annotators meaningfully engaged with the task and differentiated among harm categories and bias types. Several of the descriptive patterns observed were non-uniform and theoretically aligned as discussed above, indicating that participants did not respond randomly or default to globally dominant harms. This

strengthens confidence in the interpretability of the vignettes and in the reliability of the data on which the inferential analysis builds.

In contrast, the iEM offers an evidence-based refinement of these intuitions by identifying statistically significant bias-harm associations. Given that our study design establishes a conceptual direction from bias to harm (consistent with the literature that treats biases as sources of harm [9, 25, 71, 77]), the inferential analyses provides significant associations that uncover meaningful bias-to-harm relationships within realistic domain-stakeholder contexts. As such, the iEM provides *the diagnostic and actionable patterns* that can be used not only by designers, developers and practitioners but also by auditors, policymakers, and risk-assessment teams for proactive harm anticipation, governance, and targeted mitigation.

Significant bias-harm associations were detected primarily for *decision subjects*-patients and job applicants-and their corresponding *social groups*. This indicates that, for those directly subjected to algorithmic decisions (passive stakeholders), the type of bias present is meaningfully associated with the kind of harm experienced. *Although our statistical analyses are associational, our questionnaire was explicitly designed to embed directionality, asking respondents to identify which harms were caused by or resulted from specific biases. This design enables interpretation of significant associations as reflecting directional tendencies rather than mere co-occurrence. Recent methodological work supports this approach: Pornprasertmanit et al. [65] demonstrate that directional dependencies can be inferred from observational associations under defined assumptions; Li et al. [51] show that questionnaire data analyzed through regression and association mining can reveal “cause → effect” patterns consistent with hypothesized causal links; and Ni et al. [60] extend this reasoning by applying Bayesian causal-structure modeling to survey data to extract likely causal relationships. Following these methodological precedents, we interpret our results as evidence that certain biases tend to lead to specific harms - consistent with the causal direction embedded in our instrument, while acknowledging that causality cannot be conclusively established without longitudinal or experimental data.*

Additional significant results were observed for *developers* in the hiring domain, suggesting that biases embedded in model design, development, and deployment can correspond to reflective effects on the individuals responsible for creating these systems. Notably, no significant bias-harm differences were observed for developers in the healthcare domain, likely due to the low variance in responses. Participants appeared to perceive the effects of bias as relatively uniform, suggesting that perceptions of harm were influenced more by the strength and criticality of the domain itself than by the specific type of bias. Similarly, for *companies* and *healthcare institutions*, no statistically significant differences in harm distributions were observed across bias types. In these cases, the occurrence of harm appeared relatively uniform across bias categories. This likely reflects the fact that several active stakeholders are not direct subjects of algorithmic decisions and therefore experience bias more indirectly-through reputational, organizational, or systemic effects rather than through unequal treatment.

To facilitate interpretation, we categorize the five bias types into two groups that correspond to different stages of the AI lifecycle. *Data-related biases* (*representation, measurement, and evaluation*) arise from data-related processes that determine what information enters the system and how its performance is judged. The second group includes *design- and use-related biases* (*algorithmic and deployment*) that arise from architectural design decisions that shape model behavior and the context in which the system is used. Patterns across these two groups are discussed in the following subsections.

5.5.1 Data-related Biases and cascading QoS and Allocative Harms in Passive Stakeholders. The convergence of *representation, measurement, and evaluation* biases in Quality-of-Service (QoS) and allocative harms in the descriptive

results (Figure 2a and b) reflects their shared technical and data-related origins. *Representation bias* arises when the data used for training distort or underrepresent particular groups. *Measurement bias* occurs when the data used to represent a phenomenon rely on poorly defined proxies that mischaracterize the underlying construct, distorting what the system learns to value. *Evaluation bias* (rooted in unbalanced benchmark data in our study) occurs when the data used for testing is unrepresentative of the population, concealing disparities across groups. Although these biases arise at different stages of the AI lifecycle, they share a common origin in data and ultimately converge in effect: each distorts how systems perceive and serve individuals, leading to uneven accuracy, degraded service quality, and the reinforcement of structural inequities. These data-quality issues manifest primarily as *QoS harms* and when such disparities occur in real-world decision settings, they often cascade to *allocative harms*, influencing who receives resources or services [9, 15, 41, 74]. This pattern is clearly visible in the *Diagnosis–Patient* radar (Figure 2a) and (to a lesser extent) in the *Hiring–Applicant* radar (Figure 2b).

Inferential tests revealed significant associations between *evaluation bias* and QoS harms—specifically, *service or benefit loss* in the *diagnosis* domain—and allocative harms (*economic loss*) in the *hiring* domain. The other two data-related bias types (*representation* and *measurement*) did not reach statistical significance in this sample for reasons described in Section 5.5.5. However, their descriptive patterns suggest potentially meaningful trends that merit further investigation.

5.5.2 Data-related Biases and cascading Representational and Interpersonal Harms in Passive stakeholders. Data-quality issues underpin *representational harms*, as non-representative or biased datasets directly shape how social groups are depicted, valued, or omitted [9, 15, 70]. This pattern is evident in the *Patient Group* and *Applicant Group* radars (Figure 3 a–b), where the three data-related biases produced the strongest peaks.

The inferential analysis indicated that *measurement bias* in the *diagnosis* domain was significantly associated with *denying self-identity* and *stereotyping*. This finding indicates that when machine learning developers operationalize complex phenomena using oversimplified proxy variables, they risk distorting self-identification and reinforcing group marginalization [41, 61]. Similarly, *evaluation bias* was associated with *alienation*, likely reflecting validation practices based on narrow benchmarks that fail to capture population diversity. When such systems are deployed, individuals outside the model’s representational scope experience exclusion and a sense of being “unseen,” contributing to perceived alienation [9, 15, 77]. In the *hiring* domain, only data-related biases were linked to representational harms. *Evaluation bias* was linked to *reifying categories*, suggesting that narrow evaluation practices can harden social classifications into fixed, normative standards. Conversely, *representation bias* was associated with the representational harm of *erasure*: when specific groups are insufficiently represented in training data, the model not only performs poorly for them but effectively renders them invisible, failing to acknowledge their identity or experience.

Representational bias frequently co-occur with interpersonal harms [74]; when individuals are misrepresented or omitted by algorithmic systems, they lose the ability to define themselves within those systems, internalizing a diminished sense of agency, dignity, and well-being. This pattern explains the observed connection between representation bias and the interpersonal harm of *loss of agency or control* in the *diagnosis-patient* context.

