Journal of Governance
Volume 10 Issue 2, June 2025 (399-413)
(P-ISSN 2528-276X) (E-ISSN 2598-6465)
http://dx.doi.org/10.62870/jog.v10i2.32580

The Rome Call and The Dynamics of Institutionalizing Ethics in Artificial Intelligence Governance

Saiman Pakpahan[1*], Bambang Putra Ermansyah[2]
[1]International Relations, University of Riau, Indonesia
[2]International Relations, Padjadjaran University, Indonesia

*Correspondence Email: saiman18001@gmail.unpad.ac.id

Received: 19 January 2025; Revised: 7 May 2025; Accepted: 18 May 2025

Abstract: *This article examines the institutionalization of ethical norms in the governance of artificial intelligence (AI), focusing on the Rome Call for AI Ethics as a global initiative. The study addresses the ethical challenges posed by AI, including algorithmic bias, privacy violations, and social inequality. Using constructivism and the "norm life cycle" framework, it analyzes the emergence, diffusion, and internalization of ethical principles such as transparency, inclusion, and accountability. Findings highlight the critical roles of international organizations, private corporations, and civil society in advocating for these norms. However, challenges such as capacity disparities between nations and resistance from key actors persist. The study underscores the importance of cross-sectoral collaboration and localized approaches to ensure equitable adoption of AI ethics. By offering insights into global norm institutionalization, this research contributes to the discourse on creating responsible and sustainable AI governance frameworks that prioritize humanity's collective welfare.*
Keywords: *Artificial Intelligent; Institutionalization; Norm Life Cycle; Rome Call.*

How to Cite:
Pakpahan, S., & Ermansyah, B. P. (2025). The Rome Call and The Dynamics of Institutionalizing Ethics in Artificial Intelligence Governance. *Journal of Governance*, *10*(2), 399–413. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.62870/jog.v10i2.32580

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI), also known as machine intelligence, has undergone rapid development, profoundly influencing numerous aspects and dimensions of human life. AI has significantly transformed and shaped how individuals work, communicate, and make decisions. The proliferation of innovations in AI development has propelled technological advancements to highly sophisticated levels. However, as with other significant milestones in human history, these advancements also introduce substantial ethical challenges. The increasing reliance on AI, particularly in critical sectors such as healthcare, law, and governance, has sparked questions and discussions regarding issues like transparency, fairness, and accountability in its application. This complexity is further compounded in a global context, where AI is developed and utilized across nations with differing norms, values, and interests.

To address these ethical concerns, global initiatives such as the *Rome Call for AI Ethics* have emerged. Released in 2020 by the Pontifical Academy for Life, in collaboration with key stakeholders including Microsoft, IBM, and the FAO, this document aims to establish universal principles to guide the development and deployment of AI. The six principles advocated by the *Rome Call* are transparency, inclusion, accountability, impartiality, reliability, and the protection of privacy and security (RenAIssance Foundation, 2022). These principles underscore the importance of directing technological development toward the collective benefit of humanity, rather than as a tool for demonstrating power, dominance, or purely economic gain (Floridi et al., 2018).

The *Rome Call* serves as an appeal to foster a global framework for establishing agreed-upon ethical standards for AI governance. However, this effort faces significant resistance from various actors, including developed and developing nations, technology companies, and civil society organizations. For instance, nations with advanced technological capabilities may prioritize reinforcing their leadership in AI development, while those with limited technological capacity tend to focus on the implications of AI for sovereignty, as well as social, societal, and legal concerns. Moreover, technology companies often prioritize economic profits over ethical considerations (Mittelstadt et al., 2016). Consequently, expecting the voluntary adoption of norms like those outlined in the *Rome Call* without stringent regulation is unrealistic.

The institutionalization of AI ethics frequently encounters challenges related to political and economic stability. Additionally, establishing technical standards for these ethical principles poses further difficulties. For example, ensuring fairness and transparency in AI algorithms requires a deeper understanding of the sociocultural contexts in which the technology is applied. Algorithms tailored to specific geo-economic regions may produce unintended biases when implemented in different socio-economic and cultural settings (Binns, 2018). This necessitates a more holistic and inclusive approach to ensure AI systems are equitable, contextually relevant, and sensitive to diverse backgrounds.

