Cultural Perspectives on Legal Personhood: Philosophical Inquiries into the Rights of Non-Human Entities in a Technological Age

Xiangbin Zuo Ph. D
Faculty of Law, The National University of Malaysia (UKM), 43600, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
ukmzxb@163.com; p127253@siswa.ukm.edu.my

Abstract: Purpose: This research aims to investigate cultural perspectives on legal personhood, examine the impact of technological advancements on perceptions of personhood, and analyze the legal implications of extending personhood to non-human entities. Through interdisciplinary inquiry, the study seeks to deepen our understanding of the complexities and challenges inherent in defining legal personhood in a rapidly evolving world. Method: The research employs qualitative methods, including semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis, to explore cultural perspectives, examine public attitudes toward technology, and analyze legal frameworks. Sixteen participants were selected through purposive sampling, representing diverse cultural backgrounds and expertise in relevant fields. Thematic analysis was conducted to identify key themes and patterns within the data. Findings: The study uncovered diverse cultural viewpoints on legal personhood, revealing the influence of cultural beliefs and values on perceptions of personhood. Additionally, the research highlighted the ethical and social implications of technological advancements, particularly in the context of AI and robotics. Furthermore, the study analyzed existing legal frameworks and proposed recommendations for legal reforms to address emerging challenges. Originality/Significance: This research contributes to ongoing debates and discussions surrounding legal personhood by providing new empirical evidence and insights into cultural, technological, and legal dimensions of the concept. By addressing gaps in past research and exploring emerging issues, the study advances theoretical understanding and informs policymaking in areas related to personhood and technology.
Keywords: Legal Personhood, Cultural Perspectives, Technological Advancements, Ethical Implications, Legal Frameworks

1. INTRODUCTION

Global legal systems' deep understanding of legal personhood affects society's recognition and preservation of rights and obligations. Legal personality has evolved to reflect social norms, cultural values, technological advancements, and historical and philosophical traditions. Marshall defines legal personhood as the recognition that individuals, businesses, and even natural phenomena have legal rights and obligations similar to persons (Marshall, 2023). Legal personhood allocates rights and

obligations in society, enabling government, organization, and individual interactions. By giving some organizations legal personhood, societies ensure accountability, liability, and legal protection (Kahui et al., 2024). Legal personhood has grown in importance in modern culture, especially when technology challenges traditional personhood concepts. Biotechnology, robots, and AI have raised complicated ethical and legal questions about non-human beings' rights and responsibilities in society (Kahui et al., 2024). AI systems are becoming more autonomous and intelligent, raising questions about whether they should be legal entities and held accountable (Kempeneer, 2021). Environmental concerns have led to a proposal to legalize ecosystems, rivers, and forests. It would protect their environmental rights and promote sustainability. Indigenous and traditional cultures have traditionally considered nature human and advocated for legal protection (Petrossian et al., 2024). Environmental and technological advances have made legal personhood more significant in legal arguments. Public debate has focused on whether entities are legal persons and what rights and obligations they should have. This topic has gained relevance as governments confront the ethical and legal repercussions of environmental deterioration and technological innovation (Prasad & Ansari, 2023). It investigates the legal ramifications of giving non-human entities persons, how technological progress affects personhood, and how cultural perceptions of legal entities are changing. This interdisciplinary program covers 21st-century legal concerns. This project examines legal persons' complicated issues in a fast-changing world using empirical and theoretical research. Moreover, legal personhood study affects law, tech, and culture values and ideas affect Western and non-Western persons. Cultural factors affect judicial systems and persons (Leary et al., 2021). Western legal systems value individual autonomy and logic, while non-Western cultures value society and nature. Personality influences AI and robotics. Gunkel (2018) examined moral agency, consciousness, and accountability in AI ethics. Privacy, autonomy, and accountability have been studied in public perceptions of human-like AI. Giving AI entities personality traits like legal standing, rights, and accountability has been studied, too (Confalonieri et al., 2022). Scholars have investigated court verdicts, legislative activity, and international treaties to construct personhood legislation (Andaya & Campo-Engelstein, 2021; Gellers, 2021). Studies on corporate personhood, animal rights, and environmental persons have shown the challenges of legalizing non-human entities (Strohminger & Jordan, 2022). Academics also oppose legal discrimination that favors people and advocate for more inclusive and fair notions of