5.5.3 Design- and Use-related Biases associated with QoS and Representational Harms in Decision Subjects. *Algorithmic* and *deployment* biases emerge later in the lifecycle, where model architectures and contextual deployment decisions influence how earlier inequities are amplified or possibly mitigated. *Algorithmic bias* (rooted in architectural constraints in our study) was more clearly associated in our sample with QoS harms in both domains (see Fig. 2). There is also a strong association with *diminished health* in Fig. 2a but this was expected due to the clinical setting to which this figure

refers. This pattern was also supported by the inferential analysis, which showed that algorithmic bias was significantly associated with all three subcategories of *QoS harms*. This aligns with theoretical accounts suggesting that harm in AI systems arises not only from data but also from model design choices. Overly simplistic or compressed architectures exacerbate errors on underrepresented "long-tail" data, as design and optimization criteria often correspond to systematic inequities in model performance [35]. Notably, the *QoS harm alienation* appeared in the disease-diagnosis domain, possibly reflecting the heightened sensitivity and deeply personal nature of healthcare decisions, while the association with *increased labor* emerged in the *hiring* domain, where harms seem to be less personal and more structural or procedural.

Deployment bias arises when systems are used in contexts misaligned with their intended use, such as when advisory tools operate autonomously without human oversight. This bias showed statistically significant associations with *QoS harms*, particularly *alienation*, observed across both domains. Such harms reflect the experiential dimension of automation: when human judgment is removed, users often feel disconnected from decision-making and unable to contest outcomes. The resulting frustration and detachment underscore how deployment bias can degrade the quality of human-AI interaction itself [74] (an illustrative example scenario can be found in Appendix C.Vignette 4).

Regarding *representational harms*, inferential tests illustrate that these biases showed comparatively weaker associations than the earlier, data-related ones (*representation*, *measurement*, *evaluation*). In our experiment, *algorithmic bias* manifested primarily through *underfitting*. Such mechanisms can lead models to *reify essentialist categories*, treating socially complex attributes or even biological ones, such as age in our scenario (see Appendix C.Vignette 3)-as fixed and universal determinants of outcomes (e.g., risky pregnancy) [35, 74]. In this way, algorithmic systems oversimplify human diversity and medical variability and reduce individuals to reductive classifications. Notably, inferential tests revealed a significant association between *deployment bias* and the response category "None" within representational harms. This suggests that participants did not interpret deployment-related failures as representational, but rather as systemic or functional-arising from *over-automation* and *contextual mismatch*, where systems operate without adequate human oversight or outside their intended scope of use (as illustrated in the chatbot scenario, Appendix C.Vignette 4).

5.5.4 Active stakeholders and reflective Harms. Significant associations for the *developer* stakeholder in the Hiring domain underscore the reflective dimension of algorithmic harm, where biases embedded in the system feed back to those who build it. *Loss of agency or control* from deployment bias is the dominant spoke in Figure 4b and this association is also confirmed from the inferential tests, reflecting developers' limited ability to intervene once systems operate autonomously [43]. *Representation bias* was linked to *alienation*, suggesting that when developers produce systems later criticized for discrimination, they may experience professional isolation, moral distress or social backlash. *Measurement bias* was linked to *economic loss*, suggesting that when developers rely on poorly defined proxies, the resulting system failures can translate into tangible costs (ranging from wasted resources and to personal or professional setbacks). These findings broaden the discussion of AI harms beyond direct stakeholders, emphasizing that the development process itself constitutes a site of vulnerability, one in which creators may become secondary victims of the very biases they encode.

5.5.5 Limitations. Several limitations must be acknowledged. First, some harm categories were inherently complex or ambiguously defined, introducing interpretive variability that we sought to minimize through iterative refinements during vignette development with the LLM, as well as through the one-hour preparatory lecture conducted prior to data collection to clarify key distinctions. However, participants occasionally struggled to differentiate nuanced harm types, potentially introducing overlap or noise into the dataset. For instance, in some cases respondents selected

"technology-facilitated violence" (also associated with *deployment* bias in Table 4), even when no form of violence was depicted in the vignette, indicating interpretive spillover across harm categories. Second, the high dimensionality of the dataset-spanning multiple domains, stakeholders, bias types, and harm categories-resulted in sparse contingency tables, containing cells with low expected frequencies. Thus, the statistical power of the omnibus χ^2 and adjusted residual analysis tests was reduced, increasing the likelihood of Type II errors. To mitigate this limitation, inferential tests were evaluated at a 10% significance level and interpreted in an exploratory manner. Nonetheless, even under this relaxed criterion, some theoretically expected association patterns (clearly visible in the descriptive statistics) did not reach statistical significance, such as the relationship between data-quality biases and allocative harms [9, 70]. Future research could address these limitations through more precise harm definitions and larger annotation samples.

6 Conclusions

This work introduced ECHO, a framework designed to systematically anticipate harms emerging from AI bias across sociotechnical contexts. The framework operationalizes harm anticipation through a modular workflow that integrates stakeholder generation, vignette construction, and both human and LLM annotation, all systematically organized within ethical matrices. In doing so, it follows a sociotechnical approach that provides a structured mechanism to trace harms back to their underlying biases, by extension, to the design, development, and deployment choices across the AI lifecycle from which these biases originate.

Addressing RQ2, the design of ECHO establishes a robust and extensible methodology for mapping how bias, conditioned by domain and stakeholder context, are associated with distinct harm types. A core component of this methodological rigor is the pair of complementary analytical outputs produced by ECHO, the descriptive Ethical Matrix (dEM) and the inferential Ethical Matrix (iEM). The dEM captures stakeholder-driven intuitions and provides an interpretability and task-validity layer, ensuring that participants meaningfully distinguished among the intended conceptual categories-bias types, harm types, stakeholder roles, and domain contexts. The iEM then refines these perceptions through evidence-based inference, identifying statistically reliable bias-harm associations. Together, these complementary matrices form a robust analytic structure that systematically uncovers how different types of bias tend to give rise to distinct types of harm. By revealing these pathways, ECHO enables proactive harm anticipation and informed intervention before system deployment or even development. Each domain is represented through its own set of EMs (dEM and iEM), which systematically links biases and stakeholder roles to their corresponding harms. ECHO's modular architecture, underpinned by a mathematical formulation, combines methodological rigor with practical applicability, ensuring *adaptability* across domains, stakeholder roles, and evolving bias and harm taxonomies. Importantly, ECHO also prioritizes the *consistency* of its analytical outcomes: while results may vary across contexts, the framework is designed so that, given the same data, other researchers would discern similar bias-harm patterns and this reflects the framework's overall *reliability* [32].

Addressing RQ1, the experimental application of ECHO to two high-stakes domains demonstrated the framework's capacity to identify context-sensitive associations between specific types of AI bias and corresponding harms. Statistical analysis revealed significant associations primarily for the *passive stakeholders* (decision subjects-patients and applicants-and their corresponding marginalised groups), while more diffuse for *active stakeholders*.