The ethical implications of AI have become increasingly pertinent amid growing concerns about its impact on human rights, particularly in surveillance

systems and decision-making processes. A notable example is the controversial use of facial recognition technology, which raises fears of privacy violations and the potential for racial profiling. This situation underscores the need for global policies that are not only normative but also functional to prevent technology misuse and mitigate its adverse effects on vulnerable groups (Whittaker et al., 2018).

Civil society and non-governmental organizations play a crucial role in advocating for the adoption of AI ethical norms by global institutions. They often employ evidence-based advocacy to highlight the adverse consequences of poorly managed AI systems, such as algorithmic biases that exacerbate social inequalities or violations of individual privacy. However, their ability to influence the institutionalization of norms is often constrained by limited access to global resources and platforms compared to major actors like technology companies or advanced nations (Bryson & Theodorou, 2019).

The academic community's contribution to shaping critical discourse on AI ethics is equally significant. Research aimed at understanding the social and economic implications of AI, along with recommendations for improving its use and systematization, can inform public policy. Academics also serve as intermediaries between civil society and policymakers, ensuring that proposed regulations are grounded in robust empirical evidence and aligned with global population needs (Floridi, 2019).

We posit that cross-sectoral collaboration is a critical factor in ensuring the successful institutionalization of AI ethics. Governments, technology companies, academics, and civil society must work synergistically to establish mechanisms that promote adherence to these protocols. Global bodies such as the United Nations, G20, and OECD can serve as valuable platforms for addressing these issues on an international scale. Furthermore, active engagement from the private sector, in collaboration with governments, can facilitate the formulation of regulations that balance technological progress with the promotion of ethical values (Jobin et al., 2019).

Global experiences with AI ethics highlight the necessity of public involvement. Public education on AI applications, decision-making processes involving AI, and community participation in technology oversight can ensure more comprehensive enforcement of ethical standards. It is anticipated that as technological literacy among the general population increases, more individuals and communities will be equipped to contribute to the development of a responsible, sustainable, and equitable AI ecosystem (Coeckelbergh, 2020).

This study views such efforts as part of a broader transformation required to establish globally acceptable ethical standards. This section not only addresses these aspects but also underscores why ethics are critical in the context of AI, positioning the *Rome Call* as a starting point for tackling these issues. Based on document analysis and academic literature, it is anticipated that these norms will gain greater understanding and adoption, fostering cross-sectoral collaboration to ensure more responsible, equitable, and sustainable AI governance.

The theoretical framework employed in this study aims to examine how norms, whether regulatory or ethical, interact within international relations and relate to the ethics of AI use, as promoted by the *Rome Call*. To this end, we adopt an

approach that elucidates how norms emerge, disseminate, and become internalized in the context of international relations. Constructivism is selected as the theoretical lens, as it offers a more inclusive and comprehensive perspective on norms, ideas, and their operationalization, as well as their influence on and by actors in international relations.

Constructivists argue that agency and structure are mutually constitutive, implying that structures shape agency, and agency, in turn, shapes structures. Agency is understood as an individual's capacity to act, while structure refers to the international system, comprising material and ideational elements. Change or reinforcement within this system ultimately depends on the beliefs and ideas held by states. If these beliefs and ideas shift, social relationships may also transform. To better understand norms, three types can be identified: regulative norms, which govern and constrain behavior; constitutive norms, which create new actors, interests, or categories of action; and prescriptive norms, which designate specific norms as inherently valuable, implying that no norm is inherently negative from the perspective of its proponents (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998).

In this study, norms are defined as expected standards of behavior within a specific social context, influencing how states, international organizations, and other actors interact within international relations (Wendt, 1999). From this perspective, the governance of AI ethics is not merely a technical response to emerging technological challenges but also involves sociological elements in the development and diffusion of AI-related norms.

Within the constructivist framework, norms do not emerge spontaneously but are shaped by contextual dimensions related to the accumulation and reinforcement of power and interests among involved actors. Some AI ethical norms, such as transparency and inclusion, often face resistance from large technology companies, as they are perceived as constraints on innovation or economic profitability. Conversely, developing nations may view these promoted AI norms as potential threats to their technological sovereignty, particularly given their reliance on technological advancements from developed nations (Bryson & Theodorou, 2019).

