

FRANKENSTEIN AS A SOCIOLOGICAL CRITIQUE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: INTEGRATING SOCIOLOGY OF LITERATURE, AI ETHICS, AND RESPONSIBLE INNOVATION

Muh. Ardiansah¹

[¹Ardiansahanca20@gmail.com](mailto:Ardiansahanca20@gmail.com)

¹Universitas Cokroaminoto, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Received: 8th July 2026

Revised: 11th August 2026

Accepted: 7th September 2026

ABSTRACT Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transformed contemporary society while generating complex ethical challenges related to accountability, transparency, governance, and human oversight. Previous studies have generally examined the novel through technological, philosophical, or bioethical perspectives without systematically integrating Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, and Responsible Innovation as a unified analytical framework. This study addresses that gap by examining how *Frankenstein* functions as a sociological critique of contemporary Artificial Intelligence through the integration of these three complementary perspectives. Using a qualitative descriptive design, the research applies close reading and thematic textual analysis to selected passages from the novel, using an analytical coding matrix drawn from Sociology of Literature, UNESCO AI Ethics, and Responsible Innovation. The findings reveal four principal arguments. First, Victor Frankenstein symbolizes technological ambition detached from ethical responsibility. Second, the Creature represents ethically neutral technology shaped by social interaction and human governance. Third, the novel's tragedy illustrates the failure of Responsible Innovation by showing that ethical responsibility extends beyond creation to continuous stewardship throughout the innovation lifecycle. Finally, *Frankenstein* functions as a sociological critique of technological culture by emphasizing that sustainable innovation depends on accountability, human-centered values, and institutional governance rather than technological capability alone. The study contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship by integrating literary sociology with contemporary AI ethics and Responsible Innovation to reinterpret *Frankenstein* as a literary model of continuous AI stewardship, and it offers practical insights for AI developers, policymakers, and educators by showing how classical literature can inform ethical governance throughout the lifecycle of emerging technologies.

Keywords: *Frankenstein*; Artificial Intelligence; sociology of literature; responsible innovation; AI ethics

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has rapidly transformed contemporary society, influencing education, healthcare, finance, communication, governance, and creative industries (Russell & Norvig, 2021). While these developments offer significant benefits, they also raise complex ethical challenges around accountability, transparency, fairness, privacy, human oversight, and social responsibility (UNESCO, 2021; Floridi & Cowls, 2019). Consequently, discussions of AI are no longer confined to computer science but increasingly involve the humanities, social sciences, and literary studies, which offer critical perspectives on the broader social and ethical implications of technological innovation.

Long before the emergence of modern AI, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus* (1818) explored fundamental questions concerning scientific ambition, technological creation, and ethical responsibility (Shelley, 2018). Although widely recognized as one of the earliest works of science fiction, the novel extends beyond Gothic fiction by critically examining the relationship between scientific progress and its social consequences (Mellor, 1988; Haynes, 1994). Victor Frankenstein's creation of artificial life and his subsequent abandonment of the Creature raise enduring questions about creators' responsibilities toward the technologies they develop. These concerns closely parallel contemporary debates surrounding AI governance, responsible innovation, and ethical technology development (UNESCO, 2021; von Schomberg, 2013).

From the perspective of Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, literary works function not merely as fictional narratives but also as reflections and critiques of the societies in which they are produced (Swingewood, 1972). Literary texts reveal prevailing ideologies, social tensions, and cultural values while simultaneously questioning dominant assumptions embedded within society. Through this perspective, *Frankenstein* can be interpreted not simply

as a story about scientific experimentation but as a sociological critique of a technological culture that prioritizes scientific achievement while neglecting ethical accountability and social responsibility. This sociological perspective provides an important foundation for examining how literary narratives contribute to contemporary discussions concerning AI governance.

Recent scholarship has increasingly examined Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* in relation to Artificial Intelligence, moving beyond its conventional interpretation as a warning against scientific ambition and technological overreach. Contemporary studies have explored the novel's relevance to AI through questions of agency, human–AI relations, technological control, and sociotechnical imaginaries. Dishon (2024), for example, demonstrates how *Frankenstein* contributes to contemporary understandings of generative AI by examining the relationship between artificial agency, human actors, and systems of control. Other recent scholarship has connected *Frankenstein* with AI ethics, responsible innovation, and competing visions of technological progress, emphasizing the continuing importance of human responsibility in shaping the consequences of emerging technologies (Chaleila, 2025). These studies establish that *Frankenstein* remains a significant literary resource for understanding contemporary technological and ethical debates. However, existing scholarship has not sufficiently conceptualized the continuing ethical responsibility that follows technological creation and persists through deployment, social interaction, monitoring, evaluation, and response.

At the same time, contemporary AI governance scholarship increasingly emphasizes accountability, human oversight, lifecycle governance, and implementing responsible AI principles across the development and use of AI systems. Recent research on responsible AI governance highlights the importance of structural, relational, and procedural mechanisms for designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating AI applications (Papagiannidis et al., 2025). Similarly, scholarship connecting Responsible AI and Responsible Innovation emphasizes that ethical responsibility should extend across the innovation process rather than being limited to the initial development of a technological system (Herrmann, 2023). Research on AI accountability further shows that responsible governance requires oversight mechanisms, responsibility attribution, reporting, and institutional control (Novelli et al., 2023). Nevertheless, these discussions are primarily situated within technological, organizational, and policy contexts. The potential of literary analysis to conceptualize the continuing dimension of responsibility in AI development remains comparatively underexplored.

To address this gap, the present study develops the concept of continuous AI stewardship through an interdisciplinary reading of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, integrating Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, and Responsible Innovation theory. In this study, continuous AI stewardship refers to the sustained ethical responsibility of creators, developers, and institutions to monitor, evaluate, govern, and respond to AI's evolving consequences throughout and beyond the technological innovation lifecycle. The concept differs from AI governance, which primarily concerns the structures, rules, and mechanisms through which AI is regulated; from Responsible AI, which emphasizes the ethical principles and practices guiding the development and use of AI; and from Responsible Innovation, which emphasizes anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness within innovation processes. Continuous AI stewardship emphasizes ongoing responsibility after technological creation, particularly the obligation to maintain oversight, accountability, and responsiveness as technological systems continue to interact with society and generate consequences. Through this conceptualization, *Frankenstein* is interpreted not merely as a cautionary narrative about the dangers of artificial creation but as a literary framework for understanding why ethical responsibility must continue after innovation.

Building on this conceptualization, this study integrates Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature with the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and

Responsible Innovation theory as a unified analytical framework. Rather than treating the Creature as the principal ethical problem, the study argues that Victor Frankenstein constitutes the primary object of sociological criticism because he embodies a technological ideology that prioritizes scientific achievement while neglecting continuous ethical stewardship. This integrated perspective allows Frankenstein to be interpreted not merely as a cautionary tale about scientific ambition but as a literary model demonstrating the need for continuous ethical governance throughout the lifecycle of technological innovation.