Data-related bias (representation, measurement, evaluation) tend to give rise to QoS and representational harms that cascade into interpersonal harms. *Design-and use-related biases (algorithmic, deployment)* are primarily associated with QoS and representational harms. Regarding the *application domain*, in the *disease diagnosis* domain, biases seem to operate within a more personal and trust-dependent environment, where technical misalignments triggered psychosocial

harms such as alienation, stereotyping, or denial of identity. By contrast, in the *hiring* domain, harms that take on a more distributive form were spotted, manifesting as lost benefits, economic disadvantage, or representational erasure. Taken together, these findings highlight how the nature of harm is shaped by the type of bias and the degree of social proximity of stakeholders to algorithmic decisions, while also emphasizing the critical role of the application domain in conditioning how these dynamics unfold in practice. This underscores the need for frameworks that integrate both technical and contextual dimensions to anticipate harm.

Ultimately, the goal of ECHO is not merely to reveal where and how AI systems fail, but to provide a structured means of understanding and preventing such failures. Bias and harms are not isolated phenomena; they reflect the data assumptions, design choices, cognitive processes, and value judgments embedded throughout the AI lifecycle. By mapping these relationships systematically and integrating technical and social dimensions into a unified pipeline, ECHO supports the development of AI systems that are transparent, inclusive, and responsive to stakeholder needs. In this sense, it serves as a principled contribution to Responsible AI, shifting the focus from reactive correction to proactive harm anticipation and providing both active and passive stakeholders with a structured way to trace harm pathways, identify who is most affected, and guide design governance and targeted mitigation strategies in this emerging human-and-AI-symbiotic era.

7 Citations and Bibliographies

References

- [1] Gavin Abercrombie, Djalel Benbouzid, Paolo Giudici, Delaram Golpayegani, Julio Hernandez, Pierre Noro, Harshvardhan Pandit, Eva Paraschou, Charlie Pownall, Jyoti Prajapati, Mark A. Sayre, Ushnish Sengupta, Arthit Suriyawongkul, Ruby Thelot, Sofia Vei, and Laura Waltersdorfer. 2024. A Collaborative, Human-Centred Taxonomy of AI, Algorithmic, and Automation Harms. arXiv:2407.01294 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01294>
- [2] Alan Agresti et al. 1996. An introduction to categorical data analysis.
- [3] AIAAIC. 2025. *AI, algorithmic and automation incidents*. <https://www.aiaaic.org/aiaaic-repository/ai-algorithmic-and-automation-incidents>
- [4] Ali Alkhatib. 2021. To Live in Their Utopia: Why Algorithmic Systems Create Absurd Outcomes. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 95, 9 pages. doi:10.1145/3411764.3445740
- [5] Nazanin Andalibi, Cassidy Pyle, Kristen Barta, Lu Xian, Abigail Z. Jacobs, and Mark S. Ackerman. 2023. Conceptualizing Algorithmic Stigmatization. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 373, 18 pages. doi:10.1145/3544548.3580970
- [6] Katrin Auspurg and Thomas Hinz. 2015. *Factorial Survey Experiments*. SAGE Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, California. doi:10.4135/9781483398075
- [7] Chloe Autio, Reva Schwartz, Jesse Dunietz, Shomik Jain, Martin Stanley, Elham Tabassi, Patrick Hall, and Kamie Roberts. 2024. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile. doi:10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1
- [8] Stephanie Ballard, Karen M. Chappell, and Kristen Kennedy. 2019. Judgment Call the Game: Using Value Sensitive Design and Design Fiction to Surface Ethical Concerns Related to Technology. In *Proceedings of the 2019 on Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (San Diego, CA, USA) (DIS '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 421–433. doi:10.1145/3322276.3323697
- [9] Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. 2023. *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. <https://fairmlbook.org/pdf/fairmlbook.pdf> Available online under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.
- [10] Christine Barter and Emma Renold. 1999. *The Use of Vignettes in Qualitative Research*. <https://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU25.html> Social Research Update, Issue 25.
- [11] T Mark Beasley and Randall E Schumacker. 1995. Multiple regression approach to analyzing contingency tables: Post hoc and planned comparison procedures. *The Journal of Experimental Education* 64, 1 (1995), 79–93.
- [12] Rachel K. E. Bellamy, Kuntal Dey, Michael Hind, Samuel C. Hoffman, Stephanie Houde, Kalapriya Kannan, Pranay Lohia, Jacquelyn Martino, Sameep Mehta, Aleksandra Mojsilovic, Seema Nagar, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, John Richards, Diptikalyan Saha, Prasanna Sattigeri, Moninder Singh, Kush R. Varshney, and Yunfeng Zhang. 2018. *AI Fairness 360: An Extensible Toolkit for Detecting, Understanding, and Mitigating Unwanted Algorithmic Bias*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.01943> arXiv:1810.01943.
- [13] Sarah Bird, Miro Dudik, Richard Edgar, Brandon Horn, Roman Lutz, Vanessa Milan, Mehrnoosh Sameki, Hanna Wallach, and Kathleen Walker. 2020. *Fairlearn: A toolkit for assessing and improving fairness in AI*. Technical Report MSR-TR-2020-32. Microsoft. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/fairlearn-a-toolkit-for-assessing-and-improving-fairness-in-ai/>