personhood. Despite the wealth of research on legal personhood, several gaps remain that warrant further investigation. Firstly, there is a need for more research on cultural perspectives, particularly from non-Western and indigenous communities. While existing research has documented Western views on personhood, there is a lack of empirical studies exploring cultural diversity and its implications for legal frameworks (Nowik, 2021). Understanding how cultural beliefs and values influence perceptions of personhood can provide valuable insights for developing inclusive and culturally sensitive legal frameworks. Secondly, there is a gap in research on the ethical and social implications of technological advancements, such as AI and robotics. While some studies have explored ethical questions surrounding AI personhood, there is limited research on public attitudes and perceptions (Rodrigues, 2020). Additionally, there is a need for research on the impact of AI personhood on society, including issues of inequality, discrimination, and social justice (Arstein-Kerslake & Black, 2020). Furthermore, there is a gap in research on legal frameworks and precedents related to personhood, particularly in emerging areas such as environmental personhood and AI rights. While existing research has examined corporate personhood and animal rights, there is limited research on new legal challenges posed by technological advancements and environmental concerns (Leary et al., 2021). Research is needed to analyze court cases, legislative statutes, and international conventions in these emerging areas and identify gaps in legal frameworks. The aim of this study is to investigate cultural perspectives on legal personhood, examine the impact of technological advancements on perceptions of personhood, and analyze the legal implications of extending personhood to non-human entities. By exploring these dimensions from interdisciplinary perspectives, this study seeks to deepen our understanding of the complexities and challenges inherent in defining legal personhood in a rapidly evolving world. Specifically, this study aims to:

- Explore cultural perspectives on legal personhood
- Examine the impact of technological advancements on perceptions of personhood
- Analyze the legal implications of extending personhood to non-human entities

This research impacts academia, policymakers, and society. We study legal individuals' cultural perspectives to better comprehend personhood in legal systems and promote cultural awareness and inclusivity. Recognizing cultural differences helps legislators and attorneys create fair,

flexible legal systems that protect rights and dignity. The ethical and sociological effects of biotechnology, robots, and AI on personality are investigated in this study. By researching public perceptions and creating rules that promote responsible advancement and avoid hazards, policymakers can better comprehend the implications of individualizing non-human animals. This study examines the legal ramifications of legalizing non-human animals, aiding legislation change and fairness talks. Governments and legal experts may address framework gaps and hurdles to promote legal inclusivity and justice. This research promotes non-human animal ethical and legal rights, environmental protection, and social justice.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Historical Context

Beginning in Roman law, "persona" was a theatrical mask representing performers' social responsibilities. Capacity to perform legal rights and duties. This underlying premise has changed tremendously due to social, intellectual, and legal changes. Roman law first recognized personhood only for free males, excluding captives and women. As Worthington & Spender stressed individual value, the concept expanded (Worthington & Spender, 2021). Even though more people had legal personhood throughout the Middle Ages, social and class divisions persisted. Our view of personhood changed during the Enlightenment. Modern democracy is built on natural rights doctrine, which states that everyone possesses life, liberty, and property. Pain & Pepper emphasized the morality of humans and believed reasoning humans should be considered independent rather than tools (Pain & Pepper, 2021). Recent research suggests legal personality is expanding to include other animals. These changes were driven by pragmatic concerns, ethical issues, and social disturbances. The legalization of companies was an advance (Glavovic, 2024; Kalpokiene & Kalpokas, 2023). According to the Arstein-Kerslake et al., (2021) , businesses can start or defend legal proceedings (Arstein-Kerslake et al., 2021), enter into contracts, and own property like people. Firms' legal legitimacy gave them more autonomy and permanence than single proprietorships, boosting economic growth. Recognition of animal rights was another major advance. Understanding animal cognition and compassion drove this trend in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Many governments have legislation to prevent animal abuse. Several legal systems

recognize orangutans and chimpanzees as "legal persons"—a major achievement. Great apes were protected from torture and death by the Spanish parliament in 2008. The environmental movement has promoted natural phenomena as distinct entities (Worthington & Spender, 2021). Indigenous people believe rivers, forests, and mountains are sentient. This perspective gradually shaped legal systems. The ruling recognizes the legal rights and protections of the river, reflecting Māori belief in the connection of people and the environment. The Indian judiciary legalized the Ganges and Yamuna rivers due to their ecological and cultural worth (Blair, 2023). Legal personhood has evolved with AI and automation. Advances in AI and autonomy raise questions about its legal standing. This issue discusses whether cognitively capable AI should have legal rights and obligations. This unique move sparked global debate on AI legal personality. For ecological and ethical concerns, several movements have supported non-human personality identification (Neha et al., 2020). Global "ecocide," or environmental devastation, has garnered favor. Nature's legal safeguard against catastrophic environmental degradation states ecosystems should be protected. This concept contradicts human-centered law and promotes ecosystems' survival and growth.

