Studia Philosophica et Theologica
Vol. 26, No. 01, 2026
doi: 10.35312/spet.v26i1.821

p – ISSN : 1412 - 0674
e – ISSN : 2550 - 0589
Halaman : 99 - 115

Digital Feminism as an Agent of Change: Negotiating Power, Identity, and Justice In The Society 5.0 Era

Cicilia Damayanti
Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta
Email : Cicilia.damayanti@binus.ac.id
Philips Apriadi Wijaya
Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta
Fransiskus Gregorius Nyaming
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

"Artificial intelligence is made from natural resources, fuel, human labor, infrastructures, logistics, histories, and classifications."

Kate Crawford

Recieved:19 November 2025 Revised:16 Mei 2026 Published: 30 Mei 2026

Abstract

Digital feminism reshapes gendered power relations in Society 5.0, where datafication, algorithmic governance, and platform-based labor generate new configurations of inequality while simultaneously opening possibilities for social transformation. This study examines how contemporary feminist frameworks—particularly posthuman feminism, technoscience feminism, and digital ethics—offer theoretical and strategic tools to understand, challenge, and reconfigure these dynamics. Using an interpretive qualitative approach, the analysis synthesizes insights from Donna Haraway, Francesca Ferrando, Mariarosaria Taddeo, and recent scholarship on algorithmic bias and platform labor. Findings from academic literature, policy debates, and cases of digital work reveal structural patterns such as user-data extraction, the invisibilization of care labor, and the co-optation of feminist discourse within digital capitalism. The study highlights digital feminism as a strategic field emphasizing critical digital literacy, data sovereignty, gender-sensitive technological design, and women's participation in digital governance. Rather than occupying a passive role in technological change, women emerge as agents who reimagine digital futures, confront the persistence of patriarchal residues embedded in AI and platform infrastructures, and contribute to building more inclusive and just digital societies.

Keywords: digital feminism; algorithmic justice; platform labor; data sovereignty; Society 5.0.

Abstrak

Feminisme digital merekonfigurasi relasi kuasa berbasis gender dalam era Society 5.0, ketika datafikasi, tata kelola algoritmik, dan kerja berbasis platform menghadirkan bentuk ketidaksetaraan baru sekaligus membuka peluang transformasi struktural. Penelitian ini menelaah bagaimana kerangka feminis kontemporer—feminisme posthuman, feminisme teknosains, dan etika digital—menyediakan perangkat analitis dan strategis untuk memahami serta mengintervensi dinamika tersebut. Melalui pendekatan kualitatif interpretatif, analisis mensintesiskan perdebatan mengenai bias algoritmik, kerja platform, ekstraksi data, dan invisibilisasi kerja perawatan dari lensa beberapa pemikir seperti Donna Haraway, Francesca Ferrando, Mariarosaria Taddeo. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa kapitalisme digital kerap mengapropriasi bahasa feminis sambil mempertahankan asimetri struktural. Sebagai respons, feminisme digital menekankan literasi digital kritis, kedaulatan data, desain teknologi yang responsif gender, dan perluasan partisipasi perempuan dalam tata kelola digital. Perempuan tampil bukan sebagai penerima pasif perubahan teknologi, tetapi sebagai agen yang membentuk ulang infrastruktur digital, menantang residu patriarki dalam sistem kecerdasan buatan, dan merumuskan masa depan digital yang lebih adil serta inklusif.

Kata kunci: feminisme digital; keadilan algoritmik; kerja platform; kedaulatan data; Society 5.0.

1. Introduction

Struggles over bodies, power, and identity have long been central to contemporary social feminist studies. Women's bodies, reproductive labor, and gender expression remain sites of systemic domination—from traditional patriarchal norms to digital capitalism that transforms personal experiences into data commodities. In the Society 5.0 era, these power relations increasingly operate through digital infrastructures, artificial intelligence, and data-driven systems that shape social participation and access to power.

Society 5.0 refers to a human-centered model of social transformation that integrates digital technologies, artificial intelligence, big data, and cyber-physical systems into everyday life to address social problems and improve collective well-being[1]. Unlike Industry 4.0, which primarily emphasizes industrial automation and economic efficiency, Society 5.0 foregrounds the integration of technological innovation with human-centered social values. This framework becomes highly relevant for feminist analysis because digital infrastructures increasingly shape access to labor, representation, participation, and social recognition.

Previous research demonstrates that technological bias reflects existing social structures[2]. Studies on algorithmic bias emphasize that artificial intelligence frequently reinforces gender stereotypes and the exclusion of women from digital representation. Research on digital labour highlights women's vulnerability within platform economies and digitally mediated reproductive work. In Indonesia, studies on online gender-based violence show that digitalization opens new forms of subordination, ranging from biometric data misuse to

[1] Emily M Bender et al., —On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? ?,‖ in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '21 (New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021), 610–623, https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922; KATE CRAWFORD, *The Atlas of AI* (Yale University Press, 2021), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1ghv45t.

[2] The ILO's Social Finance Programme, —Annual Report 2023,‖ ILO, 2024, https://www.ilo.org/publications/annual-report-2023.

algorithmic surveillance that deepens gender inequality[3]. Regional studies across Southeast Asia further show that digital capitalism reproduces new forms of gender inequality through data-driven systems[4].

Despite growing scholarly attention to digital risks and algorithmic bias, significant gaps remain in social feminist analysis of how technology reshapes gendered power relations. Existing studies often adopt descriptive or risk-oriented approaches, while the integration of reproductive labor, identity performativity, and digital infrastructures within a unified feminist framework remains limited. This gap highlights the need for a more holistic approach to understanding patriarchal transformation in the Society 5.0 era.

Based on this context and the reviewed literature, this research explores how women's bodies and identities are renegotiated within the technological environment of Society 5.0, how gender injustice emerges through digital infrastructures and algorithms, and how social feminist frameworks can be used to understand and confront gender inequality in the digital age.

This discussion aims to develop a conceptual framework for understanding how gender injustice operates within digital environments and how social feminist perspectives can contribute to policy strategies, social justice practices, and the protection of women in increasingly technology-integrated societies. In doing so, the article contributes to the development of inclusive and critical gender studies relevant to the challenges of justice in the Society 5.0 era.

Unlike previous studies that primarily focus on isolated issues such as algorithmic bias, online gender violence, or platform labor, this article develops an integrated social feminist framework that connects digital ethics, care labor, algorithmic governance, data sovereignty, and identity politics within the broader context of Society 5.0. The novelty of this study lies in its interdisciplinary synthesis of contemporary feminist theory and digital ethics to examine how technological infrastructures simultaneously reproduce and transform gendered power relations in the digital era.