- [14] Edyta Bogucka, Marios Constantinides, Sanja Šćepanović, and Daniele Quercia. 2024. AI Design: A Responsible Artificial Intelligence Framework for Prefilling Impact Assessment Reports. *IEEE Internet Computing* 28, 5 (2024), 37–45. doi:10.1109/MIC.2024.3451351
- [15] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 81)*, Sorelle A. Friedler and Christo Wilson (Eds.). PMLR, 77–91. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a.html>
- [16] Zana Bućinca, Chau Minh Pham, Maurice Jakesch, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Alexandra Olteanu, and Saleema Amershi. 2023. AHA!: Facilitating AI Impact Assessment by Generating Examples of Harms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03280. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03280> Accessed July 2025.
- [17] C. Daryl Cameron, Cendri A. Hutcherson, Amanda M. Ferguson, Julian A. Scheffer, Eliana Hadjiandreou, and Michael Inzlicht. 2019. Empathy is hard work: People choose to avoid empathy because of its cognitive costs. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 148, 6 (2019), 962–976. doi:10.1037/xge0000595
- [18] Jiawei Chen, Hande Dong, Xiang Wang, Fuli Feng, Meng Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Bias and Debias in Recommender System: A Survey and Future Directions. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 41, 3, Article 67 (Feb. 2023), 39 pages. doi:10.1145/3564284
- [19] Ruizhe Chen, Jianfei Yang, Huimin Xiong, Jianhong Bai, Tianxiang Hu, Jin Hao, Yang Feng, Joey Tianyi Zhou, Jian Wu, and ZuoZhu Liu. 2023. Fast model debias with machine unlearning. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (New Orleans, LA, USA) (NIPS '23)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 639, 24 pages.
- [20] Fan Chia, Wei-Yang Huang, Liang-Min Wu, and Cheng-En Wu. 2022. A discriminant analysis of personality traits and cluster types of physical education teachers. *SAGE Open* 12, 3 (2022), 21582440221121591.
- [21] Microsoft Corp. 2022. *Responsible AI Standard, v2: General Requirements*. Technical Report. Microsoft. <https://msblogs.thesourcemediassets.com/sites/5/2022/06/Microsoft-Responsible-AI-Standard-v2-General-Requirements-3.pdf> External release.
- [22] Eoin Delaney, Zihao Fu, Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. 2025. OxonFair: a flexible toolkit for algorithmic fairness. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (NIPS '24)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 2988, 37 pages.
- [23] European Union. 2024. Artificial Intelligence Act — Article 27: Obligations of Deployers of High-Risk AI Systems. <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/article/27/>. Accessed July 2025.
- [24] Andrew Guthrie Ferguson. 2012. Predictive Policing and Reasonable Suspicion. *Emory Law Journal* 62 (2012), 259–309. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2050001> Posted: May 2, 2012; Last revised: February 12, 2014.
- [25] Emilio Ferrara. 2024. Fairness and Bias in Artificial Intelligence: A Brief Survey of Sources, Impacts, and Mitigation Strategies. *Sci* 6, 1 (2024), 3. doi:10.3390/sci6010003
- [26] Sorelle A. Friedler, Carlos Scheidegger, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. 2021. The (Im)possibility of fairness: different value systems require different mechanisms for fair decision making. *Commun. ACM* 64, 4 (March 2021), 136–143. doi:10.1145/3433949
- [27] Alex Gano. 2017. Disparate Impact and Mortgage Lending: A Beginner's Guide. *University of Colorado Law Review* 88, 4 (2017), 1109–. <https://scholar.law.colorado.edu/lawreview/vol88/iss4/7/>
- [28] Delaram Golpayegani, Harshvardhan J. Pandit, and Dave Lewis. 2023. To Be High-Risk, or Not To Be—Semantic Specifications and Implications of the AI Act's High-Risk AI Applications and Harmonised Standards. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (Chicago, IL, USA) (FAccT '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 905–915. doi:10.1145/3593013.3594050
- [29] Ece Gumusel, Kyrie Zhixuan Zhou, and Madelyn Rose Sanfilippo. 2024. User Privacy Harms and Risks in Conversational AI: A Proposed Framework. arXiv:2402.09716 [cs.HC] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.09716>
- [30] Hanna Gunn and Cathy O'Neil. 2023. Near Term Artificial Intelligence and the Ethical Matrix. In *Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*, Francisco Lara and Jan Deckers (Eds.). Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, Switzerland, 235–269. <https://philpapers.org/rec/GUNNTA-21>
- [31] SJ Haberman. 1973. The analysis of residuals in cross-classified tables: Biometrias, v. 29. (1973).
- [32] Karin Hammarberg, Maggie Kirkman, and Sheryl de Lacey. 2016. Qualitative research methods: When to use them and how to judge them. *Human Reproduction* 31, 3 (March 2016), 498–501. doi:10.1093/humrep/dev334
- [33] César A. Hidalgo, Diana Orghian, Jordi Albo Canals, Filipa de Almeida, and Natalia Martin. 2021. *How Humans Judge Machines*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- [34] Mia Hoffmann and Heather Frase. 2023. *Adding Structure to AI Harm: A Conceptual Framework for Defining, Identifying, and Classifying AI Harms*. Research Report. Center for Security and Emerging Technology, Georgetown University. <https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/adding-structure-to-ai-harm/> Accessed July 2025.
- [35] Sara Hooker. 2021. Moving beyond “algorithmic bias is a data problem”. *Patterns* 2, 4 (2021), 100241. doi:10.1016/j.patter.2021.100241
- [36] Wiebke Hutiri, Orestis Papakyriakopoulos, and Alice Xiang. 2024. Not My Voice! A Taxonomy of Ethical and Safety Harms of Speech Generators. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) (FAccT '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 359–376. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658911
- [37] Information Commissioner's Office. 2023. Annex A: Fairness in the AI Lifecycle. <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/artificial-intelligence/guidance-on-ai-and-data-protection/annex-a-fairness-in-the-ai-lifecycle/>. Accessed July 2025.
- [38] Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). 2022. *Overview of Data Protection Harms and the ICO's Taxonomy*. Technical Report. Information Commissioner's Office. <https://www.gov.uk/find-digital-market-research/overview-of-data-protection-harms-and-the-icos-taxonomy-ico> Research paper published via GOV.UK. Originally published April 30, 2022.