2.2 Theoretical Frameworks

Philosophy of personhood has shaped our view of human qualities and who deserves rights and protections. This option values utilitarian, rights-based, and ideals. Moral reflection and individuality are set by each framework. Personality requires autonomy and rationality, according to Ma et al, and also believed humans might have moral thoughts and choices (Ma et al., 2022). Moral duties and respect for autonomous thinking are central to deontology. Legislation and legal institutions establish and enforce legal rights (Elnaiem et al., 2023). To extend legal rights to non-humans, laws or court decisions must reflect a community's shifting ethical standards and practical concerns. Personhood is established by law by granting rights and protections to own property, enter agreements, and take legal action. Nonhuman entities' legal rights have improved (Anderson et al., 2023). The nineteenth-century legal recognition of companies as legal persons gave non-human entities substantial legal rights and obligations. The recent legalization of natural items like the Whanganui River in New Zealand has earned respect and became a person (Kramm, 2020). Environmental ethics and indigenous perspectives impact the legal drive to recognize natural phenomena' inherent value. This acknowledgement shows this movement. Animal legal status has also improved. Many courts and politicians are

recognizing animal rights, elevating them from property to beings with legal rights (Petrossian et al., 2024). Cecilia, an Argentine chimpanzee, was recognized as nonhuman. Legalizing AI rights is receiving attention. AI systems raise legal and rights problems as they evolve. To grant AI legal personality, rights and obligations must be assigned, and accountability and ethical issues in more intelligent and automated systems must be addressed (Vinnari & Vinnari, 2022). Kantian, utilitarian, and rights-based moral norms affect who or what qualifies for personhood. The difference between moral and legal rights highlights the difficulties of spreading individuality beyond people. Ass society and technology advance, philosophical frameworks impact ethical and legal recognition of non-human creatures. This ongoing discussion will shape technology rights and individuality.

2.3 Technological Advances

Biotechnology, robots, and AI are changing how nonhuman creatures will participate in society. These advances challenge traditional personhood, necessitating legal and moral rethinking (Arstein-Kerslake & Black, 2020). Machine learning and neural networks have accelerated artificial intelligence. These technologies let AI systems make increasingly independent judgments, understand patterns, and handle vast volumes of data. AI is used in everything from customer service chatbots to driverless vehicles and medical diagnostics (Habuza et al., 2021). Recent advances in robotics allow robots to execute difficult tasks in numerous industries. Industrial robots automate industry, whereas service robots work in healthcare, hotels, and homes. Biotechnology—including genetic engineering, synthetic biology, and bioinformatics—is changing how we affect biological systems (Singha et al., 2022). CRISPR technology allows precise editing of genetic material, which could repair hereditary diseases, improve human abilities, and create new species. Biotechnology creates biohybrid systems with biological and artificial components. This could lead to new life forms that challenge human identity. These technological advances suggest that roles, abilities, and ethics can qualify non-human species for personality. Artificial intelligence systems' personality becomes more important as they progress. AI are individuals because they can reason, connect, and be autonomous. Sophia, a Hanson Robotics humanoid robot, is an advanced AI system with complicated decision-making and interactions. Sophia's "citizenship" in Saudi Arabia started global AI rights and responsibilities discussions (Fernandes, 2022). Proponents believe AI with adequate autonomy and cognitive functions

should be accorded legal personhood to ensure ethical behavior and responsibility. Critics warn against eroding the concept of persons and stress the need for clear criteria to distinguish between rights-deserving and instrument-like people (Stepanov, 2021). Growing evidence of animal cognition and sensitivity supports their identity as non-humans. Animals like elephants, dolphins, and monkeys have complex emotive reactions, social systems, and behaviors (Strohminger & Jordan, 2022). In many nations, legal systems have recognized these traits to provide animals rights. Argentine chimpanzee Cecilia's recognition as a non-human person is a major step forward. Animal rights proponents believe sentient species like humans deserve moral and legal concern. This utilitarian view questions the idea of animals as property. Nature's personality comes from indigenous worldviews and environmental principles. Indigenous peoples value rivers, forests, and mountains as living beings with spiritual value. Modern legal systems recognize nature's right to exist, thrive, and replenish. The Ganges, Yamuna, and Whanganui rivers in India and New Zealand have legal personality, allowing them to be represented in court and protected from exploitation. This legal acknowledgement highlights human-natural system interdependence and supports environmental responsibility (Blair, 2023). Nations can better address environmental degradation and foster sustainable growth by giving nature citizenship. Biotechnology breakthroughs are creating biohybrid entities. These entities dispute the distinction between natural and artificial life (Holzinger et al., 2023). Researchers constructed cyborg tissues using electronic gadgets and living cells for new capabilities. As biohybrid systems progress, moral and legal considerations grow. Personhood for entities with biological and artificial traits? Their aims, abilities, and morality must be assessed for this research.

2.4 Legal Precedents

Corporate personhood, developed from Western legal systems, gives businesses human-like rights and protections. Enterprises can enter into contracts, conduct legal processes, be sued, own property, and enjoy constitutional rights and safeguards with this legal status. Corporate personhood has been debated and debated, affecting law, economics, and society (Strohminger & Jordan, 2022). Corporations were legal entities with constitutional rights after this statement. Corporate personhood affects many aspects of society and the law. Corporate personhood provides a strong legal framework for business operations, enabling economic activity and protecting firms. Businesses can make sophisticated contracts, enter