2. Research Method

This study employs an analytical–conceptual approach that integrates social feminist scholarship, research on algorithmic bias, and analyses of the digital economy to examine power relations, bodies, and identity in the Society 5.0 era. Data were gathered through a systematic review of secondary literature from academic journals, books, international-organization reports, and relevant publications on gender, technology, and social justice, including materials from UN Women, the International Labour Organization, and empirical studies on digital labour and online gender-based violence. The analysis applies conceptual synthesis by comparing previous findings with contemporary developments, highlighting mechanisms of gender injustice in digital spaces, and identifying gaps and opportunities for social-feminist intervention. This approach enables the development of a concise yet

[3] Fidella Julian and Wa Asmawati, ―Perempuan Dan Fenomena Kekerasan Berbasis Gender Online Dalam Media Sosial,‖ *RISOMA : Jurnal Riset Sosial Humaniora Dan Pendidikan* 2 (March 5, 2024): 33–44, https://doi.org/10.62383/risoma.v2i2.64.

[4] C M Y Park and B White, *Gender and Generation in Southeast Asian Agrarian Transformations*, Critical Agrarian Studies (Taylor & Francis, 2019); Paola Panarese, Marta Margherita Grasso, and Claudia Solinas, ―Algorithmic Bias, Fairness, and Inclusivity: A Multilevel Framework for Justice-Oriented AI,‖ *AI & SOCIETY*, 2025, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02451-2.

applicable conceptual framework for understanding shifting dynamics of power and identity across interconnected social, economic, and technological domains.

The literature selection process prioritized recent interdisciplinary scholarship published in peer-reviewed journals, academic books, and institutional reports related to feminist theory, digital ethics, artificial intelligence, platform capitalism, and Society 5.0. Sources were selected based on their relevance to gender justice, technological governance, and digital labor. The analytical process employed thematic categorization and conceptual comparison to identify recurring patterns of gender inequality, technological bias, and feminist intervention strategies across digital infrastructures.

3. Findings and Discussion

This section synthesizes the analytical findings of the study, examining how digital infrastructures, algorithmic systems, and socio-cultural structures intersect to reproduce or disrupt gendered power relations in Society 5.0. The analysis also builds on the theoretical foundations outlined in the introduction, connecting empirical patterns with broader feminist frameworks that illuminate the symbolic, material, and algorithmic dimensions of gender inequality. This article also serves as teaching material for the Social Philosophy course in STFT Widya Sasana, Malang, delivered on 14 October 2025, grounding classroom discussions in contemporary debates on justice, digital governance, and feminist critique.

3.1. Reframing the Conceptual Groundwork of Contemporary Feminist Critique

Within the landscape of contemporary gender thought, feminist critique demonstrates that gender injustice does not stand as a single issue, but emerges from the complex interplay of identity construction, power structures, material conditions, and technological ecosystems. Contemporary feminist perspectives direct analysis toward the ways gender hierarchies reproduce through layered historical processes — from the construction of subjects as the other, the performative repetition that shapes norms, inequities in care work, to human–machine relations that reorganize bodies and identity.

The positioning of certain gender groups as the other reveals that gender injustice is not merely a matter of social attitudes, but a relational structure shaping autonomy and mobility. Empirical research shows this pattern clearly in the distribution of care work: women continue to shoulder a disproportionate share of both paid and unpaid care labor, reinforcing gendered social hierarchies[5]. Within an intersectional framework, experiences of being the ―other‖ are further shaped by class, race, and economic status, demonstrating how gendered subordination is layered and deeply contextual[6].

Gender identity is understood as a performative construct shaped through social norms and repeated practices. Technological developments, however, increasingly transform the terrain of identity formation, particularly within human–machine interactions. AI systems and robots carry embedded cultural values that may reinforce or challenge dominant gender norms. Research in Enactive Artificial Intelligence therefore emphasizes the importance of inclusive AI design grounded in social values to prevent the exclusion of non-dominant

[5] Kate Bahn, Jennifer Cohen, and Yana van der Meulen Rodgers, ―A Feminist Perspective on COVID-19 and the Value of Care Work Globally.,‖ *Gender, Work, and Organization* 27, no. 5 (September 2020): 695–99, https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12459.

[6] Timothy Paul Fortin, ―Simone de Beauvoir BT - On the Nature of Human Sexual Difference: A Symposium,‖ ed. Timothy Paul Fortin (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2024), 115–76, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74531-7_4.

gender expressions[7]. In parallel, intersectional feminist approaches to AI explainability highlight the importance of —response-ability,‖ namely the capacity to evaluate technological systems from the perspectives of marginalized groups[8].

Gender injustice must also be understood within socio-economic structures: intersectional analysis stresses how burdens of care work, migration, and economic inequality are deeply shaped by the intersections of class and race[9]. The double burden carried by women — navigating formal employment while bearing domestic responsibilities — stands as a concrete manifestation of inequality, one that cannot be addressed through formal equality rhetoric alone.

Care work holds a central place in contemporary feminist critique. Contributions to care, whether paid or unpaid, remain largely invisible in public policy despite forming the foundation of social well-being. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed how global crises often become care crises: women stood at the frontlines of household and social care[10]. At the level of national policy, recognition remains uneven: studies show, for instance, that paid and unpaid care work still lacks adequate acknowledgement within state policy frameworks.

Meanwhile, within digital technology discourse, the body and gender are renegotiated through design processes. A technofeminist approach underscores that technology design is a political space: who is represented, who is excluded, and how technology can be built with sensitivity to diverse identities[11]. Feminism Gender-just AI design requires audit mechanisms, transparency, and accountability — not merely technical performance, but response-ability to social realities.

Synthesizing these streams of thought reveals a key conceptual insight: gender injustice is multi-layered, operating not only through symbols and norms, but through material realities (care economies), technology (AI and robotics), and identity relations. Contemporary feminist analysis must therefore be interdisciplinary, integrating existential, performative, intersectional, material, and posthuman perspectives.

Theoretically, this multi-layered approach enriches the conceptual framework for gender analysis by opening dialogue across gender studies, political economy, technology ethics, and the philosophy of identity. Practically, the implications are concrete: redistribution of care work through leave policies and subsidies, economic recognition of care labor, gender-bias audits within AI systems, and gender-sensitive technological literacy education. Through this lens, feminist critique becomes not only an analytical tool but also the foundation for social intervention aimed at realizing inclusive gender justice amid rapid transformation.

---

[7] Merete Lie Ines Hipolito, Katie Winkle, —Enactive Artificial Intelligence: Subverting Gender Norms in Robot-Human Interaction,‖ *Human-Computer Interaction* 1 (2023), https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.08741.

[8] Goda Klumbyte, Hannah Piehl, and Claude Draude, —Towards Feminist Intersectional XAI: From Explainability to Response-Ability,‖ *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2305.03375*, 2023.