- [39] Itay Itzhak, Gabriel Stanovsky, Nir Rosenfeld, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2024. Instructed to Bias: Instruction-Tuned Language Models Exhibit Emergent Cognitive Bias. arXiv:2308.00225 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.00225>
- [40] Samia Jabbour, David Fouhey, Scott Shepard, Timothy S. Valley, Erfan A. Kazerooni, Nataša Banovic, Jenna Wiens, and Michael W. Sjoding. 2023. Measuring the Impact of AI in the Diagnosis of Hospitalized Patients: A Randomized Clinical Vignette Survey Study. *JAMA* 330, 23 (Dec 2023), 2275–2284. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.22295
- [41] Graham M. Johnson. 2025. The hard proxy problem: proxies aren't intentional; they're intentional. *Philosophical Studies* 182 (2025), 1383–1411. doi:10.1007/s11098-025-02333-9
- [42] T. D. Jui and P. Rivas. 2024. Fairness Issues, Current Approaches, and Challenges in Machine Learning Models. *Int. J. Mach. Learn. & Cyber.* 15 (2024), 3095–3125. doi:10.1007/s13042-023-02083-2
- [43] Lauren Kahn, Emelia S. Probasco, and Ronnie Kinoshita. 2024. *AI Safety and Automation Bias: The Downside of Human-in-the-Loop*. Issue Brief. Center for Security and Emerging Technology, Georgetown University. <https://cset.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/CSET-AI-Safety-and-Automation-Bias.pdf> Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
- [44] Shivani Kapania, William Agnew, Motahhare Eslami, Hoda Heidari, and Sarah E Fox. 2025. Simulacrum of Stories: Examining Large Language Models as Qualitative Research Participants. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 489, 17 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713220
- [45] Christoph Kern, Frederic Gerdon, Ruben L. Bach, Florian Keusch, and Frauke Kreuter. 2022. Humans versus machines: Who is perceived to decide fairer? Experimental evidence on attitudes toward automated decision-making. *Patterns* 3, 10 (2022), 100591. doi:10.1016/j.patter.2022.100591
- [46] Tahsin Alamgir Kheyra, Mohamed Reda Bouadjenek, and Sunil Aryal. 2024. The Pursuit of Fairness in Artificial Intelligence Models: A Survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17333. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.17333> Accessed July 2025.
- [47] Kimon Kieslich, Nicholas Diakopoulos, and Natali Helberger. 2024. Anticipating impacts: using large-scale scenario-writing to explore diverse implications of generative AI in the news environment. *AI and Ethics* 5 (2024), 4555–4577. doi:10.1007/s43681-024-00497-4
- [48] Esther S. Kox and Beatrice Beretta. 2024. Evaluating Generative AI Incidents: An Exploratory Vignette Study on the Role of Trust, Attitude and AI Literacy. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Hybrid Human-Artificial Intelligence (HHAI 2024): Hybrid, Human AI Systems for the Social Good (Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol. 386)*. IOS Press, Malmö, Sweden, 188–198. doi:10.3233/FAIA240194
- [49] Justin Kruger, Ulle Endriss, Raquel Fernandez, and Ciyang Qing. 2014. Axiomatic analysis of aggregation methods for collective annotation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems (Paris, France) (AAMAS '14)*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC, 1185–1192.
- [50] Cheng-Lun Li, Ayse G. Buyukturk, David K. Hutchful, Natasha B. Sant, and Satyendra K. Nainwal. 2008. Portalis: using competitive online interactions to support aid initiatives for the homeless. In *CHI '08 extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems* (Florence, Italy). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3873–3878. doi:10.1145/1358628.1358946
- [51] Renzhong Li, Weiwei Cui, Tianqi Song, Xiao Xie, Rui Ding, Yun Wang, Haidong Zhang, Hong Zhou, and Yingcai Wu. 2023. Causality-based visual analysis of questionnaire responses. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 30, 1 (2023), 638–648.
- [52] Pegah Maham and Sabrina Küspert. 2023. *Governing General Purpose AI: A Comprehensive Map of Unreliability, Misuse and Systemic Risks*. Policy Brief. Interface – Stiftung Neue Verantwortung. <https://www.interface-eu.org/publications/governing-general-purpose-ai-comprehensive-map-unreliability-misuse-and-systemic-risks> Viewable at the Interface website.
- [53] Sean McGregor. 2021. Preventing Repeated Real World AI Failures by Cataloging Incidents: The AI Incident Database. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 15458–15463.
- [54] Mary L. McHugh. 2013. The chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia medica* 23, 2 (2013), 143–149.
- [55] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 54, 6, Article 115 (July 2021), 35 pages. doi:10.1145/3457607
- [56] Ben Mepham. 2000. A Framework for the Ethical Analysis of Novel Foods: The Ethical Matrix. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 12, 2 (2000), 165–176. <http://hdl.handle.net/10822/521406>
- [57] Gloria J. Miller. 2022. Stakeholder roles in artificial intelligence projects. *Project Leadership and Society* 3 (2022), 100068. doi:10.1016/j.plas.2022.100068
- [58] Rob Munro. 2021. .
- [59] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2023. *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)*. Tech. Rep. NIST AI 100-1. National Institute of Standards and Technology. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI100-1>
- [60] Yang Ni, Su Chen, and Zeya Wang. 2025. Causal Structural Modeling of Survey Questionnaires via a Bootstrapped Ordinal Bayesian Network Approach. *Psychometrika* 90, 1 (2025), 229–250.
- [61] Ziad Obermeyer, Brian Powers, Christine Vogeli, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2019. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science* 366, 6464 (2019), 447–453. arXiv:https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.aax2342 doi:10.1126/science.aax2342
- [62] Tiago P. Pagano, Rafael B. Loureiro, Fernanda V. N. Lisboa, Rodrigo M. Peixoto, Guilherme A. S. Guimarães, Gustavo O. R. Cruz, Maira M. Araujo, Lucas L. Santos, Marco A. S. Cruz, Ewerton L. S. Oliveira, Ingrid Winkler, and Erick G. S. Nascimento. 2023. Bias and Unfairness in Machine Learning Models: A Systematic Review on Datasets, Tools, Fairness Metrics, and Identification and Mitigation Methods. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing* 7, 1 (2023). doi:10.3390/bdcc7010015
- [63] Emmanouil Papagiannidis, Patrick Mikalef, and Kieran Conboy. 2025. Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review and research framework. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 34, 2 (2025), 101885. doi:10.1016/j.jsis.2024.101885