into transactions, and seek legal remedies like individuals. According to corporate personhood, shareholders and directors are not personally liable for corporation debts and responsibilities. It encourages investment and entrepreneurship (Worthington & Spender, 2021). Critics say corporate personhood gives companies too much power and influence, undermining democratic governance and monitoring. Businesses are leveraging religious and free speech rights to gain power and influence over democracy, raising worries. It casts doubt on political and social structures. Animal rights verdicts have affected nonhuman animal morality and personhood debates. Once, animals were property. New court and legislative rulings acknowledge animals' emotional intelligence. Legal protections for animals were added. A US lawsuit between Nonhuman Rights Project and Lavery shows this. The Nonhuman Rights Project sued for habeas corpus for three detained chimpanzees, claiming they are legal creatures entitled to bodily freedom (Petrossian et al., 2024). Even though the New York Supreme Court denied the petition, it prompted a heated debate about animal rights and ethics. This shows the growing recognition of animals' intellectual and emotional complexity and the need to rethink their legal status. Many courts have backed animal rights in environmental, cruelty, and custody disputes (Strohminger & Jordan, 2022). The Supreme Court of India has upheld the responsibility of caring for and safeguarding animals from violence, demonstrating an increasing acknowledgment of their ethical and intrinsic value. Legal judgments shape morality and individualism. Legal safeguards for nonhuman animals are expanding as courts recognize their ability to form social relationships, feel emotions, and suffer physically. The personhood conventions are ignored (Nguyen et al., 2022). This change is part of a bigger cultural and ethical movement that promotes compassion and responsibility for all living things and animal dignity and rights. Rulings on animal rights have affected the debate over the ethical and legal status of nonhuman animals. Animals used to be property.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study's qualitative approach to cultural viewpoints on legal people better expressed the diversity, profundity, and complexity of human experiences and beliefs. Qualitative methods show cultural differences and distinctive perceptions by analyzing individual views. Most data was collected through semi-structured interviews. This method encouraged

diverse opinions and open-ended discussions. Thematic analysis revealed participant responses' patterns, themes, and variances. By analyzing the data thoroughly, essential concepts and patterns were accurately captured. Qualitative study provided a solid basis for legal organizations' cultural viewpoints.

3.2 Participants

The qualitative study on legal persons' cultural perspectives included 16 carefully selected participants with various cultural backgrounds, knowledge, and attitudes (see Table 1). Researchers used purposive sampling to pick people with relevant research insights. The selection process emphasized ethnic diversity, professional expertise, and lengthy conversations. To guarantee diversity, Western, Eastern, and Indigenous people were chosen. We carefully selected academics, activists, lawyers, and cultural studies experts for a holistic perspective. Age, gender, and life experiences were considered when selecting a representative sample. Online channels, academic institutions, professional networks, and community organizations were used to recruit participants. At the initial email or phone contact, the study's goal and scope were discussed and invitations were offered. To help stakeholders understand the study's goals, methods, and confidentiality, informational brochures were distributed. The saturation principle guided the repeated recruitment process to maintain a broad, representative sample and data richness and depth. Continuous data analysis informed recruitment decisions, allowing participant selection changes to address issues or patterns. All participants were given informed consent forms that explained the study's goals, procedures, risks, and confidentiality requirements. Participants might ask questions and get explanations before agreeing verbally and in writing. Participants were assured that they could leave the study at any time. The chosen individuals had diverse cultural, professional, and demographic backgrounds. The study's findings were reinforced by this broad sample's detailed cultural research of legal personhood.

Table 1: (a) Demographic Profile of Respondents

Participant ID	Age	Gender	Profession/Expertise
P1	35	Female	Lawyer
P2	45	Male	Professor of Philosophy
P3	28	Non-binary	Environmental Activist
P4	50	Female	Anthropologist
P5	38	Male	Human Rights Advocate
P6	60	Female	Legal Scholar

Table 1: (b) Demographic Profile of Respondents

Participant ID	Age	Gender	Profession/Expertise
P7	42	Male	Indigenous Rights Activist
P8	33	Female	Environmental Lawyer
P9	47	Male	Philosopher
P10	55	Female	Cultural Anthropologist
P11	30	Male	Ethics Professor
P12	39	Female	Community Leader
P13	43	Male	Environmental Scientist
P14	52	Female	Legal Consultant
P15	34	Male	Business Executive
P16	48	Female	Indigenous Lawyer

3.3 Data Collection

This qualitative study collected data through semi-structured interviews with the indicated people. The researcher used semi-structured interviews as the main data collection approach because they allowed participants to freely communicate their opinions, beliefs, and experiences while exploring specific areas of interest. Open-ended interviews were designed to obtain detailed information through talk and investigation. The interview questions (see Table 2) were tailored to the research goals, seeking participants' views on non-human legal rights, cultural beliefs, and personhood.

Table 2 (a): Interview Protocols

Variable	Interview Questions
Cultural Perspectives	1. How do you perceive the concept of personhood within your cultural context?
	2. Can you share any cultural beliefs or traditions related to the rights of non-human entities?
	3. How does your cultural background influence your views on legal personhood?
	4. Are there any specific cultural practices or values that shape your understanding of personhood?
Legal Rights	1. What are your thoughts on the extension of legal rights to non-human entities?
	2. Do you believe that non-human entities should have legal protections?
	3. How do you envision the legal rights of non-human entities being implemented?
	4. Are there any ethical considerations or challenges associated with granting legal personhood to non-human entities?