[9] Mushfeka Binte Kamal et al., —Digital Ethics: A Review of Leadership Theories, Challenges, and Responsibilities,‖ *Sage Open* 15, no. 4 (October 1, 2025): 21582440251386900, https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251386901.

[10] Bahn, Cohen, and van der Meulen Rodgers, —A Feminist Perspective on COVID-19 and the Value of Care Work Globally.‖

[11] Annika Richterich, —Technofeminist Design Thinking,‖ *Full Stack Feminism* MAY (2024), https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21428/6094d7d2.f8750b3e.

3.2. Body, Identity, and Power: A Social Feminist Analysis in the Era of Technology and AI

In exploring the relationship between body, power, and identity in the Society 5.0 era, classical social feminist critique remains highly relevant while requiring renewed engagement with contemporary technological challenges. The concept of the ―other‖ continues to provide an important framework for understanding how women are positioned within unequal social relations. In digital contexts, these dynamics increasingly reappear through algorithmic systems and data-driven forms of representation that may reproduce gender hierarchies.

Furthermore, the idea of gender as performativity shows that identity is not fixed but produced through repeated social practices. Within AI and algorithmic systems, this perspective becomes an important analytical tool. In ―Exploring the Question of Bias in AI through a Gender Performative Approach,‖ Nino & Lisi (2024) apply Butler's theory to critique how AI systems reinforce binary gender norms while disregarding identity diversity . Their study demonstrates that algorithmic systems can participate in shaping gender representation through embedded socio-political assumptions[12].

A structural approach to feminist justice remains essential in relation to reproductive labor and care economies. Contemporary feminist analysis emphasizes that capitalism continues to rely heavily on social and reproductive labor traditionally carried out by women, while economic institutions frequently fail to recognize its material value[13]. Within this framework, gender justice requires both redistribution and recognition, since symbolic representation alone is insufficient without structural economic transformation.

Digital environments further intensify debates surrounding gender identity and algorithmic representation. Research in ―Gender Trouble in Language Models‖ (Hafner, Valdivia & Rocher, 2025) demonstrates that large language models frequently associate binary gender with biological sex, while transgender and non-binary identities remain marginalized or pathologized during model training [14]. These findings reveal how technological systems may reproduce exclusionary norms through automated classification and data-driven representation.

Moreover, analyses of power must consider how women's bodies function not only as sites of social conflict but also as algorithmic ones. Human–Robot Interaction (HRI) research shows that robots are often gendered through conventional stereotypes and social norms[15]. Within feminist analysis, this issue concerns how technological systems shape bodily identity, representation, and social meaning.

At this point, digital ethics becomes an essential lens. Technology and AI designers carry a moral responsibility to ensure that systems do not reproduce gender bias, erase non-dominant identity expressions, or exploit women's reproductive labor[16]. This perspective

---

[12] Gabriele Nino and Francesca Lisi, ―Exploring the Question of Bias in AI through a Gender Performative Approach,‖ *Sexuality and Gender Studies Journal* 2 (November 26, 2024): 14–31, https://doi.org/10.33422/sgsj.v2i2.735.

[13] CRAWFORD, *The Atlas of AI.*

[14] Franziska Sofia Hafner, Ana Valdivia, and Luc Rocher, ―Gender Trouble in Language Models: An Empirical Audit Guided by Gender Performativity Theory,‖ in *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2025, 1677–95.

[15] Giulia Perugia and Dominika Lisy, ―Robot's Gendering Trouble: A Scoping Review of Gendering Humanoid Robots and Its Effects on HRI,‖ *International Journal of Social Robotics* 15, no. 11 (2023): 1725–53.

[16] Mariarosaria Taddeo, ―The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence‖ (Oxford University Press, November 13, 2024), https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197745441.001.0001; L Floridi and M Taddeo, *A Companion to*

underscores the need for algorithmic ethical audits, transparency, and response-ability, ensuring that technology becomes a medium of inclusion rather than oppression.

3.3. Digital Ethics: Moral Responsibility and Technological Intervention

The expansion of AI into social, political, and economic infrastructures has made digital ethics a central component of feminist critique. Rather than viewing technology as a neutral tool, contemporary feminist analysis emphasizes that every stage of AI development — from dataset construction to system deployment — is embedded within value-laden decisions and structural power relations. This perspective positions technology and AI designers as moral agents responsible for preventing gender bias, protecting non-dominant identity expressions, and ensuring that technological systems do not extract or exploit women's reproductive labor[17]. Within this framework, algorithmic audits, transparency, and response-ability function not merely as technical safeguards but as ethical commitments that transform technology into a medium of inclusion rather than oppression.

Algorithmic auditing is a systematic process for examining AI models and detecting discriminatory patterns or negative impacts on vulnerable groups, including women and non-binary identities. This evaluation extends beyond technical considerations to ethical and social dimensions, identifying practices that may reinforce injustice[18]. In the context of gender, algorithmic audits ensure that AI systems do not disproportionately harm women in recruitment, public services, or law enforcement.

AI design and development must also incorporate gender inclusivity, as many systems today tend to reinforce patriarchal binary norms. An inclusive ethical framework encourages the representation of non-dominant gender identities in datasets, model testing through intersectional scenarios, and the integration of feminist perspectives in design teams[19].

Digital ethics must further address economic redistribution, particularly regarding women's reproductive labor such as care work or platform-based digital work. Women's contributions within digital labor ecosystems should be recognized and valued through fair remuneration, social protections, and formal acknowledgment[20].

Digital Ethics, Blackwell Companions to Philosophy (Wiley, 2025), https://books.google.co.id/books?id=p214EQAAQBAJ; Mariarosaria Blanchard, Alexander and Taddeo, ―The Ethics of Using Artificial Intelligence for Intelligence Analysis: A Review of the Key Challenges with Recommendations,‖ *A Review of the Key Challenges with Recommendations*, 2022, https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4226631.

[17] Floridi and Taddeo, *A Companion to Digital Ethics*; Alexander Blanchard, Christopher Thomas, and Mariarosaria Taddeo, ―Ethical Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Defence: Normative Tradeoffs for Principle to Practice Guidance,‖ *AI & SOCIETY* 40, no. 1 (2025): 185–98, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01866-7; Blanchard, Alexander and Taddeo, ―The Ethics of Using Artificial Intelligence for Intelligence Analysis: A Review of the Key Challenges with Recommendations‖; Taddeo, ―The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence.‖

[18] Vusumzi Funda, ―A Systematic Review of Algorithm Auditing Processes to Assess Bias and Risks in AI Systems,‖ *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development* 9 (May 16, 2025): 11489, https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd11489.