Furthermore, we see potential for debating constructivism regarding the contributions of various actors to the emergence of AI norms and ethics. For instance, scholars like Luciano Floridi, who advocate for "soft ethics," argue that flexibility and adaptability in applying ethical norms are crucial (Floridi, 2018). Such theoretical debates are highly relevant in the context of AI, where rapid technological advancements necessitate equally agile responses in establishing ethical standards.

This approach also enables an understanding of how AI ethical norms interact with pre-existing norms within the international system. Recognizing norms as critical to human relational patterns can underscore the imperative of operating AI in a more ethical and transparent manner. However, the interrelation and interaction of norms can also generate conflicts when actors prioritize differing objectives (Whittaker et al., 2018). Through a constructivist lens, the complexities and dynamics of norm institutionalization in AI governance can be better elucidated.

Norm Life Cycle

In addition to the constructivist perspective, this study employs the "norm life cycle" concept introduced by Finnemore and Sikkink (1998). This framework identifies three stages in the emergence and institutionalization of norms: emergence, cascade, and internalization. During the emergence stage, norms are introduced by individuals or groups known as "norm entrepreneurs," who engage in persuasive efforts to promote the importance of these norms. In the context of AI ethics, norm entrepreneurs include international organizations, technology companies, and academics advocating for transparency, fairness, and privacy (Cath et al., 2018).

The second stage involves norm dissemination, where state and non-state actors adopt and promote the norm through socialization, advocacy, or pressure (Jobin et al., 2019). These actors are often supported by global institutions such as the United Nations, G20, and OECD, which facilitate activities that elevate issues to public discourse. In the context of AI ethics, the *Rome Call for AI Ethics* exemplifies this stage, aiming to promote AI ethics on a global scale by engaging stakeholders across sectors.

The final stage, internalization, occurs when norms are integrated into policies, practices, and organizational or national cultures, becoming normative standards. However, internalization often faces challenges, particularly when norms conflict with the economic or political interests of relevant actors (Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

In the context of AI ethics institutionalization, the *Rome Call* is viewed as a milestone within the norm life cycle described by Finnemore and Sikkink. For example, its emergence reflects the efforts of norm entrepreneurs to establish global ethical norms for AI. The dissemination of these norms is supported by various international platforms. Nevertheless, as Finnemore and Sikkink note, the internalization of norms initiated by the *Rome Call* continues to face resistance from certain actors and specific sociocultural contexts in different nations.

It is also worth noting that norm internalization is contingent on the internal capabilities or qualifications of a state or organization (Coeckelbergh, 2020). This poses a challenge for norm entrepreneurs seeking to introduce or modify norms. Consequently, the internalization process must consider detailed aspects to ensure norm changes align with needs while remaining compatible with local values. This consideration is critical to facilitate the acceptance and internalization of advocated norms.

Method

This study employs a qualitative approach grounded in document analysis. This method was chosen as it is deemed capable of providing a comprehensive analysis of complex social phenomena (Creswell, 2014). The research is designed as a qualitative case study focusing on the analysis of the *Rome Call for AI Ethics* and its institutionalization process. Beyond describing the institutionalization of norms, this study also aims to elucidate the factors that may impede its progress. These obstacles will be elaborated upon and analyzed to generate recommendations for addressing them.

The data in this study are categorized into primary and secondary sources. Primary data include documents related to the *Rome Call*, policy reports

from international organizations, and official publications from technology companies involved in initiating the *Rome Call*. Secondary data encompass articles, journals, books, and research reports deemed relevant to this study (Creswell, 2014).

Data collection will proceed in two stages: identification and selection, followed by content analysis of the identified and selected documents. This technique is intended to enable us to understand how AI ethical norms are defined, socialized, and adopted or internalized.

Data analysis will employ both inductive and deductive approaches, wherein we will identify and analyze recurring patterns in discussions surrounding norm institutionalization. Additionally, the theoretical framework of the norm life cycle, developed by Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), will be applied, comprising several stages. Each stage will be analyzed based on specific indicators, such as the role of key actors, advocacy strategies, and challenges encountered.