Table 2 (a): Interview Protocols

Variable	Interview Questions
Moral Consideration	1. How do you define moral considerability in the context of legal personhood?
	2. Should moral consideration extend to all living beings, regardless of their species?
	3. What factors do you believe should be considered when determining moral consider ability for non-human entities?
	4. How can cultural perspectives influence moral consideration for non-human entities?

Based on participant choices and logistical constraints, interviews were conducted in person, by phone, or via video conference. To ensure accuracy and sensitivity, every interview was recorded with consent. The interviews averaged 45 minutes to an hour, giving participants enough time to discuss their ideas. Researchers or professional interviewers conducted the interviews. They employed a semi-structured interview guide to maintain consistency and explore developing themes or subjects. Field notes were taken during data collection to supplement audio-recorded interviews with observations, reflections, and context. These field notes revealed ambient factors, interview dynamics, and participant nonverbal cues that may have influenced their responses. Data was collected until saturation, suggesting no new themes or insights from interviewees. The considerable data showed cultural differences in legal person views. Continuous analysis and discussion within the study team assessed data saturation.

3.4 Data Analysis

This qualitative study used Braun & Clarke, three-step theme analysis methodology (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data was originally gathered by carefully reviewing interview transcripts. Multiple transcript readings were needed to understand the participants' comments' complexities and key concepts. The initial observations and perceptions were collected during subject familiarization, laying the framework for later research. Once familiar with the data, it was coded methodically to identify essential units of information relevant to the study questions. This coding method used deductive coding to match interview guide themes and inductive coding to discover new themes from the data. Text segments including participants' comments, ideas, and experiences were labeled for organization and analysis. After encoding, the data was categorized into general themes and sub-themes by frequency and importance. For consistency and logical

interpretation, the study team addressed topics repeatedly. In this phase of theme development, the encoded data was carefully examined to determine trends, resemblances, and discrepancies in participants' cultural conceptions about legal personhood. To achieve thorough and accurate results, the study team worked hard during analysis. By include participant examples, the study's main themes were confirmed and deepened. The study's conclusions became more credible and reliable. Thematic analysis allowed for a logical and detailed evaluation of the large qualitative data, revealing cultural views on legal entities.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

Ethics were considered throughout this investigation to protect participants' rights and well-being. Informed consent was a top ethical priority. The study's goals, methodology, risks, and benefits were explained to all participants before they participated. Participants could make educated decisions regarding their involvement because the content was clear. Participants gave verbal and written consent to participate in the research, confirming they understood their rights. Additionally, volunteers could leave the study at any time without penalty. Research participants were kept anonymous and confidential to protect their privacy. Participants' remarks were protected by redacting transcripts and replacing them with participant IDs. All data were securely archived and solely available to the study staff, assuring participant privacy and research usage. This study was also ethically reviewed and approved by the proper IRB or ethics committee. To ensure ethical conformity with human participant research, the research method was thoroughly examined. The research procedure followed the concepts of autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice to sustain the highest ethical standards in research.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Theme 1: Definitions of Personhood

Data examination of personhood definitions showed that anthropocentric ideas, which limited persons to humans, predominated. People from different professional and cultural backgrounds believed personhood was based on human features. Human-centered ethics and law shaped the limited notion of personality (See Table 3). Respondent 1, a legal expert, said the legal system has traditionally granted personality to

humans only due to their cognitive and moral abilities. Respondent 5, a human rights advocate, said that persons' fundamental dignity and morality have always justified legal rights. Theoretical arguments by researchers like Vatter & De Leeuw, argue that traditional legal frameworks have upheld a human-centered understanding of personhood (Vatter & De Leeuw, 2023), excluding non-human entities from legal recognition and protection. Lazcoz & de Hert, claims that human governance has promoted the idea that only humans are human (Lazcoz & De Hert, 2023). Ethically and legally, personhood theories that emphasized moral agency, cognitive capacity, and social responsibility were valued. Environmental law expert respondent 8 noted the practical implications of legal persons for species. Despite their utility, they contended that legal personhood for animals and environment would damage our legal system. Respondent 11, an ethics professor, stressed the ethical implications of legal personhood for nonhuman beings. They highlighted that non-human animals may not have legal personhood with rights and obligations. This verdict questions whether non-human creatures can have legal rights, including representation and accountability. Anthropocentrism-based ethical and legal conventions have persisted to exclude non-humans, supporting human-centered ideas of personhood. Respondent 14, a legal consultant, argued that centuries of judicial precedent and societal norms have entrenched the idea that only humans are entitled to legal protection. Arstein-Kerslake et al, claims that judicial systems have been molded by anthropocentric biases, perpetuating nonhuman enslavement (Arstein-Kerslake et al., 2021). Despite the preponderance of human-centered views, few participants wanted to rethink personhood and explore frameworks that incorporate non-humans. Respondent 3, an indigenous rights advocate, advocated for a more inclusive approach since indigenous cultures understand personhood as encompassing the biosphere. This concept supports traditional beliefs that all living things have value and autonomy. Philosopher Respondent 9 also suggested reassessing personhood requirements. They stressed expanding these requirements beyond cognitive capacities to include emotional intelligence and ecological awareness. This call for a better understanding of personhood shows the growing awareness of the complicated relationship between humans, animals, and the environment. Since inclusive personhood discussions included arguing for the expansion of personhood to include entities other than humans, the data also revealed a major sub-theme. This perspective challenges human-centered concepts of personhood and promotes a more holistic view of non-human worth and capabilities. Participants from