[19] Joana Berger-Estilita et al., ―AI and Inclusion in Simulation Education and Leadership: A Global Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Diversity,‖ *Advances in Simulation* 10, no. 1 (2025): 26, https://doi.org/10.1186/s41077-025-00355-1; Panarese, Grasso, and Solinas, ―Algorithmic Bias, Fairness, and Inclusivity: A Multilevel Framework for Justice-Oriented AI‖; Flavia de Simone, Martina Casillo, and Simona Collina, ―AI and Inclusivity: Co-Designing for Disability Empowerment BT - Intelligent Systems and Applications,‖ ed. Kohei Arai (Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024), 196–206.

[20] L Dowbor, *Systemic Challenges in The Digital Age: Bringing the Social Puzzle Parts Together* (Ethics International Press Limited, 2025), https://books.google.co.id/books?id=HZeHEQAAQBAJ.

Principles of transparency and responsibility are crucial as AI is increasingly deployed in high-risk domains. Transparency requires clear mechanisms for explainability so users can understand how systems operate and why algorithmic decisions are made. Responsibility highlights the ethical accountability of AI designers and policymakers for the social impact of the technologies they develop, including regular audits, public participation, and avenues for appeal when systems cause harm[21].

Designers and policymakers of AI must be recognized as moral agents who adopt gender-justice-based ethics from the earliest stages of development. This responsibility includes:

•Formulating gender-inclusive design policies

•Conducting social risk and bias assessments
•Providing mechanisms for appeal and public auditing
• Building collaborations with feminist or gender-focused communities

The synthesis presented here emphasizes that social feminism functions not only as a critical analysis of longstanding patriarchal structures but also as an ethical intervention within technology. The deployment of AI, robotic design, and predictive models must consistently incorporate intersectional justice, recognition of identity plurality, and the redistribution of economic value derived from reproductive labor. Principles of moral responsibility and technological intervention reflect core values of classical feminist critique — redistribution, recognition, and structural transformation — applied in the context of the digital era. This approach highlights the need for technological systems that are fair, gender-inclusive, respectful of non-dominant identities, and appreciative of women's contributions in social and reproductive labor, transforming classical feminist critique into a practical analytical framework for inclusive digital transformation.

3.4. Foundations of Feminist Critique and Digital Transformation

After discussing digital bias and digital ethics, a feminist reading of technological power relations requires a broader theoretical foundation. Analyses of feminist thought—from classical to contemporary—show that gender injustice cannot be separated from identity construction, power relations, and material conditions. Simone de Beauvoir's concept of ―the other‖ remains relevant, as women have historically been positioned as secondary subjects within patriarchal social structures[22]. Recent studies further demonstrate that this pattern of othering continues within modern institutions, including education, media, and digital spaces[23]. These conditions show that technological systems remain closely connected to broader structures of social inequality and feminist critique.

The concept of gender performativity contributes an important analytical perspective by emphasizing that gender identity is socially constructed through repeated practices and

---

[21] O.C. Ferrell and Linda Ferrell, ―Building a Better World: The Role of AI Ethics and Social Responsibility,‖ *Journal of Macromarketing* 44, no. 4 (September 27, 2024): 928–35, https://doi.org/10.1177/02761467241285793; Astrid Mager et al., ―Situated Ethics: Ethical Accountability of Local Perspectives in Global AI Ethics,‖ *Media, Culture & Society* 47, no. 5 (March 24, 2025): 1028–41, https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437251328200.

[22] Fortin, ―Simone de Beauvoir BT - On the Nature of Human Sexual Difference: A Symposium‖; Nadine Changfoot, ―Transcendence in Simone de Beauvoir's The Second Sex: Revisiting Masculinist Ontology,‖ *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 35, no. 4 (May 1, 2009): 391–410, https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453708102092.

[23] Minna Ruckenstein, ―Collaborative Explorations as Breathing Spaces for Digital Futures,‖ *Dialogues on Digital Society* 1, no. 2 (December 26, 2024): 131–47, https://doi.org/10.1177/29768640241308332.

cultural norms. In digital environments, this performative process increasingly operates through algorithmic mediation, content curation, and platform architectures that may reinforce or suppress non-dominant gender expressions[24]. This perspective shows that digital bias is not merely a continuation of traditional gender hierarchies, but also part of emerging mechanisms of identity formation shaped by data systems and technological governance[25]. Consequently, the relationship between technological design and gender construction becomes a critical area of contemporary feminist intervention.

Bell Hooks' intersectional approach underscores that gender injustice is always connected to race, social class, and other forms of marginalization[26]. In digital and platform economies, this perspective becomes especially relevant. Women from minority groups or working-class backgrounds often experience the deepest impacts of digital inequality—through platform labor burdens, biased content curation, or automated assessments affecting economic access. Intersectionality reveals that the algorithmic bias identified in the digital-ethics discussion is not only a technical issue but also a manifestation of historical power relations.

Nancy Fraser deepens this framework by highlighting two dimensions of justice: redistribution and recognition. Gender justice cannot be achieved through symbolic representation alone, but also requires material recognition and fair economic compensation for reproductive and care work that is frequently undervalued within social and technological systems[27].

Silvia Federici supplements this perspective by foregrounding the body and reproductive labor as key sites of capitalist exploitation. Modern economies, including data economies, rely heavily on care work and social reproduction performed by women, yet such labor is frequently excluded from formal valuation. Federici's perspective expands the understanding of exploitation beyond domestic spaces into digital environments, where user participation, platform labor, and data production increasingly become forms of unpaid or underrecognized labor[28]. Algorithmic bias, therefore, is not only a matter of representation but also closely connected to the structure of digital labor.

Donna Haraway offers a theoretical bridge linking body, identity, and technology through the concept of ―cyborg feminism.‖ The cyborg—as a hybrid of human and machine—disrupts traditional dichotomies and encourages feminist analysis of human–

---

[24] Gerasimos Kakoliris, ―Judith Butler on Gender Performavity,‖ *Dianoesis* 17 (June 6, 2025): 57–74, https://doi.org/10.12681/dia.41735.

[25] Audrey Benoit, ―The Social Materiality of Sex: For and Beyond Judith Butler BT - Thinking with Women Philosophers: Critical Essays in Practical Contemporary Philosophy,‖ ed. Eléonore Le Jallé and Audrey Benoit (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022), 53–74, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12662-8_3; Timothy Paul Fortin, ―Judith Butler BT - On the Nature of Human Sexual Difference: A Symposium,‖ ed. Timothy Paul Fortin (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2024), 177–215, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74531-7_5; Cicilia Damayanti, ―Kepedulian Dalam Pendidikan Untuk Dilindungi Kesetaraan Perempuan,‖ *Studia Philosophica et Theologica* 22 No. 1, no. 1 (2022): 41–62, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35312/spet.v22i1.399.

[26] B Hooks, *Feminism Is for Everybody: Passionate Politics* (Pluto Press, 2000), 12–18,.