Accordingly, this study examines how Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* functions as a sociological critique of contemporary Artificial Intelligence by demonstrating its relevance as a literary framework for continuous AI stewardship. By integrating literary sociology with contemporary AI ethics and Responsible Innovation, the study contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship in three ways. First, it offers a more comprehensive interpretation of Frankenstein by linking literary representation to sociological ideology and contemporary ethical governance. Second, it reconceptualizes Victor Frankenstein as a model of irresponsible innovation whose failure lies not in technological creation itself but in abandoning ethical responsibility after creation. Finally, it demonstrates how classical literature can contribute to ongoing debates concerning responsible AI governance by offering conceptual insights into accountability, stewardship, and human-centered technological development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous Studies on *Frankenstein* and Artificial Intelligence

Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* has long attracted scholarly attention because of its exploration of scientific ambition, ethical responsibility, and the consequences of technological innovation. Early literary criticism primarily interpreted the novel as a Gothic narrative reflecting Romantic anxieties concerning scientific advancement and the transgression of natural boundaries. With the rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI), however, scholarly attention has increasingly shifted toward examining *Frankenstein* as a literary text that can illuminate contemporary ethical debates surrounding intelligent technologies. Recent studies have connected *Frankenstein* with AI ethics, posthumanism, technological governance, and bioethics. Scholars generally interpret Victor Frankenstein as representing scientific ambition, while the Creature is viewed as a metaphor for artificial beings or autonomous technologies created through human innovation. These studies have highlighted important issues such as technological risk, creator responsibility, unintended consequences, and the ethical relationship between humans and intelligent machines. Together, they show that Shelley's novel continues to offer valuable insights into contemporary technological challenges.

Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature

Alan Swingewood argues that literature is not merely an artistic product but also a reflection of the social conditions, cultural values, and ideological conflicts existing within society. Literary texts therefore provide important evidence for understanding how societies construct, negotiate, and criticize dominant ideas through narrative representation. Among the many approaches to literary criticism, Swingewood's Sociology of Literature is particularly appropriate for the present study because the primary objective is not simply to interpret the symbolism of *Frankenstein*, but to examine how the novel critiques the social ideology underlying scientific and technological development. Unlike approaches that emphasize textual autonomy or authorial intention, Swingewood's framework enables literary texts to be analyzed as reflections and critiques of broader social structures. This perspective is therefore especially relevant for investigating how Victor Frankenstein embodies a technological culture that celebrates innovation while neglecting ethical accountability. In this study, Swingewood's theory serves as the principal interpretive framework for identifying sociological criticism

embedded in the narrative before relating these findings to contemporary discussions of Artificial Intelligence.

UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence

The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) represents the first globally endorsed normative framework for AI governance. It emphasizes that AI systems should remain human-centered, transparent, accountable, inclusive, and respectful of fundamental human rights while promoting sustainable social development. The UNESCO Recommendation provides internationally recognized ethical principles adopted by UNESCO Member States. These principles offer a suitable normative basis for evaluating ethical responsibility in technological development while remaining broad enough to support interdisciplinary interpretation across literary studies, ethics, and innovation governance. In this study, UNESCO's ethical principles provide the normative criteria for evaluating Victor Frankenstein's actions. His abandonment of the Creature illustrates failures of accountability, human oversight, and ethical responsibility that remain central to contemporary AI governance.

Responsible Innovation Theory

Responsible Innovation, proposed by von Schomberg (2013), argues that innovation should continuously consider ethical, social, environmental, and economic consequences throughout its entire lifecycle. Rather than evaluating innovation solely according to technological achievement, this framework emphasizes anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness as essential dimensions of responsible technological development. Responsible Innovation was selected because it complements UNESCO's ethical principles. While UNESCO identifies normative values that should guide AI development, Responsible Innovation explains how to operationalize those values throughout the innovation process. Consequently, this framework extends ethical evaluation beyond technological creation by emphasizing continuous stewardship after innovation. Within Frankenstein, Victor's failure to anticipate the consequences of his experiment, reflect on its ethical implications, involve broader society, and remain responsible after creation illustrates the absence of all four dimensions of Responsible Innovation.

Integration of Theoretical Frameworks

Although each theoretical framework offers valuable insights, none alone can explain the complexity of Frankenstein. Swingewood's Sociology of Literature explains how the novel represents and critiques the social ideology surrounding scientific progress, but it does not establish explicit ethical standards for evaluating technological responsibility. Conversely, UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence provides internationally recognized ethical principles but is not designed as a framework for literary interpretation. Likewise, Responsible Innovation explains how to maintain ethical responsibility throughout the innovation lifecycle but does not address the sociological meanings embedded in literary narratives. For these reasons, the present study integrates the three complementary frameworks into a single analytical model. Swingewood provides the sociological lens for interpreting literary representation, UNESCO supplies the normative principles for evaluating ethical responsibility, and Responsible Innovation explains how responsibility should operate throughout technological development. Together, they enable Frankenstein to be examined as a literary text, a sociological critique, and a conceptual model for contemporary AI governance.

Research Gap and Conceptual Framework

Although previous studies have demonstrated Frankenstein's continuing relevance to discussions of Artificial Intelligence, three important limitations remain. First, existing scholarship predominantly interprets the novel through technological, philosophical, or bioethical perspectives while giving comparatively limited attention to the sociological

ideology underlying technological innovation. Second, previous studies generally apply literary sociology, AI ethics, and innovation studies separately rather than integrating these complementary perspectives into a unified analytical framework. Third, literary scholarship has paid little attention to continuous AI stewardship, leaving insufficient explanation of how ethical responsibility extends beyond technological creation to encompass long-term governance, accountability, and institutional oversight.

To address these limitations, the present study integrates Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, and Responsible Innovation theory within a unified analytical framework. Through this integration, *Frankenstein* is interpreted not only as a literary critique of scientific ambition but also as a sociological model that illustrates the importance of continuous ethical stewardship throughout the lifecycle of technological innovation. This interdisciplinary approach constitutes the principal contribution of the present study by demonstrating how classical literature can enrich contemporary discussions concerning responsible AI governance.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to examine Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus* through the integrated perspectives of Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, and Responsible Innovation theory. A qualitative literary approach was selected because the study interprets textual meanings, sociological representations, and ethical issues embedded in literary narratives rather than measuring quantitative variables. Integrating these three complementary frameworks enables the analysis to examine the novel as a literary text, a sociological critique, and a conceptual reflection on contemporary AI governance. The primary source of data was Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus* (Penguin Classics edition, Shelley, 2018; originally published in 1818). The Penguin Classics edition was selected because it is widely recognized in literary scholarship for its editorial reliability, standardized chapter organization, and accessibility, thereby ensuring consistency in textual references and quotations throughout the analysis.