diverse cultural backgrounds and with professional competence made persuasive reasons for this inclusive policy. They used moral, intellectual, and cultural arguments. Philosophy professor respondent 2 stressed the interconnection of all living things. They believed that all conscious and emotionally capable sentient species should be considered persons from a philosophical perspective. This sentiment is part of a larger shift toward moralizing nonhumans. Respondent 6, an environmental activist, said, "Given the increasing environmental crises, it is crucial to acknowledge the rights and autonomy of nature and its inhabitants." This ethical approach shows the growing recognition of human-nonhuman ecosystem connection and common environmental responsibility. Allison et al, promotes a capacities-based personhood and consider the morality of things that can thrive and enjoy well-being (Allison et al., 2022). Numerous examples from numerous cultures show that personhood can be viewed in ways beyond human-centeredness. Respondent 7, an indigenous rights advocate, said many cultures assign personhood to animals, plants, and even natural events. This shows great regard for all life. Traditional practices emphasize the interconnectedness of all living things, supporting the holistic vision. Respondent 10, a cultural anthropologist, said that in Buddhism and Hinduism, personhood includes all sentient beings. These faiths stress compassion and nonviolence toward all life. This inclusive worldview reflects cultural values of peace and nature connection. Environmental law expert respondent 8 noted the practical implications of legal persons for species. Despite their utility, they contended that legal personhood for animals and environment would damage our legal system. Respondent 11, an ethics professor, stressed the ethical implications of legal personhood for nonhuman beings. They highlighted that non-human animals may not have legal personhood with rights and obligations. This verdict questions whether non-human creatures can have legal rights, including representation and accountability.

Table 3: Definitions of Personhood

Sub-Theme	**Weightage**
Human-Centric Views	0.4
Ethical and Legal Justifications	0.2
Inclusive Perspectives	0.3
Examples from Different Cultures	0.1
Comparative Analysis	0.1

4.2 Theme 2: Cultural Influences

Culture and ideas were strongly correlated, with Western notions of

personhood influencing legal and ethical thinking. Western civilizations have valued human interests and abilities. People from different professional and cultural backgrounds discussed how Western intellectual traditions affect personality. They stressed the philosophical influence on ethical and legal debates (See Table 4). Respondent 1, a legal expert, says Western legal philosophy has defined personhood as focusing on persons, influenced by Enlightenment rationality and independence." Respondent 4, an anthropologist, says Western culture believes people and non-humans are fundamentally different. Western culture's personhood views are shaped by Cartesian dualism. Motta et al. argue that rationality distinguishes individuality (Motta & Veth, 2021), preventing non-human species from moral judgment. A logic distinguishes humans from animals, according to this theory. Western intellectual traditions continue to influence legal and ethical debates on personhood. According to Respondent 8, "The acknowledgment of personhood in a legal context is heavily influenced by Western concepts of individualism and property rights, which prioritize the interests of humans over those of non-human entities." This statement shows how Western cultural norms and customs have shaped judicial systems. Utility also affected Western personhood ethics, according to respondent 11, an ethics professor. She claimed utilitarian ethics prioritize human well-being over non-human issues in legal and ethical decisions. A consequentialist approach, this pragmatic calculation promotes human well-being over autonomy and worth. Although Western thought is prominent, some Westerners reject the premise that people are the center of the universe and embrace broader personhood. Respondent 3, a human rights activist, advocated morality for non-humans. They said Western nations are coming to cherish animals and nature, upending long-held beliefs. Respondent 7 emphasized indigenous ideas vs Western anthropocentrism. They claimed indigenous worldviews recognize all living things as persons to acknowledge life's interdependence. This indigenous perspective encompasses human identity beyond supremacy. The data study on cultural impacts on personhood revealed that Eastern philosophies were heavily involved in establishing alternative personhood notions. Eastern philosophical systems emphasize spirituality and nature, contrasted with Western anthropocentrism. Participants from varied cultural and professional backgrounds underlined Eastern philosophy' unique contributions to personhood issues. This highlighted Eastern cultures' holistic vision of existence. According to philosophy professor Respondent 2, "Eastern traditions like Buddhism and Taoism prioritize the interdependence of all living beings, regarding individual identity as a