This study acknowledges limitations stemming from its focus solely on publicly available documents and literature. Consequently, confidential documents or internal dynamics related to the formulation and advocacy of the *Rome Call* may not be bedeclare @classmethod

Through a comprehensive and systematic research methodology, this study aims to provide in-depth insights into the process of institutionalizing AI ethical norms at the global level and the factors influencing its success.

Results and Discussion

Emergence of Norms: The Rome Call

The emergence of a norm represents the initial stage of the norm life cycle, as outlined by Finnemore and Sikkink (1998). This stage refers to the point at which a norm is introduced and promoted by norm entrepreneurs. In this section, the researcher will discuss the background of the *Rome Call*'s emergence and the key actors involved in introducing this norm.

The *Rome Call* was first introduced in 2020 to address moral concerns related to AI. These concerns stem from innovations during the AI Revolution, which, while yielding significant technological breakthroughs across various fields, have also raised substantial ethical issues, such as algorithmic bias, privacy violations, and social inequalities (RenAIssance Foundation, 2022). Consequently, there has been a push for stakeholders, including governments, technologists, and civil society, to reach a consensus in formulating a comprehensive and ethical framework for regulating AI use.

Several events paved the way for the formulation of the AI principles later articulated in the *Rome Call*. These events unfolded amid ongoing geopolitical, economic, and terrorism-related competition. Within this ethical framework, the actors involved in the *Rome Call* played a highly significant role in shaping its ethical principles. A key actor in this process is the Pontifical Academy for Life, a Vatican-affiliated institution focused on addressing moral and ethical issues. They were the primary actor in the *Rome Call*, aiming to provide moral guidance for AI use (RenAIssance Foundation, 2024).

Alongside the Pontifical Academy for Life, multinational corporations such as Microsoft and IBM also played critical roles in the development of the *Rome Call*. These companies have been integral to debates on AI ethics (RenAIssance

Foundation, 2024) and possess the resources and capabilities needed to influence global policy directions. In this regard, the interaction between public and private sectors was a crucial factor in the *Rome Call*'s success. A report by Roff and Danks (2018) suggests that the involvement of major technology companies in such initiatives is an effort to demonstrate their role as socially responsible corporate actors with moral and ethical awareness.

International organizations, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), also participated in the *Rome Call*. The FAO views AI as a tool to enhance agricultural productivity and drive breakthroughs in achieving food security. However, it also acknowledges the multifaceted challenges AI presents. The FAO's involvement highlights the importance of a multistakeholder approach in addressing the regulatory challenges posed by AI ethics. A study by Cath et al. (2018) indicates that international organizations often serve as bridges between actors with divergent interests, facilitating constructive dialogue that can lead to actionable solutions.

In addition to institutional actors, individual actors also played significant roles as norm entrepreneurs in promoting the *Rome Call*. A notable figure is Luciano Floridi, a philosopher specializing in technology ethics. He has been a proponent of "soft ethics," advocating for flexibility and adaptability in addressing technological ethical issues. In one of his works, Floridi (2018) argues that overly rigid normative approaches can stifle innovation, necessitating a dynamic and inclusive framework in the context of technological development.

The consolidation of the *Rome Call* was multidimensional, involving numerous negotiations and consultations. For instance, in its early stages, the Pontifical Academy for Life organized a workshop that brought together experts from diverse fields, including technology, law, and philosophy. The workshop aimed to address the most pressing challenges in AI development while formulating broadly acceptable ethical principles. Mittelstadt (2019) argues that the inclusion of diverse stakeholders is a key factor in successfully promoting widely accepted norms, as it accommodates a broader range of perspectives.

However, the emergence of the *Rome Call* was not without challenges. One of the most significant obstacles was the divergence of interests between developed and developing nations. Advanced economies, with high technological capacities, often prioritize innovation and market dominance, while developing nations are more concerned with AI's social and economic impacts. Research by Nemitz (2018) suggests that such disparities often create asymmetric power dynamics, where the voices of developing nations are less heard in global discussions.

Additionally, resistance from some companies opposing the normalization of ethical standards in technology development posed further challenges. Binns (2018) notes that resistance in such cases often stems from concerns over additional costs. To counter this, the *Rome Call*'s proponents emphasized that ethical principles could create long-term value for companies, such as by enhancing public trust.

