

## Leading Sustainable AI Governance: A Framework for Institutional Resilience and Equitable AI Adoption in Canadian Higher Education

Kimberly Taylor, University of Calgary, [Kimberly.taylor@ucalgary.ca](mailto:Kimberly.taylor@ucalgary.ca)  
 Rachel Mallinson, University of Calgary, [Rachel.mallinson@ucalgary.ca](mailto:Rachel.mallinson@ucalgary.ca)  
 Anna Dawson, University of Calgary, [anna.dawson1@ucalgary.ca](mailto:anna.dawson1@ucalgary.ca)

### Introduction

Moral injury, meaning psychological distress arising from actions, omissions, or systemic conditions that violate one's deeply held moral beliefs, has predominantly been studied in clinical and military contexts. While scholars increasingly recognize this as a distinct phenomenon in civilian workplaces, it remains conceptually underdeveloped within Industrial-Organizational (I/O) psychology, thereby limiting the development of interventions relevant to organizations. The construct currently lacks a standardized operational definition in non-military settings. Therefore, this scoping review aims to synthesize existing literature on moral injury using an I/O psychology lens. It will investigate how the construct is defined, distinguished from related concepts, measured, and linked to organizational antecedents (e.g., leadership failure, institutional betrayal) and work-related outcomes (e.g., turnover intentions, counterproductive work behavior).

universities representing diverse institutional types. Data collection includes document analysis of institutional AI policies, semi-structured interviews with senior administrators and faculty leaders, and focus groups with educators implementing AI. Data analysis employs thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) with cross-case comparison to identify patterns shaping resilient AI governance.

### Research Questions

This review aims to answer three key questions:

1. Conceptualization: How is moral injury defined and distinguished from burnout and occupational stress in civilian workplace literature?
2. Antecedents: What organizational factors are identified as drivers of moral injury?
3. Outcomes: What are the reported consequences of moral injury?

### Scoping Review Protocol

The review follows the framework outlined by Arksey and O'Malley (2005), refined by the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI), and adheres to the PRISMA-ScR reporting guidelines. Inclusion criteria are based on the Population, Concept, and Context (PCC) framework. The population includes civilian workers employed in non-military sectors. The concept encompasses studies explicitly investigating moral injury, moral distress, or ethical conflict causing strain. The context focuses on organizational and workplace environments, job demands, and organizational culture. Studies focusing

exclusively on active-duty military, general stress without ethical violations, or purely clinical interventions without discussing workplace antecedents will be excluded.

The search strategy involves keyword searches in databases such as PsycINFO. Two independent reviewers will screen titles and abstracts against inclusion criteria, followed by a full-text review of potentially relevant articles. A third reviewer will resolve any disagreements to reach a consensus. Extracted data will include the industry sector, definition of moral injury, antecedents (structural, policy, cultural, leadership), and outcomes. A PRISMA flow diagram will track and visualize the number of studies identified, screened, eligible, and included.

### Objective

By distilling a fragmented literature into clear organizational constructs, this scoping review will synthesize evidence across disciplines to answer what distinguishes moral injury from occupational stress in the civilian workforce. The findings will establish the conceptual boundaries necessary to develop valid measurement tools and systemic interventions.

### References

- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19-32.
- Peters, M. D., Godfrey, C., McInerney, P., Munn, Z., Tricco, A. C., & Khalil, H. (2024). Scoping reviews. In E. Aromataris, C. Lockwood, K. Porritt, B. Pilla, & Z. Jordan (Eds.), *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. Joanna Briggs Institute. <https://doi.org/10.46658/jbimes-24-09>
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., . . . Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467-473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/m18-0850>