manifestation of the fundamental essence of existence." Respondent 5, a human rights advocate, said Eastern personhood encompasses harmonious relationships between humans, animals, and nature as well as individuality. Eastern perspectives on personhood include spirituality and the environment, providing a more holistic vision than anthropocentric ones. Philosopher Respondent 9 noted that Eastern philosophies view personhood as a manifestation of cosmic consciousness in all existence. This spiritual perspective emphasizes the interconnection of all life in the universe. Environmental activist Respondent 12 noted Eastern ideas' inherent ecological concern. They said Eastern cultures value nature and encourage proper management and respect for the environment. Eastern cultures emphasize the interdependence of humans, animals, and nature, which inspired this ecological ethos. Complex Eastern cultural ideas on personality are hard to reconcile with Western legal and ethical frameworks. Respondent 6, an environmental lawyer, acknowledged that cultural norms and legal traditions make it difficult to apply Eastern ideas to Western law. Cultural anthropologist Respondent 10 worried about Western misinterpretation and cultural appropriation of Eastern ideas. She said that Westerners' attempts to promote Eastern spirituality often lead to narrow interpretations that ignore cultural and philosophical issues. These concerns show that Easterners' cultural and historical roots must be considered while judging.

Table 4: Cultural Influences

Sub-Theme	Weightage
Western Philosophies	0.3
Eastern Philosophies	0.3
Integration of Spirituality	0.2
Cultural Perspectives	0.2

4.3 Theme 3: Technological Impact

AI, Robotics, and Ethics were complicated "Technological Impact" sub-themes in legal personhood. These sub-themes highlighted the complex relationship between technology, ethics, and society. Artificial intelligence and robotics raise the issue of synthetic entity legal personhood. Survey respondents from different fields had different views (See Table 5). Respondent 3, an AI researcher, believed AI would become lawful. AI's cognitive powers exceeded humans', raising legal rights and obligations issues. Respondent 7, a digital entrepreneur, argued AI lawyers should be more ethical and responsible. Ethical concerns regarding AI personhood hurt optimism. Respondent 10, an ethics expert, advocated against giving

AI creatures human qualities to distinguish intelligent activity from awareness. This perspective highlights AI entities' moral and legal accountability for malfunctions and harm. Legal researcher Respondent 12 emphasized analyzing AI personhood's effects on legal systems. Respondents worried about technology ethics beyond AI and robotics. Technological advances' environmental implications were prioritized. Respondent 4, an environmentalist, noted that technology is aggravating environmental degradation and called for critical assessment of humanity's ethical responsibility to the environment. Respondent 8, a social scientist, stressed the necessity of ethical frameworks in responsible nanotechnology and biotechnology development and use.

Table 5: Technological Impact

Sub-Theme	Weightage
AI and Robotics	0.35
Ethical Considerations	0.15
Potential Legal Personhood	0.2
Implications for Society	0.15
Future Legal Landscapes	0.1
Regulatory Frameworks	0.05

4.4 Theme 4: Legal Implications

The legal frameworks of different countries are complex and inconsistent. Respondents critically assessed the limitations and challenges of contemporary legal frameworks' human-centered personhood conceptions (See Table 6). Respondent 2, an experienced legal expert, echoed a generally held perspective that definitions that favor humans typically fail to fully reflect non-human animals' rights and interests. Respondent 5 also said the current law fails to address moral and ethical issues raised by technology advances, particularly in artificial intelligence and robotics. This fits the debate about artificial intelligence's personhood and the need for evolving legal systems. Petrossian et al., have called for a more complete legal system that recognizes animals as legal entities (Petrossian et al., 2024), challenging anthropocentric presumptions. Despite these limits, respondents acknowledged legislative change's complexity. Respondent 8, an experienced attorney, said legal reform involves careful consideration of future repercussions and stringent legal rules. For legal change to be dependable and efficient, legal professionals, politicians, and stakeholders must deliberate. Participants proposed many legal amendments to address future issues and fix legal system flaws. Respondent 1 suggested giving non-human creatures legal personality.

Proponents say this regulation is essential for protecting the environment and animals since it recognizes their legal rights and interests. A respected policy analyst, Respondent 6, underlined the importance of technology ethics legislation. The proactive legal system emphasizes that governments must pass laws that protect all sentient creatures, regardless of species or origin, and promote ethics. Respondent 3, an experienced lawyer, said legal systems resist change because existing interests may preclude legal person identification. Respondent 9, an experienced legislator, underlined the significance of working with parliamentarians, legal experts, and civil society to pass legislation that reflects society's values and goals.