[27] N Fraser, *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*, New Directions in Critical Theory (Columbia University Press, 2009), https://books.google.co.id/books?id=TyCrXUQJ4VkC; Nancy Fraser, ―Capitalism. A Conversation in Critical Theory. A Précis,‖ *Philosophy and Public Issues - Filosofia E Questioni Pubbliche* 11, no. 2 (2021).

[28] S Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, Common Notions (PM Press, 2020); S Federici, *Caliban and the Witch* (Autonomedia, 2004).

technology relations in the digital age[29]. This perspective highlights that technological systems increasingly participate in shaping identity, embodiment, and social experience.

Several contemporary thinkers extend these feminist perspectives into posthuman discussions. Francesca Ferrando, for example, situates humans, technology, and ecology within an interconnected relationship. In The Art of Being Posthuman (2025), Ferrando argues that posthumanism should emphasize relational coexistence rather than technological domination . Her perspective encourages digital feminism to view women not merely as users of technology but as active participants in shaping digital and ecological futures. This contribution reinforces the importance of identity pluralism and non-hierarchical technological development[30].

Mariarosaria Taddeo adds an important digital-ethics perspective to this discussion. In The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence (2024), Taddeo argues that AI governance and autonomous systems may reproduce gender inequality through embedded bias and unequal power relations. Her collaborative work with Blanchard (2024) further emphasizes the importance of translating ethical principles into accountable technological practices . This perspective reinforces the need for algorithmic transparency, ethical audits, and inclusive AI governance within contemporary technological societies[31].

Meanwhile, Juni Schindler, Goda Klumbytė, and Matthew Fuller (2025), in ―Situated Bayes – Feminist and Pluriversal Perspectives on Bayesian Knowledge,‖ emphasize that Bayesian models are shaped by social contexts, identities, and user experiences rather than functioning as purely abstract computational systems. Their concept of ―situated knowledge‖ highlights the importance of incorporating plural human experiences into AI development and data analysis[32]. This perspective offers an important analytical contribution to digital feminism by encouraging more reflexive and socially accountable approaches to technological design and algorithmic governance.

Taken together, these discussions reveal that gender injustice in the digital era is multilayered: symbolic, material, digital, and ecological. Focusing solely on symbolic bias or economic discrimination is insufficient; technology, algorithms, and digital architectures must also become sites of critique and transformation. Practical implications include algorithmic-ethics audits, gender-sensitive platform design, policies for redistributing the value of care work, and social advocacy to strengthen women's capacity within digital and economic spaces. In this light, the framework of social feminism functions not only as an

---

[29] Ni Nyoman Galuh Sri Wedari, Wahyu Budi Nugroho, and Gede Kamajaya, ―FEMINISME CYBORG DONNA JEANNE HARAWAY: REKONSEPSI TUBUH PEREMPUAN DI DUNIA SIBER,‖ *JURNAL ILMIAH SOSIOLOGI: SOROT; Vol 2 No 2 (2022): JISSOROT*, August 1, 2022, https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/sorot/article/view/90198; R Pohl, *An Analysis of Donna Haraway's A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century*, The Macat Library (Macat Library, 2019), https://books.google.co.id/books?id=UUyfDwAAQBAJ.

[30] Francesca Ferrando, ―The Art of Being Posthuman: Who Are We in the 21st Century?,‖ *Interconnections: Journal of Posthumanism* 04, no. 01 (2025), https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26522/posthumanismjournal.v4i1.5030; F Ferrando, *The Art of Being Posthuman: Who Are We in the 21st Century?* (Polity Press, 2023).

[31] Blanchard, Thomas, and Taddeo, ―Ethical Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Defence: Normative Tradeoffs for Principle to Practice Guidance‖; Taddeo, ―The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence‖; Blanchard, Alexander and Taddeo, ―The Ethics of Using Artificial Intelligence for Intelligence Analysis: A Review of the Key Challenges with Recommendations‖; Floridi and Taddeo, *A Companion to Digital Ethics*.

[32] Juni Schindler, Goda Klumbytė, and Matthew Fuller, ―Situated Bayes--Feminist and Pluriversal Perspectives on Bayesian Knowledge,‖ *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2506.09472*, 2025.

analytical tool but also as a transformative guide in Society 5.0—shaping digital ecosystems that are more just, inclusive, and oriented toward sustainable relations among technology, identity, and ecology.

The theoretical framework developed here shows that technology not only reproduces inequality but also opens new spaces for negotiating identity and agency. This is the point where attention shifts to the digital public sphere as a dialectical arena in which vulnerability and empowerment intersect. Interactions between women, algorithms, platforms, and online social dynamics illustrate the need to expand feminist critique toward analyzing how women construct strategies of empowerment within complex digital architectures. This shift leads the discussion into digital feminism and the dialectics of the public sphere as part of a broader transformation in the technological era.

3.5. Digital Feminism and the Dialectics of the Public Sphere: From Vulnerability to Empowerment

Digital feminism asserts that the virtual public sphere is not merely an extension of older political arenas, but a new field of contestation where gendered power is restructured through technology. Digitalization presents a complex duality: on one side, access to online platforms and global communication networks enables women to mobilize solidarity, pursue rights, and articulate identity autonomously; on the other side, entrenched patriarchal structures migrate into digital domains, operating through algorithms, data ecosystems, and globalized labor platforms. User data—including women's data—becomes high-value commodity, exposed to exploitation, and generates real risks related to security, privacy, and algorithmic bias[33]. This tension situates digital feminism within an ongoing interplay between emerging opportunities for empowerment and vulnerabilities reproduced by the technological infrastructure itself.

These dynamics are increasingly visible in Indonesia's digital landscape. Reports from Komnas Perempuan and various digital-rights organizations show rising cases of online gender-based violence, including cyber harassment, non-consensual distribution of intimate content, and digital intimidation targeting women activists and public figures[34]. At the same time, many women participate in platform-based economies as online sellers, content creators, ride-hailing workers, and digital freelancers, often without adequate labor protection or data security. Gaps in digital literacy and unequal access to technological resources further intensify women's vulnerability within rapidly expanding digital ecosystems. These conditions demonstrate that the promises of Society 5.0 in Indonesia remain inseparable from broader struggles over gender justice, digital inclusion, and technological accountability.

Gendered vulnerabilities on platforms are not merely symbolic, but structural and material. Digital labor, including platform economies and tech-mediated care sectors, often

---

[33] Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (Profile Books, 2019); Suyasha Singh Isser, Rekha Navneet, and Nihal Raj, —Digital Surveillance And Privacy Of Women,‖ *Educational Administration Theory and Practice Journal* 30 (March 16, 2024): 1975–84, https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i3.1556; Anri Nishnianidze, —Surveillance in the Digital Age,‖ *European Scientific Journal* 20 (February 21, 2024): 1–25, https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n37p1; J Li, J Huang, and X Meng, *Global Infectious Disease Surveillance Technologies and Data Sharing Protocols* (Frontiers Media SA, 2025),; N Higdon and A Butler, *Surveillance Education: Navigating the Conspicuous Absence of Privacy in Schools*, Critical Interventions (Taylor & Francis, 2024).