The emergence stage in the norm life cycle is critical, as it sets the trajectory for the norm's future legitimacy. Norm entrepreneurs, who drive the socialization of the norms they initiate, are the most

pivotal actors in this phase (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998). In the *Rome Call*, the narrative began with the premise that AI, if driven solely by profit-oriented entrepreneurs, is highly susceptible to misuse. Such misuse could manifest in forms like algorithmic discrimination or privacy violations. This narrative was bolstered by empirical evidence highlighting the potential risks of unregulated AI.

In conclusion, the emergence stage of the *Rome Call for AI Ethics* reflects the complexity and dynamics involved in institutionalizing ethical norms at the global level. By engaging diverse actors from the public, private, and civil society sectors, the *Rome Call* established a robust foundation for disseminating ethical norms in AI development. However, the challenges encountered during this process indicate that norm institutionalization is not a linear process but involves ongoing negotiations and compromises among competing interests.

Cascade (Norm Dissemination): The Role of International Organizations, Multinational Corporations, and Other Actors

The next stage in the norm life cycle is the cascade, or dissemination phase. During this stage, norms are propagated through various persuasive strategies and advocacy campaigns. This phase is crucial, as institutions or actors advocating for the norm promote it to the broader international community. At this stage, norms previously understood by a limited group begin to gain acceptance among a larger international audience. In the case of the *Rome Call*, dissemination was facilitated by international organizations such as the United Nations, OECD, and the European Union (Standard Ethics, 2023). These organizations helped spread the *Rome Call*'s core ideas and served as conduits for promoting adherence to its ethical principles.

One strategy employed during the dissemination phase was the organization of international conferences and forums. For example, in 2020, the *Rome Call* was presented during a side event at the UN General Assembly on global technology issues. The presentation aimed to promote the *Rome Call*'s ethical AI principles to UN member states while encouraging their integration into national policies and regulations. Such international forums are instrumental in norm diffusion, as they enable direct engagement among stakeholders.

The OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) also played a significant role in norm dissemination by issuing guidelines and policy documents supporting the *Rome Call*'s principles. As an organization comprising many advanced economies, the OECD has substantial capacity to set standards in AI ethics and achieve global reach. An OECD report noted that the *Rome Call*'s principles of transparency, accountability, and inclusivity have been integrated into policy recommendations for member states (OECD, 2019). These policy documents serve not only as management tools but also as advocacy instruments that facilitate norm adoption at the national level.

Advocacy campaigns are another critical element in norm dissemination. In the context of the *Rome Call*, such campaigns were conducted in collaboration with civil society organizations and technology companies. For instance, Microsoft and IBM, early supporters of the *Rome Call*, actively championed AI ethical principles through social media campaigns and educational workshops (RenAIssance Foundation,

2024). While the involvement of multinational technology companies is often driven by strategic considerations, such as building a reputation for ethical technology development, their participation extends beyond mere profit motives.

Civil society organizations also served as key advocates for promoting AI ethical standards. Groups like Access Now and AlgorithmWatch collaborated with policymakers to ensure that the principles articulated in the *Rome Call* were implemented inclusively and equitably. A study by Eubanks (2018) suggests that civil society organizations often act as intermediaries between communities directly affected by technology and global actors involved in policymaking.

An effective advocacy strategy was the use of compelling and globally relevant narratives. In the *Rome Call*'s context, the narrative emphasized ethics' role in mitigating AI's adverse effects, such as algorithmic discrimination and privacy violations. As Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) argue, the success of norm diffusion depends on actors' ability to craft a narrative that resonates with diverse audiences. In this case, the narrative highlighted not only AI's negative impacts but also its potential positive contributions when applied responsibly.

Digital media also played a vital role in reaching broader audiences. For example, the Pontifical Academy for Life launched a digital campaign featuring video clips, infographics, and online discussions about the *Rome Call*'s principles. This campaign aimed to raise public awareness about the philosophy underpinning AI ethics. The use of digital technology in norm advocacy not only expanded the campaign's geographic reach but also fostered closer engagement between advocates and their audiences.

However, the norm dissemination process faced challenges. Resistance from interest groups with competing agendas was a primary obstacle. For instance, during the early advocacy of the *Rome Call*'s principles, some advanced economies were reluctant to adopt certain norms, arguing that they placed disproportionate pressure on technologically advanced nations to implement all recommended principles (Laforge et al., 2024). Such disparities often hinder achieving a global consensus on establishing specific ethical norms.