Sampling Procedure

Textual data were selected through purposive sampling because the study aimed to examine passages directly relevant to the research questions rather than analyze every section of the novel. Approximately 35 key textual passages, including narrative descriptions and character dialogues, were selected as the primary analytical units. These passages were considered sufficient because they consistently represented the major themes examined throughout the study. The inclusion criteria consisted of passages that: 1) represent Victor Frankenstein's scientific ambition and technological decision-making; 2) illustrate the Creature's learning process, social interaction, or moral development; 3) reflect ethical responsibility, accountability, governance, or the social consequences of technological innovation; and 4) demonstrate relationships between technological development and broader social values. Narrative passages unrelated to these analytical categories were excluded from detailed analysis.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection employed library research and close reading. The novel was read repeatedly to identify passages relevant to the research objectives. During each reading, potentially relevant quotations were manually highlighted, recorded, and organized in a coding worksheet, along with chapter references and preliminary analytical notes.

Simultaneously, the study systematically reviewed recent scholarly literature on literary sociology, AI ethics, and Responsible Innovation to support interpretation and maintain theoretical consistency throughout the analysis.

Data Analysis Procedure

The study employed thematic textual analysis supported by an analytical coding matrix integrating Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, and Responsible Innovation theory.

Table 1. Thematic Coding Matrix

Textual Evidence	Initial Code	Category	Theme	Swingewood Interpretation	UNESCO AI Ethics	Responsible Innovation
Victor creates the Creature	Scientific ambition	Technological ideology	Creator responsibility	Critique of scientific ideology	Responsibility	Anticipation
Victor abandons the Creature	Abandonment	Ethical accountability	Governance failure	Social irresponsibility	Accountability	Responsiveness
Creature learns language	Social learning	Identity formation	Human development	Socialization process	Human dignity	Inclusion
Society rejects the Creature	Social exclusion	Discrimination	Governance and ethics	Reflection of social prejudice	Fairness	Reflexivity

The coding process was conducted manually without qualitative data analysis software to maintain close engagement with the literary text while ensuring interpretive consistency. The analytical process consisted of four stages. First, the researcher conducted initial coding by identifying significant words, narrative events, dialogues, and descriptions related to scientific ambition, technological responsibility, social interaction, governance, and ethical accountability. Second, the researcher grouped similar codes into broader analytical categories, including technological ideology, creator responsibility, socialization, ethical governance, and innovation stewardship. Third, we refined these categories into overarching themes aligned with the research objectives through continuous comparison between textual evidence and the three theoretical frameworks.

Finally, each theme was interpreted using the analytical coding matrix. We first analyzed each selected quotation through Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature to identify representations of social ideology and cultural values. The same textual evidence was subsequently examined using UNESCO AI Ethics to evaluate ethical principles such as accountability, transparency, fairness, human dignity, and meaningful human oversight. Responsible Innovation theory was then applied to assess anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness throughout the innovation process. This sequential analytical procedure ensured that literary interpretation remained grounded in textual evidence before developing broader ethical and sociological interpretations.

Trustworthiness

To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, the study employed theoretical triangulation by integrating three complementary analytical frameworks. Interpretations were continuously supported by direct textual evidence from the novel and compared with recent peer-reviewed scholarship in literary criticism, AI ethics, and innovation studies. An analytical coding matrix was maintained throughout the research process to ensure consistency between textual evidence, coding categories, thematic development, and theoretical interpretation. This procedure strengthened the credibility, transparency, and dependability of the analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Victor Frankenstein as an Irresponsible Innovator: A Sociological Critique of Ethical Failure

Victor Frankenstein's ethical failure becomes evident immediately after the successful creation of the Creature. Rather than responding to his achievement with responsibility or curiosity, Victor abruptly rejects the being he has brought into existence. Reflecting on the moment of creation, he states: "*the beauty of the dream vanished, and breathless horror and disgust filled my heart*" (Shelley, 2018). The contrast between "*beauty of the dream*" and "*horror and disgust*" is significant because it reveals a sharp separation between Victor's desire to create and his willingness to confront the consequences of creation. Before the Creature becomes a social or moral problem, Victor has already psychologically withdrawn from his creation.

This rejection becomes more explicit when Victor recalls: "*Unable to endure the aspect of the being I had created, I rushed out of the room*" (Shelley, 2018). The phrase "*the being I had created*" establishes a direct relationship between creator and creation, while the verbs "*unable to endure*" and "*rushed out*" emphasize Victor's immediate refusal to remain engaged with the consequences of his experiment. The significance of this passage therefore lies not simply in Victor's fear but in the timing of his withdrawal: he abandons his responsibility at the moment the Creature becomes an independent entity requiring care, guidance, and recognition. Shelley's narrative therefore distinguishes between the achievement of creation and the responsibility that follows it.

Victor's language also shows that his rejection stems from the gap between his imagined creation and its material reality. Earlier, he had pursued the creation of life with extraordinary determination, describing his ambition in terms of an almost obsessive desire to penetrate the mysteries of nature. Yet when the Creature becomes physically present, Victor no longer sees the realization of his scientific ambition as an achievement. Instead, the result becomes an object of "*horror and disgust.*" This contrast suggests that Victor's ethical failure begins before the Creature commits any harmful act. His judgment is based on his emotional response to the appearance of his creation rather than on an assessment of the Creature's character or potential. The narrative thus places the initial ethical rupture within the creator's response rather than within the created being.

The consequences of this abandonment become clearer as the narrative progresses. The Creature later describes his own moral condition by stating: "*I was benevolent and good; misery made me a fiend*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 10). Although this statement belongs to the Creature's later reflection, it provides retrospective evidence of the consequences of Victor's initial rejection. The opposition between "*benevolent and good*" and "*misery made me a fiend*" indicates a process of transformation rather than an inherently evil identity. The verb "*made*" is particularly important because it attributes the Creature's transformation to an external condition, *misery*, rather than presenting violence as an essential characteristic. Read together with Victor's immediate abandonment, these passages establish a causal relationship between irresponsible creation, social neglect, and subsequent harm.

Victor's later reflection on his experience: "*Learn from me, if not by my precepts, at least by my example, how dangerous is the acquirement of knowledge*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 4). The imperative "*Learn from me*" transforms Victor's personal experience into a lesson for others. Importantly, however, the warning does not simply identify knowledge as dangerous. The phrase positions Victor himself as an "*example,*" suggesting that the consequences of knowledge depend on how it is pursued and managed. His experience therefore becomes a narrative demonstration of the responsibilities associated with scientific knowledge rather than a straightforward rejection of scientific inquiry.