- [64] Samir Passi and Solon Barocas. 2019. Problem Formulation and Fairness. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Atlanta, GA, USA) (FAT* '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 39–48.
- [65] Sunthud Pornprasertmanit and Todd D Little. 2012. Determining directional dependency in causal associations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 36, 4 (2012), 313–322.
- [66] Manish Raghavan, Solon Barocas, Jon Kleinberg, and Karen Levy. 2020. Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: evaluating claims and practices. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Barcelona, Spain) (FAT* '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 469–481. doi:10.1145/3351095.3372828
- [67] Pooja S. B. Rao, Sanja Šćepanović, Ke Zhou, Edyta Paulina Bogucka, and Daniele Quercia. 2025. RiskRAG: A Data-Driven Solution for Improved AI Model Risk Reporting. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (CHI '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 11, 26 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713979
- [68] Marta Sabou, Kalina Bontcheva, Leon Derczynski, and Arno Scharl. 2014. Corpus Annotation through Crowdsourcing: Towards Best Practice Guidelines. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'14)* (Reykjavik, Iceland). European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Reykjavik, Iceland, 859–866. <https://aclanthology.org/L14-1412/>
- [69] Mark NK Saunders. 2011. *Research methods for business students*, 5/e. Pearson Education India.
- [70] Devansh Saxena, Ji-Youn Jung, Jodi Forlizzi, Kenneth Holstein, and John Zimmerman. 2025. AI Mismatches: Identifying Potential Algorithmic Harms Before AI Development. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–23. doi:10.1145/3706598.3714098
- [71] Reva Schwartz, Apostol Vassilev, Kristen K. Greene, Lori Perine, Andrew Burt, and Patrick Hall. 2022. Towards a Standard for Identifying and Managing Bias in Artificial Intelligence. doi:10.6028/NIST.SP.1270
- [72] Andrew D. Selbst, Danah Boyd, Sorelle A. Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. 2019. Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Atlanta, GA, USA) (FAT* '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 59–68. doi:10.1145/3287560.3287598
- [73] Donald Sharpe. 2015. Your chi-square test is statistically significant: now what?. *Practical assessment, research & evaluation* 20, 8 (2015), n8.
- [74] Renee Shelby, Shalaleh Rismani, Kathryn Henne, AJung Moon, Negar Rostamzadeh, Paul Nicholas, N'Mah Yilla-Akbari, Jess Gallegos, Andrew Smart, Emilio Garcia, and Gurleen Virk. 2023. Sociotechnical Harms of Algorithmic Systems: Scoping a Taxonomy for Harm Reduction. In *Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (Montréal, QC, Canada) (AI/ES '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 723–741. doi:10.1145/3600211.3604673
- [75] Emma A. M. Stanley, Raissa Souza, Anthony J. Winder, Matthias Wilms, G. Bruce Pike, Gabrielle Dagasso, Christopher Nielsen, Sarah J. MacEachern, and Nils D. Forkert. 2025. Assessing the Impact of Sociotechnical Harms in AI-Based Medical Image Analysis. In *Ethics and Fairness in Medical Imaging*, Esther Puyol-Antón, Ghada Zamzmi, Aasa Feragen, Andrew P. King, Veronika Cheplygina, Melanie Ganz-Benjamin, Enzo Ferrante, Ben Glocker, Eike Petersen, John S. H. Baxter, Islem Rekik, and Roy Eagleson (Eds.). Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 163–175.
- [76] Agus Sudjianto. 2025. Rethinking Model Validation as Business Strategy, Not Technical Testing: The Top-Down Hacking Approach. SSRN preprint. doi:10.2139/ssrn.5351070 Accessed July 2025.
- [77] Harini Suresh and John Guttag. 2021. A Framework for Understanding Sources of Harm throughout the Machine Learning Life Cycle. In *Proceedings of EAAMO '21: Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization* (–, NY, USA) (EAAMO '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 17, 9 pages. doi:10.1145/3465416.3483305
- [78] Nicoleta Tantalaki and Athina Vakali. 2025. Rolling in the Deep of Cognitive and AI Biases. *Commun. ACM* (2025). Forthcoming / In press.
- [79] Matthew S Thiese, Brenden Ronna, and Ulrike Ott. 2016. P value interpretations and considerations. *Journal of thoracic disease* 8, 9 (2016), E928.
- [80] European Union. 2024. Annex III: High-Risk AI Systems Referred to in Article 6(2). <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/annex/3/>. Accessed: 2025-11-20.
- [81] Benjamin van Giffen, Dennis Herhausen, and Tobias Fahse. 2022. Overcoming the pitfalls and perils of algorithms: A classification of machine learning biases and mitigation methods. *Journal of Business Research* 144 (2022), 93–106. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.01.076
- [82] Janita F.J. Vos and Marjolein C. Achterkamp. 2006. Stakeholder identification in innovation projects: Going beyond classification. *European Journal of Innovation Management* 9, 2 (04 2006), 161–178. doi:10.1108/14601060610663550
- [83] Laura Weidinger, Jonathan Uesato, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Po-Sen Huang, John Mellor, Amelia Glaese, Myra Cheng, Borja Balle, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, Courtney Biles, Sasha Brown, Zac Kenton, Will Hawkins, Tom Stepleton, Abeba Birhane, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Laura Rimell, William Isaac, Julia Haas, Sean Legassick, Geoffrey Irving, and Iason Gabriel. 2022. Taxonomy of Risks posed by Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (FAccT '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 214–229. doi:10.1145/3531146.3533088
- [84] Nur Yildirim, Changhoon Oh, Deniz Sayar, Kayla Brand, Supritha Challa, Violet Turri, Nina Crosby Walton, Anna Elise Wong, Jodi Forlizzi, James McCann, and John Zimmerman. 2023. Creating Design Resources to Scaffold the Ideation of AI Concepts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (Pittsburgh, PA, USA) (DIS '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2326–2346. doi:10.1145/3563657.3596058
- [85] Renwen Zhang, Han Li, Han Meng, Jinyuan Zhan, Hongyuan Gan, and Yi-Chieh Lee. 2025. The Dark Side of AI Companionship: A Taxonomy of Harmful Algorithmic Behaviors in Human-AI Relationships. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (CHI '25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 13, 17 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713429

- [86] Xinyue Zhang, Vanja Skorić, and Giovanni Sileno. 2024. Automating Fundamental Right Impact Assessment: An Open Experiment. In *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems: JURIX 2024 (Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol. 395)*. IOS Press, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 204–214. doi:10.3233/FAIA241246

Appendix

A Stakeholder Generation

This appendix illustrates the stakeholder generation process. The example includes the original prompt and the corresponding model response.

One-Shot Prompt for the Hiring Domain: Suppose a bank deploys an AI system to scan the information of loan applicants and predict whether they are likely to repay a loan to provide it or not. The potential stakeholders for this system – active (who function as moral agents that specify, build, and influence systems’ outcomes) and passive (who become affected by a system but do not actively contribute to its outcome)– are the applicants, the employees of the bank, the bank, other banks, the AI system developers, the family/friends of the applicant, society, the applicants who identify as racial/ethnic minorities, the applicants who identify as women.

Tell me which are the potential stakeholders active and passive for an AI system that is used to screen candidates for job interviews by a company that replaced their HR manager with this system?

Response: For an AI system used to screen job candidates—especially one that replaces the HR manager—we can identify potential active and passive stakeholders based on their roles in influencing or being affected by the system. Here’s a structured breakdown:

Active Stakeholders (They shape the system’s outcomes through design, deployment, or operational influence.)

- (1) The company (as an entity) – It made the decision to adopt the AI system and sets hiring goals/policies.
- (2) Company executives / decision-makers – Define hiring criteria, approve the AI’s use, and evaluate its performance.
- (3) AI system developers / vendors – Build and train the AI system, choose features/proxies, and define model architecture.
- (4) Data scientists / ML engineers within the company (if applicable) – Fine-tune or audit the model, maintain the pipeline.
- (5) Hiring managers / remaining HR staff – May still intervene in final hiring decisions or adjust how the AI is used.
- (6) Regulators or compliance officers – Influence requirements for fairness, explainability, non-discrimination, etc.

Passive Stakeholders (They are affected by the AI system but do not directly influence it.)

- (1) Job applicants (in general) – Directly impacted by the AI’s screening decisions (shortlisted or rejected).
- (2) Applicants from historically marginalized groups (e.g., women, racial/ethnic minorities, disabled applicants) – May face disproportionate harms due to biased data or design.

- (3) Society at large – Influenced indirectly via labor market access, fairness perceptions, and long-term societal inequalities.
- (4) Families or dependents of job applicants – Affected economically or emotionally by hiring outcomes.
- (5) Other companies in the industry – May adopt similar practices or face competition pressure, leading to ecosystem-level impact.
- (6) Employees of the company – Existing staff may experience cultural, diversity, or workload shifts depending on who is hired.
- (7) Labor unions / advocacy groups – Though not always involved, they may become stakeholders if harms are reported.

The outputs were restricted for clarity and survey feasibility, retaining four stakeholders: applicant, marginalized applicant groups, AI system developer, and hiring company.