Additionally, some technology companies exhibited reluctance to adopt these norms, particularly when ethics were perceived as slowing innovation or harming business interests. To address this, *Rome Call* advocates emphasized that adopting ethical principles could yield long-term benefits for companies, such as enhancing consumer trust and creating competitive advantages. Generally, proposals promising tangible economic benefits are more likely to persuade companies to accommodate advocated norms.

So we must underscore the importance of accommodating diverse interests and adopting inclusive strategies during the norm dissemination phase. To achieve broader advocacy for AI ethical norms, international institutions, civil society, and technology organizations must unite around a shared goal. Moreover, the challenges encountered during this phase demonstrate that norm dissemination is not a unidirectional process but a dynamic interplay of conflicting values and interests, requiring continuous negotiation to resolve.

Norm Internalization

The next stage in the norm life cycle, according to Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), is internalization. In this stage, norms that have undergone the processes of emergence and dissemination begin to be institutionalized by states and organizations, becoming part of policies, practices, or cultures. In the context of the *Rome Call*, efforts to adopt AI ethical principles into the stage of operational implementation universally are integrated in this phase, namely internalization. Within the context of the *Rome Call*, efforts focus on adopting AI ethical principles into operational implementation and eliminating barriers that hinder such implementation.

Italy is one of the countries that has begun to implement the norms advocated by the *Rome Call*. As the host country of the inaugural *Rome Call*, Italy has integrated the principles of transparency, accountability, and inclusion into its national AI policies. The Italian government, through the Ministry of Innovation and Digital Technology, has issued guidelines containing recommendations for technology companies to ensure that the AI products and services they develop align with the ethical principles proposed in the *Rome Call*. This policy promotes independent audits to enforce compliance with ethical norms while providing incentives for companies that prioritize ethics in their technological innovations (AGID, 2024).

In addition to Italy, the European Union also plays a role as a supranational actor in promoting the internalization of the norms advocated by the *Rome Call*. This is evident in the *Artificial Intelligence Act* drafted by the European Union as a legislative framework designed to ensure that AI is used responsibly and equitably across all its member states. The principles articulated in the *Rome Call* are included here, such as the principle of fairness, which is integrated into various regulations across multiple sectors, from healthcare to transportation (European Parliament, 2024). In our view, the AIA can be regarded as a highly significant step forward in efforts to standardize and internalize AI ethics as advocated by the *Rome Call* as binding law at the regional level.

Beyond Europe, advanced Asian countries have also demonstrated their commitment to internalizing the norms advocated by the *Rome Call*. In relation to AI ethics, the Japanese government has launched an initiative known as "Society 5.0." This initiative discusses a strategic vision and mission aimed at creating a society capable of balancing technological innovation with human needs (Samudio, 2023). Principles articulated by the *Rome Call*, such as inclusivity and privacy, also find a place within this initiative's framework. According to us, Japan's approach provides insight into how norms and ethics in technology development can be adapted to cultural and local needs contexts, rather than solely considering innovative aspects and capital accumulation. This approach highlights that the adoption and internalization of values and norms can increase in likelihood when sociocultural aspects are also taken into account.

At the organizational level, multinational technology companies such as Microsoft and IBM have also taken significant roles in efforts to internalize the principles articulated by the *Rome Call*. Efforts to support the internalization of these principles can also be found in various workshops, technology development, or training programs

(RenAIssance Foundation, 2024). These steps are taken to reinforce their reputation as technology companies that strive for innovation while simultaneously maintaining their commitment to upholding the ethical and normative standards they initiated.

However, despite significant progress in the internalization process of these norms, various obstacles still persist that must be addressed to ensure the application and internalization of these norms are accepted on a broader, even universal, scale. One obstacle that we believe requires immediate resolution is the disparity in capabilities and capacities between developed and developing countries. This disparity arises because developing countries are often constrained by limited resources, infrastructure, technology, and access to education. This, of course, ultimately affects the implementation of the fairness principle advocated by the *Rome Call*. The gaps and inequalities in the aforementioned sectors, according to us, also contribute to creating disparities in AI governance at local or regional levels.