Through this sequence of textual evidence, Victor can be understood as an irresponsible innovator whose central failure lies in the absence of sustained responsibility after creation.

His actions show three connected stages: an intense desire to create, an immediate rejection of the created entity, and a failure to respond adequately to the consequences that follow. The ethical problem therefore does not reside solely in Victor's decision to create artificial life. It emerges more clearly from his refusal to remain accountable for what happens after the creation enters the world.

Table 2. *Victor Frankenstein as the Prototype of the Modern AI Developer*

Evidence from the Novel	Sociology of Literature Interpretation	UNESCO AI Ethics Principle	Responsible Innovation Dimension
Victor's obsessive pursuit of creating life	Represents nineteenth-century scientific ambition and the ideology of technological progress	Human dignity and responsibility	Anticipation
Victor abandons the Creature immediately after its creation	Demonstrates the absence of social and moral responsibility	Accountability and human oversight	Responsiveness
Victor refuses to supervise or educate the Creature	Reflects irresponsible technological governance	Responsibility and transparency	Reflexivity
Victor's actions lead to social tragedy	Innovation without ethical commitment produces harmful societal consequences	Human-centered AI	Inclusion and lifecycle governance

Taken together, these passages demonstrate that Shelley's critique is more complex than a warning against scientific ambition alone. The narrative repeatedly contrasts the moment of technological achievement with the creator's subsequent refusal to assume responsibility. Victor's tragedy therefore develops from a discontinuity between creation and stewardship. This textual pattern provides the primary basis for the study's argument that *Frankenstein* can be read as a literary framework for understanding continuous AI stewardship, in which ethical responsibility persists after technological creation and extends to the continuing consequences of innovation.

The Creature as a Socially Constructed Intelligence: Learning, Exclusion, and Ethical Development

Unlike interpretations that portray the Creature as inherently monstrous, Shelley's narrative presents him as an intelligent being whose moral and social development emerges through interaction with his environment. His development begins with sensory confusion and gradually progresses toward language, emotional awareness, and moral reflection. The Creature describes his earliest experiences by explaining, "*I was a poor, helpless, miserable wretch; I knew, and could distinguish, nothing*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 11). The sequence of "*poor*," "*helpless*," and "*miserable*" establishes the Creature not as an inherently threatening entity but as a vulnerable being without knowledge or social orientation. The phrase "*I knew, and could distinguish, nothing*" further indicates that his initial condition is characterized by cognitive and social incompleteness rather than predetermined evil.

The Creature's subsequent development occurs through observation and imitation. As he observes the De Lacey family, he gradually acquires knowledge of language, social relationships, and human emotions. He explains, "*I learned and applied the words 'fire,' 'milk,' 'bread,' and 'wood'*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 11). The importance of this passage lies in the active verb "*learned*," which emphasizes that the Creature's intellectual abilities develop through experience. He does not possess complete knowledge immediately after his creation; instead, his understanding is gradually constructed through exposure to the social world. The accumulation of ordinary words such as "*fire*," "*milk*," "*bread*," and "*wood*" also demonstrates that his intelligence develops through interaction with material objects and human practices.

The Creature's learning subsequently expands from vocabulary to social and moral understanding. While observing the De Lacey family, he recognizes relationships between

individuals and begins to understand concepts such as affection, poverty, labor, and social responsibility. He states, "*I discovered also another means by which I could assist their labours*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 12). The verb "*assist*" is significant because it indicates an emerging desire to contribute positively to the lives of others. Rather than demonstrating an inherent tendency toward violence, the Creature initially seeks a socially constructive role. His moral development is therefore represented through action: learning is followed by empathy, and empathy generates a desire to help.

This process becomes even more significant when the Creature begins to understand human social structures and his own position within them. After observing the De Lacey family, he recognizes the emotional and economic relationships that shape human life. He reflects, "*I learned that the possessions most esteemed by your fellow-creatures were, high and unsullied descent united with riches*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 13). The phrase "*your fellow-creatures*" creates a linguistic distance between the Creature and humanity, while the words "*descent*" and "*riches*" reveal his growing awareness that social status is structured by inherited privilege and material wealth. The Creature therefore does not merely learn language; he learns the ideological values through which society classifies individuals.

This observation becomes crucial to the Creature's understanding of his own exclusion. After learning about human society, he compares its social standards with his own condition and realizes that he possesses neither social status nor human appearance. He observes, "*I possessed no money, no friends, no kind of property*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 13). The repetition of "*no*" emphasizes the cumulative nature of his exclusion. His marginalization is not produced by a single rejection but by the absence of multiple forms of social recognition. Shelley therefore represents identity as something shaped through relationships and social structures rather than as a fixed characteristic determined at birth.

The Creature's desire for social recognition becomes explicit when he encounters the De Lacey family. He initially approaches them indirectly because he recognizes that his physical appearance may influence their response. He explains, "*I cherished hope, it is true; but it vanished when I beheld my reflection in water*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 15). The contrast between "*hope*" and "*vanished*" captures the psychological effect of social exclusion before direct interaction even occurs. The Creature has internalized the expectation that his appearance will prevent him from being accepted. His identity is therefore shaped not only by how society treats him but also by his anticipation of how society will judge him.

The encounter with the De Lacey family confirms this fear. Although the blind De Lacey initially listens to him sympathetically, Felix reacts violently when he discovers the Creature. The Creature recalls that Felix "*tore me from his father*" and that the family subsequently rejected him (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 15). The physical violence of "*tore*" contrasts sharply with the Creature's earlier attempts to communicate peacefully. Shelley therefore constructs a repeated pattern in which the Creature's attempts at social integration are interrupted by rejection. His subsequent transformation cannot be understood independently of this accumulation of social experiences.

The Creature later summarizes this transformation in one of the novel's most significant statements: "*I was benevolent and good; misery made me a fiend*" (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 17). The semantic contrast between "*benevolent and good*" and "*fiend*" establishes a clear transformation, while the verb "*made*" attributes this transformation to an external process. Shelley does not write that the Creature was inherently a fiend; rather, "*misery made*" him one. The construction therefore presents violence as the consequence of accumulated suffering and social rejection. This distinction is central to understanding the Creature as a socially constructed intelligence rather than an inherently dangerous artificial being.

The Creature's account also demonstrates that his moral development remains relational even after his rejection. His requests to Victor show that he still seeks recognition, companionship, and guidance. When he asks Victor to create a female companion, he frames his demand in terms of his isolation: "*I am alone and miserable; man will not associate with*

me” (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 17). The parallel between “*alone*” and “*miserable*” reinforces the relationship between social exclusion and emotional suffering, while the statement “*man will not associate with me*” identifies social rejection as the central condition shaping his existence. The Creature therefore does not initially demand power over humanity; he demands the possibility of belonging within a social world.