[34] Adiyatma Nugraha et al., —PEREMPUAN DALAM DUNIA KERJA: ANALISIS KETIMPANGAN GENDER DAN DAMPAKNYA TERHADAP PEREKONOMIAN,‖ April 20, 2025; I. R Boangmanalu, A., & Aprilia, —Maskulinitas Baru: Redistribusi Kerja Perawatan Dalam Perspektif Feminisme.,‖ *Jurnal Perempuan* 28, no. 3 (2023): 271–84, https://indonesianfeministjournal.org/index.php/IFJ/article/view/890.

channels technical solutions into longstanding inequalities in care work while concealing the reproductive burden historically carried by women. The logic of ―platform care‖ obscures domestic and caregiving labor, leaving women's contributions invisible and continuously exploited[35]. Digitalization, therefore, does not automatically produce empowerment; rather, it can reinforce older inequalities in more concealed and harder-to-trace forms.

Amid these vulnerabilities, digital feminism also generates strategic, creative, and transformative spaces of resistance. Online activism does not operate solely through discourse production but builds concrete capacities: critical literacy toward algorithms, risk-analysis skills for digital environments, data-management competencies, and platform-based advocacy strategies. Networked campaigns, transnational solidarities, and community mobilizations illustrate that digital empowerment extends beyond access, encompassing the ability to intervene, manage, and reshape digital publics.

At the same time, digital capitalism holds significant capacity to co-opt feminist movements and convert them into cultural commodities. Issues of gender equality risk being reduced to commercial aesthetics, creating pressure to cultivate data-driven and algorithm-aware strategies of resistance to safeguard the political substance of the movement[36]. Global realities further show that promises of digital inclusivity collide with gaps in access, literacy, and infrastructure. Women from marginalized groups, migrant communities, or lower socio-economic backgrounds encounter greater barriers in accessing the full potential of technological tools[37]. These conditions underscore that patriarchy and economic injustice do not disappear in digital spaces; both shift forms while continuing to restrict opportunities for empowerment.

From a strategic standpoint, digital feminism calls for multidimensional interventions that enable women to navigate and shape digital environments critically, including:

1. **Strengthening Feminist Digital Literacy:** Equipping women with the ability to identify algorithmic bias, recognize patterns of data exploitation, anticipate digital-security risks, and develop effective communication strategies.

2. **Data Sovereignty Advocacy:** Promoting understanding of data rights, identity-protection strategies, and data utilization for social-advocacy purposes.

---

[35] Vicky Kluzik, ―Governing Invisibility in the Platform Economy: Excavating the Logics of Platform Care,‖ *Internet Policy Review* 11, no. 1 (2022), https://doi.org/DOI: 10.14763/2022.1.1636; Ned Rossiter and Soenke Zehle, ―Platform Politics and a World Beyond Catastrophe,‖ in *Digital Platforms and Algorithmic Subjectivities*, ed. Emiliana Armano, Marco Briziarelli, and Elisabetta Risi, vol. 24 (University of Westminster Press, 2022), 33–46, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv319wpvm.6.

[36] Fraser, ―Capitalism. A Conversation in Critical Theory. A Précis‖; M van Elteren, *Deconstructing Digital Capitalism and the Smart Society: Invasive Platforms, Unchecked Monopolies, Humane Alternatives* (McFarland, Incorporated, Publishers, 2025); Zhiyi Liu, ―Capitalism from a Digital Economics Perspective BT - Principles of Digital Economics: Innovation Theory in the Age of Intelligence,‖ ed. Zhiyi Liu (Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2022), 143–53, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-9020-4_14.

[37] L Daniela, *Inclusive Digital Education*, Educational Communications and Technology: Issues and Innovations (Springer International Publishing, 2022); D Ifenthaler, D G Sampson, and P Isaías, *Open and Inclusive Educational Practice in the Digital World*, Cognition and Exploratory Learning in the Digital Age (Springer International Publishing, 2022); Patience Ampuriire et al., ―Perspectives of Men and Women Working in Vector Control in Africa Regarding Barriers and Opportunities for Achieving Gender Inclusivity,‖ *Malaria Journal* 24, no. 1 (2025): 151, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-025-05394-7; Berger-Estilita et al., ―AI and Inclusion in Simulation Education and Leadership: A Global Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Diversity.‖

3. **Economic Justice in Digital Spaces:** Reinforcing protections for women workers in the gig economy, e-commerce, and creative-content sectors through regulation, labor-rights literacy, and economic-negotiation strategies.

4. **Sustainable Tech Ethics:** Integrating gender perspectives into technology design, AI practices, and socio-ecological sustainability frameworks.

5. **Democratizing Digital Participation:** Ensuring women's access to policy forums and digital-governance spaces through policy literacy, data-driven advocacy, strategic communication, and coalition building.

This dialectic highlights that digital feminism does not progress linearly or utopically. Digital spaces remain arenas where resistance and co-optation intertwine. With critical frameworks and concrete capacity-building, digital feminism becomes a vital instrument for advancing social transformation, expanding access, strengthening solidarity, and challenging injustice in the technological era.

4. Conclusion

In the era of Society 5.0, gender injustice no longer operates solely through cultural and institutional structures but is increasingly reproduced through digital infrastructures, algorithmic systems, platform economies, and data governance. This article demonstrates that digital transformation reshapes women's participation through new forms of vulnerability, including algorithmic bias, digital exploitation, unequal labor conditions, and the marginalization of reproductive and care work within digital economies. Through the perspective of social feminism, the study highlights that technological systems are never neutral because they reflect existing social and political power relations.

This article contributes to contemporary discussions on digital feminism by integrating feminist theory, digital ethics, platform capitalism, and Society 5.0 into a broader analytical framework. The discussion shows that feminist digital literacy, data sovereignty, ethical technology design, and inclusive digital participation are essential for strengthening gender justice in technological societies. In this context, digital feminism functions not only as a critique of technological inequality but also as a transformative framework for building more inclusive and humane digital environments.

Nevertheless, this study remains conceptual and theoretical in nature. Future research may expand this discussion through empirical studies focusing on women's experiences within digital platforms, artificial-intelligence governance, digital labor systems, and online public participation, particularly within the Indonesian context and other Global South societies.

Within this horizon, women reclaim their rightful place alongside men as co-architects with God of a more just and humane world. Grounded in the shared dignity of the imago Dei, women and men alike participate in the ethical responsibility to transform digital society, challenge structures of injustice, and cultivate a future rooted in solidarity, justice, and human flourishing.