B Vignette and MCQ Generation

This appendix presents the interaction used to generate a vignette and a multiple-choice questionnaire for an AI system exhibiting representation bias in the hiring domain.

Prompt:

Construct a scenario describing an AI system with representation bias in a hiring domain.

Response:

Context. A multinational company, TechNova Solutions, develops an AI system to automatically screen resumes for a sales job. The goal is to reduce hiring time and ensure "data-driven" objectivity in selecting top candidates.

How the AI Works: The system uses a machine learning model trained on data from past employees, most of whom were men from elite universities who worked in urban branches. The AI is designed to predict the likelihood of job success for new applicants.

The Problem: Representation Bias. The training data underrepresents women, people from smaller towns, or those who attended less well-known schools or non-traditional educational backgrounds (e.g., bootcamps or community colleges). As a result, the system "learns" patterns of success from overrepresented profiles and gives lower relevance scores to resumes that deviate from this norm.

Impact: Qualified candidates from underrepresented groups are less likely to be shortlisted, despite having comparable or even superior skills and experience.

Explanation: This is representation bias because the training sample did not adequately represent the full diversity of competent applicants. The system generalizes based on skewed data, favoring the majority group and marginalizing others. The bias is embedded in the data and perpetuates historical inequalities.

Prompt: Create a vignette regarding this model to use it in a survey. Keep in mind to use a simplified language as our respondents may not be familiar with AI terms.

Response: TechNova Solutions uses a computer system to screen resumes for a sales job. The system was trained using data from past employees—most of whom were men from elite universities who worked in urban branches. Because of this, the system tends to favor candidates who match these profiles. Applicants from different backgrounds—such as women, people from smaller towns, or those who attended less well-known schools—are often rejected, even if they have the right skills for the job.

Prompt (regarding the stakeholder role):

In the above scenario, add a prompt asking about the harms faced by the applicant from our stakeholder list.

Final vignette constructed.

Response: TechNova Solutions uses a computer system to screen resumes for a sales job. The system was trained using data from past employees—most of whom were men from elite universities who worked in urban branches. Because of this, the system tends to favor candidates who match these profiles. Applicants from different backgrounds—such as women, people from smaller towns, or those who attended less well-known schools—are often rejected, even if they have the right skills for the job.

If you were a job applicant which of the following harms do you think you would personally most likely face?.

Prompt (using [74]’s harm taxonomy paper attached):

Look at the harm types presented in this work. Create a multiple-choice question where respondents are asked to choose two of these harm types. Refine the answer choices to make them clear, engaging, and easy for respondents to understand.

Response:

- **Opportunity Loss:** Missing out on job opportunities because the AI wrongly assesses your qualifications.
- **Economic Loss:** Facing financial consequences, such as lost income or hindered career progression, from unjustified rejection.
- **Alienation:** Feeling isolated or unwelcome by the hiring process.
- **Increased Labor:** Having to put in extra effort (e.g., altering resumes) just to get noticed by the system.
- **Service or Benefit Loss:** Being denied the opportunity of a fair evaluation or accurate feedback from the system, affecting your chances of selection.
- **Loss of Agency or Control:** Having no control over how the AI system evaluates you.
- **Technology-Facilitated Violence:** The system reinforces or enables harassment or abuse.
- **Diminished Health and Well-Being:** Experiencing stress, anxiety, or a loss of confidence due to unfair rejections.

- **Privacy Violation:** Concern that your personal data might be improperly handled or used without clear consent.

C Sample vignettes

This appendix presents representative vignettes used in the ECHO study, illustrating how different bias types emerge in AI systems across various domains. Each vignette narrates a concise case of an AI system exhibiting a specific bias type within a given context of use.

Vignette 1: Hiring, Representation Bias

TechNova Solutions uses a computer system to screen resumes for a sales job. The system was trained using data from past employees-most of whom were men from elite universities who worked in urban branches. Because of this, the system tends to favor candidates who match these profiles. Applicants from different backgrounds-such as women, people from smaller towns, or those who attended less well-known schools-are often rejected, even if they have the right skills for the job.

Vignette 2: Disease Diagnosis, Evaluation Bias

A dental AI system was developed to detect tooth decay using X-ray images. However, while the system was trained on a diverse range of patient data, it was only tested in urban dental clinics with advanced imaging equipment. Because the AI was never properly evaluated in other settings, it works well in high-tech clinics but struggles in community health centers that use older X-ray machines or different imaging techniques. As a result, some cavities go undetected because the system fails to recognize decay patterns in lower-quality scans, while some patients may receive false positives.

Vignette 3: Disease Diagnosis, Algorithmic Bias

A hospital uses an AI system to assess pregnancy risks. However, instead of analyzing how different health factors interact, the system relies on a simplified formula that assumes age is the most important risk factor, leading directly to a high-risk pregnancy. This system is too simplistic to capture the real complexity of maternal health. As a result, it overlooks how other factors such as high blood pressure and borderline glucose levels interact in complex ways and contribute to complications. Because of this, a young mother with slightly high blood pressure may be classified as low-risk, even though her condition could be dangerous. Meanwhile, an older mother with no other health issues may be labeled high-risk simply because the system prioritizes age over all other factors.

Vignette 4: Disease Diagnosis, Deployment Bias

An AI chatbot (an AI assistant that provides automated responses in conversations) was originally designed to assist therapists by flagging potential signs of depression and anxiety during online consultations. However, in some clinics, it's used as the sole decision-maker for prescribing therapy sessions. Without human oversight, it misses complex cases-such as patients masking symptoms or presenting atypically-leading to misdiagnoses or delays in appropriate care.

Vignette 5: Hiring, Evaluation Bias

TechNova uses a computer system to select customer support staff. The system was trained using a wide range of employee data but was only tested using information from workers in a single large city office. Because it was only checked against this narrow sample, the AI now works well for urban candidates but struggles to fairly evaluate applicants from other environments-like rural towns, small cities, or international offices. As a result, qualified candidates who don't match the "city office" profile are often rejected, not because they lack skills, but because the AI was never properly tested to handle their backgrounds.

D Ethical Matrices

Table 7. Descriptive Ethical Matrix for the Hiring Domain (majority $\tau = 0.5$; near-ties within $\pm 5\%$ of top frequency).