Table 3. *The Creature as a Symbol of Artificial Intelligence*

Evidence from the Novel	Sociology of Literature Interpretation	UNESCO AI Ethics Principle	Responsible Innovation Dimension
The Creature learns language through observation	Social identity develops through interaction	Human dignity	Inclusion
The Creature seeks acceptance from humans	Society shapes technological development	Fairness and non-discrimination	Inclusion
Continuous rejection by society	Social exclusion produces conflict	Equality and justice	Responsiveness
The Creature becomes violent after repeated discrimination	Ethical outcomes depend on governance rather than technology	Human-centered AI	Reflexivity

Taken together, the Creature's development presents a continuous sequence of learning, social recognition, exclusion, and moral transformation. Shelley first depicts him as “*helpless*” and unable to distinguish the world around him; she then shows him acquiring language and social knowledge; subsequently, repeated rejection produces alienation and misery; finally, the Creature explicitly identifies this misery as the force that transformed him. This narrative progression provides textual evidence for interpreting intelligence as socially situated and ethically relational. It also supports the study's broader argument that responsible technological development requires sustained attention to the social environments in which intelligent entities operate. The findings suggest that the Creature should not be interpreted simply as a metaphor for dangerous autonomous technology; instead, it demonstrates that the behavior and social consequences of an intelligent creation are influenced by education, interaction, recognition, exclusion, and continuing human responsibility.

Responsible Innovation and Continuous AI Stewardship in Frankenstein

These findings show that the ethical consequences of scientific innovation in Frankenstein emerge from the creator's subsequent decisions about the created being. Victor Frankenstein's responsibility becomes particularly visible when the Creature confronts him and explains the consequences of his abandonment. Rather than remaining silent about his condition, the Creature articulates a clear demand for recognition and companionship: “*I am malicious because I am miserable. Am I not shunned and hated by all mankind?*” (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 17). The rhetorical question “*Am I not shunned and hated*” places social rejection at the center of the Creature's explanation of his behavior. More importantly, the statement “*I am malicious because I am miserable*” establishes a causal relationship between emotional suffering and violence. The Creature does not present his condition as an inherent characteristic but as the consequence of prolonged exclusion.

The Creature subsequently identifies Victor as responsible for his condition because Victor created him and then abandoned him. He tells Victor, “*You are my creator, but I am your master; obey!*” (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 20). The juxtaposition between “*creator*” and “*master*” reverses the conventional hierarchy between creator and creation. Victor possesses the power to create life, but the Creature argues that creation itself generates an obligation that Victor cannot simply abandon. The statement therefore marks an important ethical transition in the narrative: the relationship established through technological creation continues to shape the creator's responsibilities after the moment of invention.

This responsibility becomes even more explicit when the Creature asks Victor to create a companion. He explains, *"I am alone and miserable; man will not associate with me; but one as deformed and horrible as myself would not deny herself to me"* (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 17). The repeated emphasis on *"alone"* and *"miserable"* demonstrates that the Creature's request is fundamentally concerned with social belonging. His demand for another being is presented as an attempt to resolve the social consequences of his exclusion rather than simply as a desire to reproduce. Victor is therefore confronted with a second ethical decision after the original creation: whether and how he should respond to the social and emotional consequences generated by his first innovation.

Victor initially agrees to create the companion but later destroys the unfinished body. His reaction reveals the instability of his ethical commitment. Reflecting on the consequences of his decision, he describes the moment when he destroys the Creature's potential companion and states: *"I had resolved to be benevolent and do good, but I was now seized with a desire to destroy my own work"* (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 20). The contrast between *"resolved to be benevolent and do good"* and *"a desire to destroy my own work"* illustrates another rupture between intention and sustained responsibility. Victor recognizes an ethical obligation but fails to maintain it when confronted with uncertainty and fear.

The destruction of the companion is followed by a direct threat from the Creature: *"I shall be with you on your wedding-night."* (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 20). The short and declarative structure of the statement marks a dramatic transformation in the relationship between creator and creation. Victor's earlier abandonment has produced consequences that now return directly to him. The narrative thus establishes a recurring pattern: Victor creates, withdraws, faces consequences, and responds only after harm has already emerged. His actions demonstrate the absence of a sustained process of anticipation, evaluation, and responsiveness.

The consequences of Victor's decision continue to accumulate. After the Creature's threat, Victor becomes increasingly concerned with protecting himself while remaining unable to resolve the underlying relationship between himself and his creation. The tragedy therefore develops through a sequence of unresolved responsibilities rather than through a single act of scientific transgression. Each decision Victor makes produces new circumstances that require further ethical judgment. Shelley's narrative consequently presents technological responsibility as temporally extended: creation generates consequences, consequences require responses, and responses themselves create further consequences.

This pattern is especially significant when Victor later reflects upon the broader consequences of his scientific pursuit. He warns, *"Learn from me, if not by my precepts, at least by my example, how dangerous is the acquirement of knowledge"* (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 4). The phrase *"by my example"* is important because Victor's experience functions as a model of failed responsibility rather than merely as a warning against knowledge. His failure lies in the inability to manage the consequences of knowledge once it has been transformed into technological action. The narrative therefore shifts the ethical focus from whether creation should occur to what the creator must do after creation has occurred.

Table 4. Failure of Responsible Innovation in Frankenstein

Narrative Evidence	Responsible Innovation Dimension	Ethical Consequence	Sociological Interpretation
Victor creates artificial life without considering future consequences	Anticipation	Unforeseen social risks	Scientific ambition exceeds ethical foresight
Victor abandons the Creature after creation	Responsiveness	Absence of post-creation responsibility	Failure of technological governance
Victor conceals the truth about his experiment	Reflexivity	Ethical accountability is ignored	Individual ambition overrides public responsibility
Society receives no protection from Victor's invention	Inclusion	Collective harm and social instability	Innovation excludes societal interests

Accordingly, *Frankenstein* presents technological innovation as an ongoing social and ethical process rather than a completed event. Victor's central failure is not simply that he creates artificial life, but that he fails to remain responsibly engaged with what his creation becomes and what consequences it generates. The Creature's repeated appeals, Victor's changing decisions, and the subsequent social tragedies collectively demonstrate that technological responsibility must extend beyond invention toward continuing oversight, evaluation, accountability, and responsiveness. This narrative pattern provides the strongest textual foundation for understanding *Frankenstein* as a literary framework for continuous AI stewardship.