5. References

Books

CRAWFORD, KATE. *The Atlas of AI*. Yale University Press, 2021. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1ghv45t.

Floridi, L, and M Taddeo. *A Companion to Digital Ethics*. Blackwell Companions to Philosophy. Wiley, 2025.

Fortin, Timothy Paul. —Judith Butler BT - On the Nature of Human Sexual Difference: A Symposium.‖ edited by Timothy Paul Fortin, 177–215. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74531-7_5.

———. —Simone de Beauvoir BT - On the Nature of Human Sexual Difference: A Symposium.‖ edited by Timothy Paul Fortin, 115–76. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74531-7_4.

Fraser, N. *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. New Directions in Critical Theory. Columbia University Press, 2009.

Hooks, B. *Feminism Is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Pluto Press, 2000.

Ifenthaler, D, D G Sampson, and P Isaías. *Open and Inclusive Educational Practice in the Digital World*. Cognition and Exploratory Learning in the Digital Age. Springer International Publishing, 2022.

Li, J, J Huang, and X Meng. *Global Infectious Disease Surveillance Technologies and Data Sharing Protocols*. Frontiers Media SA, 2025.

Pohl, R. *An Analysis of Donna Haraway's A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century*. The Macat Library. Macat Library, 2019.

Simone, Flavia de, Martina Casillo, and Simona Collina. —AI and Inclusivity: Co-Designing for Disability Empowerment BT - Intelligent Systems and Applications.‖ edited by Kohei Arai, 196–206. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024.

Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. Profile Books, 2019.

References

Ampuriire, Patience, Ramadhani M Bofu, Betwel J Msugupakulya, Winifrida P Mponzi, Damaris Matoke-Muhia, Marceline F Finda, and Fredros O Okumu. —Perspectives of Men and Women Working in Vector Control in Africa Regarding Barriers and Opportunities for Achieving Gender Inclusivity.‖ *Malaria Journal* 24, no. 1 (2025): 151. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-025-05394-7.

Bahn, Kate, Jennifer Cohen, and Yana van der Meulen Rodgers. —A Feminist Perspective on COVID-19 and the Value of Care Work Globally.‖ *Gender, Work, and Organization* 27, no. 5 (September 2020): 695–99. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12459.

Bender, Emily M, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. —On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? ?‖ In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. FAccT '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922.

Benoit, Audrey. —The Social Materiality of Sex: For and Beyond Judith Butler BT - Thinking with Women Philosophers: Critical Essays in Practical Contemporary Philosophy.‖ edited by Eléonore Le Jallé and Audrey Benoit, 53–74. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12662-8_3.

Berger-Estilita, Joana, Mia Gisselbaek, Arnout Devos, Albert Chan, Pier Luigi Ingrassia, Basak Ceyda Meco, Odmara L Barreto Chang, et al. —AI and Inclusion in Simulation Education and Leadership: A Global Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Diversity.‖ *Advances in Simulation* 10, no. 1 (2025): 26. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41077-025-00355-1.

Blanchard, Alexander and Taddeo, Mariarosaria. —The Ethics of Using Artificial Intelligence

for Intelligence Analysis: A Review of the Key Challenges with Recommendations.‖ *A Review of the Key Challenges with Recommendations*, 2022. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4226631.

Blanchard, Alexander, Christopher Thomas, and Mariarosaria Taddeo. —Ethical Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Defence: Normative Tradeoffs for Principle to Practice Guidance.‖ *AI & SOCIETY* 40, no. 1 (2025): 185–98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01866-7.

Boangmanalu, A., & Aprilia, I. R. —Maskulinitas Baru: Redistribusi Kerja Perawatan Dalam Perspektif Feminisme.‖ *Jurnal Perempuan* 28, no. 3 (2023): 271–84. https://indonesianfeministjournal.org/index.php/IFJ/article/view/890.

Changfoot, Nadine. —Transcendence in Simone de Beauvoir's The Second Sex: Revisiting Masculinist Ontology.‖ *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 35, no. 4 (May 1, 2009): 391–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453708102092.

CRAWFORD, KATE. *The Atlas of AI*. Yale University Press, 2021. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1ghv45t.

Damayanti, Cicilia. —Kepedulian Dalam Pendidikan Untuk Dilindungi Kesetaraan Perempuan.‖ *Studia Philosophica et Theologica* 22 No. 1, no. 1 (2022): 41–62. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35312/spet.v22i1.399.

Daniela, L. *Inclusive Digital Education*. Educational Communications and Technology: Issues and Innovations. Springer International Publishing, 2022.

Dowbor, L. *Systemic Challenges in The Digital Age: Bringing the Social Puzzle Parts Together*. Ethics International Press Limited, 2025. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=HZeHEQAAQBAJ.

Elteren, M van. *Deconstructing Digital Capitalism and the Smart Society: Invasive Platforms, Unchecked Monopolies, Humane Alternatives*. McFarland, Incorporated, Publishers, 2025.

Federici, S. *Caliban and the Witch*. Autonomedia, 2004.

———. *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. Common Notions. PM Press, 2020.

Ferrando, F. *The Art of Being Posthuman: Who Are We in the 21st Century?* Polity Press, 2023.

Ferrando, Francesca. —The Art of Being Posthuman: Who Are We in the 21st Century?‖ *Interconnections: Journal of Posthumanism* 04, no. 01 (2025). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26522/posthumanismjournal.v4i1.5030.

Ferrell, O.C., and Linda Ferrell. —Building a Better World: The Role of AI Ethics and Social Responsibility.‖ *Journal of Macromarketing* 44, no. 4 (September 27, 2024): 928–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/02761467241285793.

Floridi, L, and M Taddeo. *A Companion to Digital Ethics*. Blackwell Companions to Philosophy. Wiley, 2025. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=p214EQAAQBAJ.

Fortin, Timothy Paul. —Judith Butler BT - On the Nature of Human Sexual Difference: A Symposium.‖ edited by Timothy Paul Fortin, 177–215. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74531-7_5.

———. —Simone de Beauvoir BT - On the Nature of Human Sexual Difference: A Symposium.‖ edited by Timothy Paul Fortin, 115–76. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74531-7_4.

Fraser, N. *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. New Directions in Critical Theory. Columbia University Press, 2009. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=TyCrXUQJ4VkC.