Resistance or opposition from actors in the technology industry and government sectors can also be a factor hindering the internalization process of these norms. Although technology companies like Microsoft have shown a positive response to efforts to internalize these normative standards, there is also the possibility and potential that technology companies may perceive the standardization of norms they are required to internalize as reducing their flexibility in innovation. The same response is also likely to emerge from certain governments, particularly those with authoritarian systems. Such countries tend to reject norms that promote transparency and accountability. Thus, in our view, more adaptive strategies are needed to ensure that the advocated norms are accepted by actors with different interests and backgrounds.

The next obstacle is the still unclear consensus on how these AI ethical principles should be applied in practice. This is because, in many cases, norms can be interpreted and implemented in varying ways between one country and another or between one organization and another. These variations in interpretation and implementation are heavily influenced by each respective socio-cultural context.

To address these obstacles, we argue that cross-sectoral and cross-national cooperation is necessary to create a more inclusive and flexible atmosphere and mechanism that can garner as much support as possible. This can be implemented or pursued by initiating dialogues or negotiations in international forums. Additionally, to address the obstacle of disparities between developing and developed countries, initiatives such as financial and technical support from developed to developing countries are needed to ensure the application and internalization of the AI principles and norms articulated by the *Rome Call* are maximized.

Moreover, at the societal level, efforts are also needed to increase public awareness of the importance of ethics in technology development, particularly AI. Public education, campaigns, and advocacy can be approaches taken to create a social ecosystem that supports the internalization of norms and values.

Conclusion

In an era of rapid artificial intelligence (AI) development, ethics

becomes a fundamental issue in ensuring that this technology is not only beneficial but also responsible and fair. The institutionalization of norms in AI governance, as proposed by the *Rome Call*, underscores the importance of principles such as transparency, inclusion, and accountability. The *Rome Call* reflects global efforts to establish ethics as the foundation for AI technology development, addressing challenges such as algorithmic bias, privacy violations, and social inequalities.

The *Rome Call*, initiated by various international actors, including the Vatican, major technology companies like Microsoft and IBM, and international organizations such as the FAO, emphasizes cross-sectoral collaboration. This collaboration demonstrates the need for a multistakeholder approach to tackle the complex challenges in AI regulation. The "norm life cycle" concept proposed by Finnemore and Sikkink provides a relevant framework for understanding the process of norm institutionalization, from emergence and dissemination to internalization.

The emergence stage of the norms in the *Rome Call* was influenced by norm entrepreneurs who utilized persuasive narratives to highlight the importance of ethics in AI. Organizations such as the Pontifical Academy for Life and figures like Luciano Floridi contributed to raising global awareness about the risks of AI without ethical guidance. This narrative was supported by empirical evidence of the negative impacts of unregulated AI, such as discrimination and privacy violations.

In the dissemination stage, international organizations such as the UN and OECD played significant roles through advocacy, conferences, and policy formulation. Norm dissemination was supported by digital campaigns, social media, and the involvement of technology companies and civil society organizations. These strategies were designed to reach a broader audience and increase public awareness of AI ethical principles. However, challenges such as resistance from advanced countries and technology companies to these norms highlight the need for ongoing negotiations.

The internalization stage marks the adoption of norms into operational policies and practices. Significant examples include Italy and the European Union, which have integrated the *Rome Call*'s principles into national and regional regulations. Initiatives such as "Society 5.0" in Japan demonstrate how these norms can be adapted to local cultural contexts. Multinational technology companies are also engaged in internalization through training programs and ethical technology development.

However, norm internalization faces obstacles, including capacity disparities between developed and developing countries, resistance from certain actors, and differences in norm interpretation and implementation. These obstacles underscore the need for international cooperation, financial support, and public education efforts to create an ecosystem that supports norm internalization.

From a constructivist perspective, AI ethical norms do not emerge naturally but through a process of negotiation and compromise involving various interests. Therefore, the success of norm institutionalization depends on cross-sectoral and cross-national collaboration. By supporting initiatives like the *Rome Call*, the international community can create a more responsible, fair, and sustainable AI governance framework. These efforts are not only about preventing risks but also

about maximizing AI's positive potential for global human progress.