Frankenstein as a Sociological Critique of Contemporary Artificial Intelligence

The findings of this study show that *Frankenstein* can be read as a sociological critique of technological development, in which scientific achievement becomes problematic when separated from ongoing ethical responsibility. Throughout the analysis, Victor Frankenstein is portrayed not simply as an ambitious scientist but as an innovator who fails to maintain responsibility after creation. At the same time, the Creature's development demonstrates that the consequences of technological creation are shaped by social interaction, institutional responses, and the conditions surrounding the created entity. The central finding, therefore, is that the ethical problem represented in *Frankenstein* lies not in technological creation itself but in the failure to sustain responsible relationships with the consequences of innovation.

This finding is that the narrative pattern identified in *Frankenstein*: Victor's creation produces consequences that require continuing responses, yet he repeatedly withdraws from those responsibilities. The findings also support the argument within Responsible Innovation scholarship that innovation should be understood as an ongoing process rather than as a single technological achievement. This corresponds with the present analysis of Victor's failure to anticipate consequences, reflect upon his decisions, include affected interests, and respond constructively when problems emerge. However, the literary analysis adds a relational dimension that is less visible in procedural accounts of responsible innovation. Victor's failure is not merely a failure to follow an ethical procedure; it is a failure to sustain an ethical relationship with the entity and social environment produced by his innovation.

From the perspective of Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, this relational failure also represents a broader ideological problem. Victor's behavior reflects a technological culture in which scientific achievement and individual recognition are valued more highly than the social responsibilities generated by innovation. The novel therefore transforms an individual tragedy into a critique of the social ideology surrounding technological progress. The Creature's subsequent exclusion reinforces this interpretation because society's reactions shape his development. The findings consequently suggest that technological consequences cannot be separated from the social structures, values, and institutional practices surrounding technological development.

The integration of these findings provides the theoretical basis for the concept of continuous AI stewardship proposed in this study. Existing concepts provide important but distinct dimensions of technological responsibility. AI governance primarily addresses the structures, rules, institutions, and mechanisms that govern AI. Responsible AI emphasizes ethical principles and practices for the development and use of AI. Responsible Innovation emphasizes anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness within innovation processes. Continuous AI stewardship connects these dimensions by emphasizing the persistence of responsibility after technological creation, particularly the obligation to maintain oversight, accountability, evaluation, and responsiveness as technological systems continue to generate social consequences.

The concept of continuous AI stewardship therefore emerges from the novel's narrative structure and contemporary ethical frameworks. Victor's experience demonstrates that creation initiates rather than terminates responsibility. Once the Creature exists, new circumstances

continuously emerge: the Creature develops through social interaction, requests recognition and companionship, reacts to rejection, and eventually produces consequences that affect other members of society. Each stage requires further ethical judgment from the creator. This sequence provides a literary representation of a principle that is increasingly important in contemporary AI governance: technological responsibility must remain active throughout the system's social and operational lifecycle.

This interpretation also contributes to the understanding of AI ethics by challenging technology-centered explanations of technological harm. The Creature is not initially characterized as inherently violent. His statement, “*I was benevolent and good; misery made me a fiend*” (Shelley, 2018, Chapter 10), demonstrates that his transformation is connected to social experience. The finding suggests that ethical outcomes emerge through interactions between technological entities and their environments. Applied cautiously to AI, this perspective indicates that responsibility should not be attributed exclusively to the technical system itself. Developers, institutions, users, and governance structures also participate in shaping the conditions under which AI systems operate and generate consequences.

Table 5: *Frankenstein as a Sociological Critique of Contemporary Artificial Intelligence*

Research Finding	Sociological Meaning	Contemporary AI Implication
Victor prioritizes scientific success over ethical responsibility	Critique of technological ideology	Developers must remain accountable throughout the AI lifecycle
The Creature develops through social interaction	Technology reflects social values and governance	AI systems are shaped by human decisions, data, and institutional practices
Irresponsible innovation produces social tragedy	Ethical responsibility is inseparable from innovation	AI governance requires transparency, oversight, and continuous monitoring
Literature reflects and critiques social reality	Classical literature remains relevant for understanding modern technology	Literary studies contribute to interdisciplinary AI ethics discussions

Taken together, these findings show that *Frankenstein's* continuing relevance lies not simply in its representation of artificial creation but in its exploration of what happens after creation. The novel demonstrates that innovation generates enduring relationships, social consequences, and ethical obligations. This insight provides the foundation for conceptualizing continuous AI stewardship as a form of sustained responsibility that accompanies technological systems from creation through deployment, interaction, monitoring, evaluation, and response. In this sense, *Frankenstein* functions not merely as a warning about the dangers of technological ambition but as a literary framework for understanding the necessity of responsible technological stewardship in contemporary AI society.

Discussion

Victor Frankenstein as the Prototype of the Modern AI Developer

The findings indicate that Victor Frankenstein represents more than an individual scientist driven by excessive ambition. Through Swingewood’s *Sociology of Literature*, Victor can be understood as representing a broader social ideology in which scientific achievement is associated with progress, distinction, and control. This interpretation aligns with recent scholarship connecting *Frankenstein* to contemporary debates about Artificial Intelligence. Patowary (2023) identifies parallels between Victor’s creation of artificial life and contemporary concerns about morality, responsibility, and the consequences of technological development. Similarly, Chaleila (2025) interprets *Frankenstein* through the tension between technological progress and technological danger, emphasizing the continuing relevance of Shelley’s critique of scientific overreach. These studies support the present finding that Victor’s ambition is ethically problematic when scientific achievement is pursued without adequate consideration of its consequences. However, this study extends this scholarship by

shifting attention from the initial act of creation to the responsibilities that follow. While previous interpretations often emphasize ambition, creation, and technological danger, this study argues that Victor's most significant ethical failure occurs after creation, when he refuses to maintain responsibility toward the Creature and the society affected by his actions.

Dishon's (2024) analysis provides a further point of comparison by interpreting *Frankenstein* as a sociotechnical imaginary through which contemporary understandings of Artificial Intelligence are constructed, particularly in relation to agency, human–technology relations, and control. The present study agrees that Shelley's novel remains valuable for examining how societies imagine and negotiate the consequences of emerging technologies. However, whereas Dishon emphasizes the role of Frankensteinian narratives in shaping sociotechnical imaginaries of AI, the present study shifts the analytical emphasis toward the continuing responsibilities of technological creators. Victor's failure is therefore not simply a failure to control his creation but a failure to sustain an ethical relationship with an entity whose development and consequences continue beyond the moment of creation. This distinction extends the sociotechnical interpretation of *Frankenstein* by emphasizing the temporal dimension of technological responsibility.

This finding also aligns with Díaz-Rodríguez et al. (2023), who argue that trustworthy AI requires linking ethical principles to practical requirements for responsible AI systems, while Corrêa et al. (2023) show that AI governance increasingly depends on accountability, transparency, human oversight, and responsible implementation. These perspectives reinforce the argument that technological development cannot be separated from the responsibilities of the people and institutions involved. Nevertheless, this literary analysis adds a different dimension by illustrating the consequences of abandoning responsibility after technological success. Victor therefore serves as a literary representation of a governance problem that remains relevant to contemporary AI: the tendency to regard successful development as the endpoint of responsibility rather than the beginning of continuing obligations.