Fraser, Nancy. —Capitalism. A Conversation in Critical Theory. A Précis.‖ *Philosophy and*

Public Issues - Filosofia E Questioni Pubbliche 11, no. 2 (2021).
Funda, Vusumzi. —A Systematic Review of Algorithm Auditing Processes to Assess Bias and Risks in AI Systems.‖ *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development* 9 (May 16, 2025): 11489. https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd11489.
Hafner, Franziska Sofia, Ana Valdivia, and Luc Rocher. —Gender Trouble in Language Models: An Empirical Audit Guided by Gender Performativity Theory.‖ In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1677–95, 2025.
Higdon, N, and A Butler. *Surveillance Education: Navigating the Conspicuous Absence of Privacy in Schools*. Critical Interventions. Taylor & Francis, 2024.
Hooks, B. *Feminism Is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Pluto Press, 2000. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=0au7QbAJH0gC.
Ifenthaler, D, D G Sampson, and P Isaías. *Open and Inclusive Educational Practice in the Digital World*. Cognition and Exploratory Learning in the Digital Age. Springer International Publishing, 2022.
Ines Hipolito, Katie Winkle, Merete Lie. —Enactive Artificial Intelligence: Subverting Gender Norms in Robot-Human Interaction.‖ *Human-Computer Interaction* 1 (2023). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.08741.
Julian, Fidella, and Wa Asmawati. —Perempuan Dan Fenomena Kekerasan Berbasis Gender Online Dalam Media Sosial.‖ *RISOMA : Jurnal Riset Sosial Humaniora Dan Pendidikan* 2 (March 5, 2024): 33–44. https://doi.org/10.62383/risoma.v2i2.64.
Kakoliris, Gerasimos. —Judith Butler on Gender Performavity.‖ *Dianoesis* 17 (June 6, 2025): 57–74. https://doi.org/10.12681/dia.41735.
Kamal, Mushfeka Binte, Md. Bulbul Hossain, Jahirul Islam, Iftay Khairul Alam, Nadim Ibn Sayed, Mohammed A Assiri, and Rony Mia. —Digital Ethics: A Review of Leadership Theories, Challenges, and Responsibilities.‖ *Sage Open* 15, no. 4 (October 1, 2025): 21582440251386900. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251386901.
Klumbyte, Goda, Hannah Piehl, and Claude Draude. —Towards Feminist Intersectional XAI: From Explainability to Response-Ability.‖ *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2305.03375*, 2023.
Kluzik, Vicky. —Governing Invisibility in the Platform Economy: Excavating the Logics of Platform Care.‖ *Internet Policy Review* 11, no. 1 (2022). https://doi.org/DOI: 10.14763/2022.1.1636.
Li, J, J Huang, and X Meng. *Global Infectious Disease Surveillance Technologies and Data Sharing Protocols*. Frontiers Media SA, 2025. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=pTSNEQAAQBAJ.
Liu, Zhiyi. —Capitalism from a Digital Economics Perspective BT - Principles of Digital Economics: Innovation Theory in the Age of Intelligence.‖ edited by Zhiyi Liu, 143–53. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-9020-4_14.
Mager, Astrid, Magdalena Eitenberger, Jana Winter, Barbara Prainsack, Christiane Wendehorst, and Payal Arora. —Situated Ethics: Ethical Accountability of Local Perspectives in Global AI Ethics.‖ *Media, Culture & Society* 47, no. 5 (March 24, 2025): 1028–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437251328200.
Nino, Gabriele, and Francesca Lisi. —Exploring the Question of Bias in AI through a Gender Performative Approach.‖ *Sexuality and Gender Studies Journal* 2 (November 26, 2024): 14–31. https://doi.org/10.33422/sgsj.v2i2.735.
Nishnianidze, Anri. —Surveillance in the Digital Age.‖ *European Scientific Journal* 20 (February 21, 2024): 1–25. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n37p1.
Nugraha, Adiyatma, Aufar Subrata, Imanuel Uneputty, Erina Zahira Nurhasan, and Gesya

Reihan Nurbayan. ―PEREMPUAN DALAM DUNIA KERJA: ANALISIS KETIMPANGAN GENDER DAN DAMPAKNYA TERHADAP PEREKONOMIAN,‖ April 20, 2025.

Panarese, Paola, Marta Margherita Grasso, and Claudia Solinas. ―Algorithmic Bias, Fairness, and Inclusivity: A Multilevel Framework for Justice-Oriented AI.‖ *AI & SOCIETY*, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02451-2.

Park, C M Y, and B White. *Gender and Generation in Southeast Asian Agrarian Transformations*. Critical Agrarian Studies. Taylor & Francis, 2019.

Perugia, Giulia, and Dominika Lisy. ―Robot's Gendering Trouble: A Scoping Review of Gendering Humanoid Robots and Its Effects on HRI.‖ *International Journal of Social Robotics* 15, no. 11 (2023): 1725–53.

Pohl, R. *An Analysis of Donna Haraway's A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century*. The Macat Library. Macat Library, 2019. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=UUyfDwAAQBAJ.

Programme, The ILO's Social Finance. ―Annual Report 2023.‖ ILO, 2024. https://www.ilo.org/publications/annual-report-2023.

Richterich, Annika. ―Technofeminist Design Thinking.‖ *Full Stack Feminism* MAY (2024). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21428/6094d7d2.f8750b3e.

Rossiter, Ned, and Soenke Zehle. ―Platform Politics and a World Beyond Catastrophe.‖ In *Digital Platforms and Algorithmic Subjectivities*, edited by Emiliana Armano, Marco Briziarelli, and Elisabetta Risi, 24:33–46. University of Westminster Press, 2022. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv319wpvm.6.

Ruckenstein, Minna. ―Collaborative Explorations as Breathing Spaces for Digital Futures.‖ *Dialogues on Digital Society* 1, no. 2 (December 26, 2024): 131–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/29768640241308332.

Schindler, Juni, Goda Klumbytė, and Matthew Fuller. ―Situated Bayes--Feminist and Pluriversal Perspectives on Bayesian Knowledge.‖ *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2506.09472*, 2025.

Simone, Flavia de, Martina Casillo, and Simona Collina. ―AI and Inclusivity: Co-Designing for Disability Empowerment BT - Intelligent Systems and Applications.‖ edited by Kohei Arai, 196–206. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024.

Singh Isser, Suyasha, Rekha Navneet, and Nihal Raj. ―Digital Surveillance And Privacy Of Women.‖ *Educational Administration Theory and Practice Journal* 30 (March 16, 2024): 1975–84. https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i3.1556.

Taddeo, Mariarosaria. ―The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence.‖ Oxford University Press, November 13, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197745441.001.0001.

Wedari, Ni Nyoman Galuh Sri, Wahyu Budi Nugroho, and Gede Kamajaya. ―FEMINISME CYBORG DONNA JEANNE HARAWAY: REKONSEPSI TUBUH PEREMPUAN DI DUNIA SIBER.‖ *JURNAL ILMIAH SOSIOLOGI: SOROT; Vol 2 No 2 (2022): JISSOROT*, August 1, 2022. https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/sorot/article/view/90198.

Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. Profile Books, 2019.