Stakeholder / Bias	Representation	Measurement	Algorithmic	Evaluation	Deployment
Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (11/19, 58%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (13/18, 72%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • service or benefit loss (9/19, 47%) • opportunity loss (8/19, 42%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (13/18, 72%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (8/18, 44%) • service or benefit loss (7/18, 39%)
Applicant group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stereotyping (9/19, 47%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demeaning (9/18, 50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demeaning (9/19, 47%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reifying categories (10/18, 56%) • demeaning (9/18, 50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demeaning (6/18, 33%) • stereotyping (6/18, 33%) • erasure (6/18, 33%)
Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (7/17, 41%) • alienation (7/17, 41%) • diminished health and well-being (7/17, 41%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (7/16, 44%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (8/18, 44%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased labor (8/17, 47%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of agency or control (9/16, 56%)
Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (13/19, 68%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • service or benefit loss (8/14, 57%) • opportunity loss (8/14, 57%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (15/16, 94%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (11/18, 61%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (9/17, 53%)

Table 8. Ethical Matrix for the Disease Diagnosis Domain (harms sorted by frequency)

Stakeholder / Bias	Representation	Measurement	Algorithmic	Evaluation	Deployment
Patient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (9) opportunity loss (8) service or benefit loss (5) economic loss (3) loss of agency or control (2) increased labor (2) privacy violation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (12) opportunity loss (9) service or benefit loss (5) alienation (3) loss of agency or control (3) economic loss (2) technology-facilitated violence (2) privacy violation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (12) alienation (6) opportunity loss (6) service or benefit loss (2) loss of agency or control (2) technology-facilitated violence (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (10) opportunity loss (10) service or benefit loss (9) economic loss (4) loss of agency or control (2) technology-facilitated violence (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (9) alienation (8) opportunity loss (6) loss of agency or control (5) increased labor (3) economic loss (2) technology-facilitated violence (1) service or benefit loss (1)
Patient group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (10) denying self-identity (6) demeaning (5) reifying categories (2) alienation (2) erasure (1) none (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (15) denying self-identity (12) reifying categories (4) erasure (3) demeaning (3) alienation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (10) reifying categories (6) alienation (3) denying self-identity (2) erasure (2) demeaning (2) none (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alienation (8) none (7) demeaning (5) reifying categories (4) erasure (3) denying self-identity (2) stereotyping (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stereotyping (8) none (7) erasure (5) denying self-identity (4) demeaning (3) alienation (2) reifying categories (1)
Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (12) increased labor (6) service or benefit loss (5) alienation (4) opportunity loss (2) economic loss (2) technology-facilitated violence (2) loss of agency or control (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (9) increased labor (6) loss of agency or control (6) privacy violation (3) service or benefit loss (2) opportunity loss (2) technology-facilitated violence (1) alienation (1) economic loss (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> service or benefit loss (9) loss of agency or control (7) increased labor (5) diminished health and well-being (4) alienation (4) technology-facilitated violence (3) opportunity loss (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased labor (9) diminished health and well-being (8) service or benefit loss (6) alienation (4) economic loss (3) opportunity loss (2) privacy violation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of agency or control (7) diminished health and well-being (7) alienation (7) increased labor (6) service or benefit loss (4) technology-facilitated violence (2) privacy violation (2) economic loss (1)
Healthcare institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (8) loss of agency or control (7) increased labor (4) service or benefit loss (4) opportunity loss (4) economic loss (3) privacy violation (1) alienation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (9) increased labor (7) service or benefit loss (7) loss of agency or control (5) economic loss (2) alienation (2) privacy violation (1) opportunity loss (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (13) increased labor (6) loss of agency or control (5) alienation (4) service or benefit loss (3) opportunity loss (3) economic loss (2) privacy violation (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diminished health and well-being (11) service or benefit loss (8) increased labor (7) loss of agency or control (4) economic loss (3) opportunity loss (2) alienation (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased labor (7) economic loss (6) loss of agency or control (6) diminished health and well-being (5) alienation (2) service or benefit loss (1) privacy violation (1)

Table 9. Ethical Matrix for the Hiring Domain (harms sorted by frequency)

Stakeholder / Bias	Representation	Measurement	Algorithmic	Evaluation	Deployment
Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (11) • loss of agency or control (7) • service or benefit loss (6) • economic loss (5) • increased labor (3) • diminished health and well-being (3) • alienation (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (13) • diminished health and well-being (8) • increased labor (5) • service or benefit loss (2) • economic loss (2) • alienation (2) • loss of agency or control (2) • privacy violation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • service or benefit loss (9) • opportunity loss (8) • economic loss (7) • increased labor (6) • loss of agency or control (3) • diminished health and well-being (1) • alienation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (13) • economic loss (8) • diminished health and well-being (7) • service or benefit loss (2) • alienation (2) • loss of agency or control (2) • increased labor (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (8) • service or benefit loss (7) • diminished health and well-being (6) • alienation (5) • loss of agency or control (3) • economic loss (2) • privacy violation (1) • technology-facilitated violence (1) • increased labor (1)
Applicant group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stereotyping (9) • erasure (7) • demeaning (6) • denying self-identity (4) • reifying categories (3) • alienation (2) • none (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demeaning (9) • alienation (5) • stereotyping (5) • denying self-identity (5) • none (4) • reifying categories (2) • erasure (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demeaning (9) • stereotyping (5) • none (5) • denying self-identity (4) • erasure (3) • alienation (3) • reifying categories (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reifying categories (10) • demeaning (9) • alienation (7) • stereotyping (4) • denying self-identity (2) • erasure (2) • none (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demeaning (6) • stereotyping (6) • erasure (6) • none (5) • alienation (4) • reifying categories (2) • denying self-identity (1)
Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (7) • alienation (7) • diminished health and well-being (7) • service or benefit loss (5) • increased labor (4) • technology-facilitated violence (2) • loss of agency or control (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (7) • economic loss (6) • increased labor (6) • alienation (5) • loss of agency or control (5) • diminished health and well-being (3) • privacy violation (2) • service or benefit loss (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (8) • increased labor (6) • loss of agency or control (6) • service or benefit loss (6) • diminished health and well-being (5) • economic loss (2) • alienation (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased labor (8) • loss of agency or control (6) • diminished health and well-being (6) • opportunity loss (5) • service or benefit loss (2) • alienation (3) • economic loss (2) • privacy violation (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of agency or control (9) • increased labor (7) • opportunity loss (5) • economic loss (5) • service or benefit loss (2) • alienation (2) • diminished health and well-being (2)
Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (13) • increased labor (6) • service or benefit loss (5) • diminished health and well-being (4) • alienation (4) • loss of agency or control (4) • economic loss (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • service or benefit loss (8) • opportunity loss (8) • diminished health and well-being (5) • economic loss (2) • alienation (2) • technology-facilitated violence (1) • increased labor (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (15) • service or benefit loss (7) • economic loss (3) • loss of agency or control (3) • diminished health and well-being (1) • alienation (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (11) • service or benefit loss (8) • increased labor (5) • economic loss (4) • diminished health and well-being (3) • loss of agency or control (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity loss (9) • service or benefit loss (8) • economic loss (4) • diminished health and well-being (4) • alienation (4) • increased labor (2) • loss of agency or control (1) • technology-facilitated violence (1) • privacy violation (1)