The Creature as a Symbol of Artificial Intelligence

The second finding demonstrates that the Creature should not be understood simply as a representation of dangerous or uncontrollable technology. This interpretation provides an important point of comparison with recent *Frankenstein* scholarship. Yang et al. (2025) use the *Frankenstein* metaphor to examine ethical concerns surrounding generative AI, particularly the relationship between technological creation and human responsibility. Similarly, Chaleila (2025) emphasizes the continuing tension between the promise of artificial creation and the risks associated with its consequences. These studies demonstrate that the Creature remains a productive metaphor for discussing AI-related ethical uncertainty. However, the present study differs by placing greater emphasis on the social processes through which the Creature develops. Rather than treating the Creature as inherently dangerous, the analysis shows that its transformation is closely connected to exclusion, failed communication, and the absence of responsible human guidance.

Dishon (2025) further demonstrates the contemporary relevance of *Frankenstein* by examining the relationship between the Creature, education, and contemporary AI. His analysis highlights the importance of learning and the relationship between artificial entities and their human environments. The present study supports this emphasis on interaction and development but extends it through a sociological interpretation of the Creature's transformation. The Creature learns language, observes human behavior, develops emotional awareness, and forms moral judgments through social experience. Its development therefore illustrates that the consequences of technological systems are partly shaped by the environments, institutions, and practices in which they are embedded.

This interpretation is also compatible with the sociotechnical perspective proposed by Sartori and Theodorou (2022), who emphasize the importance of understanding AI through relationships among technological systems, human actors, and broader social structures. From

this perspective, technology should not be treated as an isolated object whose effects are predetermined. Rather, technological outcomes emerge through interaction among technical capabilities, human decisions, institutional practices, and social contexts. The Creature provides a literary representation of this process. Its artificial origin does not automatically determine its moral behavior; instead, its experiences of acceptance, rejection, education, and exclusion contribute to its eventual transformation.

Technology Without Responsibility: A Failure of Responsible Innovation

The third finding demonstrates that the central tragedy of *Frankenstein* can be interpreted as a failure of Responsible Innovation. Victor's abandonment of the Creature therefore represents more than personal negligence which demonstrates the consequences of treating innovation as a technical achievement rather than as a continuing social process. This finding is consistent with the Responsible Innovation framework developed by von Schomberg (2013) and further elaborated by Stilgoe et al. (2013), particularly through the principles of anticipation, reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness. Victor fails across these dimensions. He does not adequately anticipate the consequences of his experiment, does not critically reconsider his decisions, excludes society from the process, and fails to respond constructively when the consequences of his creation become evident.

Recent research on responsible AI governance further supports this interpretation. Papagiannidis et al. (2025) emphasize that responsible AI governance requires structural, relational, and procedural practices across the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of AI applications. This lifecycle perspective is particularly relevant to Victor's failure because his responsibility ends precisely when the Creature begins to exist independently. While Papagiannidis et al. (2025) provide a contemporary governance perspective on sustaining responsibility throughout AI processes, the present literary analysis illustrates the consequences of failing to maintain such responsibility. *Frankenstein* therefore provides a narrative representation of a governance gap in which ethical responsibility is treated as a discrete stage rather than an ongoing obligation.

Batool et al. (2025) similarly demonstrate through their systematic review that AI governance involves multiple mechanisms of accountability and requires coordination across different levels of technological and institutional practice. Their work reinforces the idea that AI ethics cannot depend exclusively on the intentions of individual developers. The present study agrees with this institutional perspective but adds a literary and sociological dimension: Victor's failure illustrates how the absence of sustained responsibility can emerge when individual ambition is not connected to broader mechanisms of accountability. The tragedy of *Frankenstein* can consequently be understood as both an individual and structural failure of governance.

The importance of continuous oversight is also emphasized by Laux (2024), who examines human oversight and democratic AI governance in the context of the European Union AI Act. Human oversight is particularly relevant to the present findings because Victor relinquishes precisely the kind of continuing involvement that contemporary AI governance seeks to institutionalize. The comparison, however, reveals an important distinction. Contemporary AI governance addresses oversight through institutional and regulatory mechanisms, whereas Shelley dramatizes the problem through the breakdown of a personal relationship between creator and creation. Bringing these perspectives together demonstrates that accountability has both institutional and relational dimensions.

Frankenstein as a Sociological Critique of Contemporary Artificial Intelligence

The fourth finding demonstrates that *Frankenstein* functions not as a literal prediction of Artificial Intelligence but as a sociological critique of the social ideology surrounding technological innovation. This interpretation is supported by Dishon (2024), who shows *Frankenstein's* enduring importance for understanding sociotechnical imaginaries of AI. The

present study agrees that the novel provides a powerful framework for examining how societies imagine intelligent technologies and their consequences. However, it extends this approach by emphasizing responsibility across time. The significance of *Frankenstein* is therefore not limited to its ability to anticipate cultural anxieties about artificial beings. Its deeper relevance lies in its representation of the social relationship between technological creators, technological creations, and the communities affected by innovation.

The findings also contribute to contemporary AI ethics by demonstrating that ethical responsibility cannot be reduced to a fixed list of principles. UNESCO (2021) emphasizes human dignity, fairness, transparency, accountability, inclusion, and meaningful human oversight as essential components of ethical AI. These principles are clearly relevant to Victor's conduct and to society's treatment of the Creature. Nevertheless, the present analysis suggests that principles alone are insufficient if they are not sustained through practice. Victor's tragedy demonstrates that recognizing responsibility in principle does not guarantee responsible behavior over time. Ethical governance must therefore remain active as technologies develop, interact with users, and generate new social consequences.

This argument is further supported by contemporary scholarship on AI governance. Díaz-Rodríguez et al. (2023) emphasize the need to connect ethical principles with practical requirements for trustworthy AI, while Corrêa et al. (2023) show that AI governance involves a broad range of principles and institutional arrangements. Papagiannidis et al. (2025) further emphasize the need for responsible governance across different stages of AI development and use, and Laux (2024) highlights the importance of meaningful human oversight. Together, these studies demonstrate that contemporary AI ethics is increasingly moving from abstract principles toward governance practices that address implementation, monitoring, oversight, and accountability.

Recent scholarship further reinforces the *Frankenstein* analogy's continued relevance. Thielscher (2026), for example, revisits *Frankenstein* in relation to intelligent machines and human dignity, demonstrating that the literary narrative continues to provide a useful framework for contemporary questions about the development of intelligent technologies. While such work focuses on the ethical conditions surrounding intelligent machines, the present study emphasizes the continuing relationship between creators, technological systems, and society. This distinction strengthens the contribution of the present research: rather than asking only whether an intelligent technology is ethically designed, the study asks whether responsibility is maintained after that technology enters a changing social environment.