Acknowledge

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all the individuals and institutions who support this research

References

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 149–159. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1712.03586

Binns, R. (2018). Algorithmic accountability and public reason. *Philosophy & Technology, 31*, 543–556. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-017-0263-5

Bryson, J. J., & Theodorou, A. (2019). How society can maintain human-centric artificial intelligence. In *Toivonen, M., Saari, E. (eds) Human-Centered Digitalization and Services. Translational Systems Sciences, vol 19. Springer, Singapore.* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7725-9_16

Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the 'good society': The US, EU, and UK approach. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 24*, 505–528. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-017-9901-7

Choi, H., & Kim, S. (2022). Variability in AI ethics adoption: A comparative study. *Technology in Society, 69,* 101–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101892

Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). *AI ethics.* The MIT Press.

AGID. (2024). *Italian Strategy for Artificial Intelligence 2024-2026*. Accessed from https://www.agid.gov.it/sites/agid/files/2024-07/Italian_strategy_for_artificial_intelligence_2024-2026.pdf

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor.* St. Martin's Press.

European Parliament. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence Act*. Accessed from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2024-0138_EN.pdf

Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization, 52*(4), 887–917. https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550789

Floridi, L. (2018). Soft ethics and the governance of the digital. *Philosophy & Technology, 31*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-018-0303-9

Floridi, L. (2019). Establishing the rules for building trustworthy AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*, 261–262. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0055-y

Green, A., & Carter, J. (2022). Corporate responsibility in AI: Ethical frameworks and practices. *Journal of Business Ethics, 175*(3), 345–367. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04890-z

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*, 389–399.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

LaForge, G., Muggah, R., Seiler, G. (2024). *Bridging the AI Governance Divide*. T20 Policy Brief. Accessed from https://www.t20brasil.org/media/documentos/arquivos/TF05_ST_05_Bridging_the_AI_gov66cdcbf06f991.pdf

Li, X., & Zhao, Y. (2022). Resistance to global AI norms: Challenges in authoritarian regimes. *AI & Society, 37*(2), 150–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01267-3

Meijer, A., & Bijl, P. (2022). The EU Artificial Intelligence Act: Opportunities and challenges for ethical AI. *European Policy Studies, 14*(1), 23–45. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-021-00352-9

Mittelstadt, B. D. (2019). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*, 501–507. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0114-4

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679

Nemitz, P. (2018). Constitutional democracy and technology in the age of artificial intelligence. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A.* **376 :** 20180089. http://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0089

OECD (2019), *Artificial Intelligence in Society*, Accessed from https://doi.org/10.1787/eedfee77-en.

Patel, R., & Kumar, N. (2021). Bridging the AI ethics gap: Capacity building in developing nations. *Development and Change, 52*(6), 1208–1231. https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12674

RenAIssance Foundation. (2022). *Rome Call for AI Ethics*. Accessed from https://www.romecall.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/RomeCall_Paper_web.pdf

RenAIssance Foundation. (2024). *Mission Report : The Activities of the Renaissance Foundation October 2022 – October 2023*. Accessed from https://www.romecall.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/RomeCall_report-web.pdf

Roff, H., & Danks, D. (2018). "Trust but verify": The difficulty of trusting autonomous systems. *Journal of Military Ethics, 17*(1), 2–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2018.1481907

Standard Ethics. (2023). *Unmasking Sustainibility in AI : An Overview of Global Company Practices*. Accessed from https://www.standardethics.eu/edocman/research-methodology/Research_Unmasking%20AI_21.11.2023_final.pdf

Samudio, R.E.R. (2023). AI Decision-making in Smart Cities, Japan's Society 5.0 dalam *Challenges of Law and Technology - Herausforderungen des Rechts und der Technologie - Retos del Derecho y de la Tecnología*. Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Tanaka, K., & Suzuki, T. (2021). Society 5.0 and the ethical use of AI: Lessons from Japan. *AI Policy Research, 9*(4), 199–218.

https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2021.1984126

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics First Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whittaker, M., Crawford, K., Dobbe, R., Fried, G., Kaziunas, E., Mathur, V., ... & Schwartz, O. (2018). AI Now Report 2018. *AI Now Institute*. Dapat diakses di https://ainowinstitute.org/AI_Now_2018_Report.pdf