The critical comparison with previous scholarship therefore reveals both continuity and extension. Earlier studies have established *Frankenstein*'s value for discussions of scientific ambition, technological risk, artificial beings, and AI ethics. Recent scholarship has further expanded this conversation by examining Frankensteinian imaginaries, generative AI, education, governance, and human dignity (Chaleila, 2025; Dishon, 2024, 2025; Jowsey et al., 2025; Patowary, 2023; Thielscher, 2026; Yang et al., 2025). The present study extends these discussions by bringing literary sociology, contemporary AI ethics, and Responsible Innovation into a single analytical argument centered on the continuity of responsibility. Its principal contribution is therefore not the claim that *Frankenstein* predicted AI, but the proposition that the novel provides a literary model for understanding why technological responsibility must continue beyond creation.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* remains highly relevant for understanding contemporary ethical challenges surrounding Artificial Intelligence. Through the integrated perspectives of Alan Swingewood's Sociology of Literature, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, and Responsible Innovation theory, the novel is interpreted not merely as an early science-fiction narrative but as a sociological critique of technological ideology and a literary framework for continuous AI stewardship. The

findings reveal that Shelley's primary criticism is directed not toward scientific innovation itself but toward the ethical failure that occurs when technological creation is separated from long-term responsibility, accountability, and human oversight. Victor Frankenstein's abandonment of the Creature symbolizes a broader technological culture in which scientific achievement is prioritized while ethical stewardship is neglected, whereas the Creature's moral development demonstrates that intelligence evolves through continuous interaction with social environments rather than through inherent characteristics alone.

The study contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship by positioning *Frankenstein* as a sociological critique of technological ideology, introducing the concept of continuous AI stewardship, and integrating Sociology of Literature, UNESCO AI Ethics, and Responsible Innovation to inform responsible AI governance. Practically, the findings emphasize continuous accountability, human oversight, transparency, and long-term ethical responsibility throughout the AI innovation lifecycle. However, the study is limited to qualitative analysis of *Frankenstein* through three theoretical frameworks and does not include comparative literary texts or empirical AI case studies. Future research could expand the analysis across different literary and cultural contexts and integrate literary perspectives with empirical studies of AI governance, algorithmic accountability, and policy implementation to strengthen the connection between literature, sociology, ethics, and responsible technological innovation.

REFERENCES

- Almeida, P. G. R. de, & Santos Júnior, C. D. dos. (2024). Artificial intelligence governance: Understanding how public organizations implement it. *Government Information Quarterly*, 41, 102003. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.102003>
- Bartneck, C., Lütge, C., Wagner, A., & Welsh, S. (2021). *An introduction to ethics in robotics and AI*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-51110-4>
- Batool, A., Zowghi, D., & Bano, M. (2025). AI governance: A systematic literature review. *AI and Ethics*, 5, 3265–3279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00653-w>
- Camilleri, M. A. (2024). Artificial intelligence governance: Ethical considerations and implications for social responsibility. *Expert Systems*, 41(7), e13406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13406>
- Chaleila, W. A. (2025). Frankenstein's legacy: Utopian and dystopian visions in an AI-driven world. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 5(6), 3491–3509. <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i6.2477>
- Corrêa, N. K., Galvão, C., Santos, J. W., Del Pino, C., Pinto, E. P., Barbosa, C., Massmann, D., Mambrini, R., Galvão, L., Terem, E., & de Oliveira, N. (2023). Worldwide AI ethics: A review of 200 guidelines and recommendations for AI governance. *Patterns*, 4(10), 100857. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100857>
- Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Coeckelbergh, M., López de Prado, M., Herrera-Viedma, E., & Herrera, F. (2023). Connecting the dots in trustworthy artificial intelligence: From AI principles, ethics, and key requirements to responsible AI systems and regulation. *Information Fusion*, 99, 101896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101896>
- Dishon, G. (2024). From monsters to mazes: Sociotechnical imaginaries of AI between Frankenstein and Kafka. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 6, 962–977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00482-4>
- Dishon, G. (2025). Frankenstein, Emile, ChatGPT: Educating AI between natural learning and artificial monsters. *Educational Theory*, 75(4), 702–719. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.70025>
- Jowsey, T., Stapleton, P., Campbell, S., Davidson, A., McGillivray, C., Maugeri, I., Lee, M., & Keogh, J. (2025). Frankenstein, thematic analysis and generative artificial intelligence: Quality appraisal methods and considerations for qualitative research. *PLOS ONE*, 20(9), e0330217. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0330217>

- Laux, J. (2024). Institutionalised distrust and human oversight of artificial intelligence: Towards a democratic design of AI governance under the European Union AI Act. *AI & Society*, 39, 2853–2866. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01777-z>
- Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Conboy, K. (2025). Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review and research framework. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 34(2), 101885. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2024.101885>
- Patowary, U. (2023). Artificial intelligence and Mary Shelley's Frankenstein: A comparative analysis of creation, morality and responsibility. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, 3(4), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.3.4.16>
- Sartori, L., & Theodorou, A. (2022). A sociotechnical perspective for the future of AI: Narratives, inequalities, and human control. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 24, Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-022-09624-3>
- Sloane, M., & Zakrzewski, J. (2022). German AI start-ups and AI ethics: Using a social practice lens for assessing and implementing socio-technical innovation. *AI and Ethics*, 3(4), 1039–1056.
- Stahl, B. C. (2021). Artificial intelligence for a better future: An ecosystem perspective on the ethics of AI and emerging digital technologies. *AI and Ethics*, 1, 545–550. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00139-1>
- Thielscher, C. (2026). Frankenstein 2.0: Now IT works. How to build an intelligent machine with human dignity. *AI and Ethics*, 6, Article 64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00894-3>
- Yang, Z., Wu, J. G., & Xie, H. (2025). Taming Frankenstein's monster: Ethical considerations relating to generative artificial intelligence in education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 45(4), 1330–1343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2023.2300137>
- Zaidan, E., & Ibrahim, I. A. (2024). AI governance in a complex and rapidly changing regulatory landscape: A global perspective. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 1121. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03560-x>
- Shelley, M. (2018). *Frankenstein; or, The modern Prometheus*. Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1818)
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9), 1568–1580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008>
- Swingewood, A. (1972). *The sociology of literature*. Paladin.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>
- Von Schomberg, R. (2013). A vision of responsible innovation. In R. Owen, J. Bessant, & M. Heintz (Eds.), *Responsible innovation: Managing the responsible emergence of science and innovation in society* (pp. 51–74). Wiley.