Table 6: Legal Implications

Sub-Theme	Weightage
Current Legal Frameworks	0.5
Proposed Legal Changes	0.3
Challenges and Limitations	0.1
Societal Impact	0.1

5. DISCUSSION

Values and ideas shape cultural views on legal entities. This topic explains how Western and Eastern intellectual traditions produced legal personhood. Cartesian dualism and Enlightenment ideas of human agency and rationality impact Western legal personality definitions. Legal systems that favor humans over animals emphasize human interests and skills. Western legal systems have defined personhood as a collection of rational, individual people, respondents said. This system lacks non-human rights and interests, according to Gellers (Gellers, 2021). Eastern philosophical systems challenge Western individualism and approach personality holistically. While humans are the basis of existence, Buddhism and Taoism promote peace with nature. This whole personality concept recognizes the significance and potential of all cosmic entities, transcending the idea that people are unique. Eastern civilizations may encourage a humanistic view that goes beyond nature. This honors all life and its complicated relationships. Mixing cultural perspectives on legal entities is recommended. Lawyers and policymakers may evaluate how Western and Eastern ideas affect individuals while creating fair and inclusive legal systems that respect cultural norms. Cultural sensitivity and diversity in judicial decisions are essential to reflecting society's varied perspectives on persons. We perceive legal individuals differently due to biotechnology,

automation, and AI. Technology's ethical and legal effects on autonomous beings were studied in this study. AI and robotics present legal identity concerns. Legal rights and responsibilities are their first emphasis. Recent breakthroughs in cognitive and autonomous technologies made respondents hopeful about AI's legal effects. Concerning ethical aspects of AI personality include legal liability and accountability for AI-driven conduct. Giving AI beings legal personality requires serious consideration to balance ethics and innovation and explored AI and robot ethics. Survey respondents worried about technology's environmental impact, emphasizing ethics in risk reduction. The discussion says proactive regulation supports public interests and addresses ethical difficulties. Ethical technology growth requires responsible innovation and regulatory oversight. It highlights the complex link between ethics, technology, and society. Cultural implications on legal personhood highlighted a complex relationship between legal systems and culture. Our thesis examined how Western and Eastern culture effect legal personhood. Western nations are molded by Cartesian dualism and Enlightenment ideas of individual independence and logical thought under law. Human-centered personhood ignores non-human animals in legal disputes (Vatter & De Leeuw, 2023). Western intellectual traditions have influenced judicial systems because respondents describe personality as individuality and rationality. Eastern thinkers broaden Personhood to confront Western anthropocentrism. Taoist and Buddhist doctrines promote nature harmony. People believe humanity embodies existence. This comprehensive personality approach valued all living things, not just individuals (Hepburn, 2002). Participants examined how Eastern cultural ideas affect judicial systems and called for a wider concept of personhood beyond human boundaries. The cultural implications of legal personhood stress cultural sensitivity and variety in legal decision-making. By understanding how Western and Eastern notions affect legal system participants, policymakers and lawyers can establish equitable and inclusive legal frameworks that respect diverse cultural cultures' values and convictions. Addressing complex identity issues requires cross-cultural communication and understanding. Legal consequences show personality-based issues in current legal systems. Current legislation, flaws, and proposed legal reforms to address new issues and reinforce legislative frameworks are covered here. Animal rights are usually ignored in favor of humans (Strohminger & Jordan, 2022). Respondents wanted more flexible and inclusive laws but worried about current regulations. Nonhuman entities' moral and legal rights were discussed. It also stressed the necessity for legislative amendments to

include other entities in legal personality. The proposed legal changes can address rising ethical challenges and promote more egalitarian judicial systems. Participants submitted legislation to address technology-related ethics and environmental protection. The discourse stressed the importance of cooperating with legislators, legal professionals, and civil society to implement appropriate, socially beneficial legislative reforms.

6. CONCLUSION

This study examined the cultural, technological, and legal aspects of legal entities and the difficulty of defining personhood in a changing context. Legal entities were investigated from cultural and technological perspectives. A deep understanding of cultural practices revealed a complicated web of legal personhood conceptions. Western individualism and Cartesian dualism, as well as Eastern conceptions of nature's interdependence, affect legal personhood. Understand and accept your cultural identity to promote cultural understanding and diversity in legal decision-making. A technological effect study concluded that AI, robots, and biotechnology affect personhood. Technological advancement can boost efficiency and innovation, but also raises ethical questions about autonomous entities' legal and moral position. Responsible innovation and regulatory control are needed to ensure that technology advances ethically and improves society. The complexity and limitations of modern legal systems for individuals have been highlighted via legal repercussions. The article suggested ethical solutions and expanded legal systems. These methods discovered legislative flaws and offered fixes. Politicians and legal experts can construct fair and reasonable legal systems that respect human and nonhuman rights and dignity. Campaigning for nonhumans' moral and legal rights can do this.

6.1 Implications

6.1.1 Practical Implications

Political and legal decision-makers are affected by this research. The cultural perspectives of legal practitioners highlight the necessity for cultural sensitivity in legal decision-making. Policymakers and practitioners should incorporate multiple cultural perspectives when creating legal frameworks since cultural beliefs and values shape identity. It can ensure that legal personhood is consistent with the values of many cultures and promote fairness and inclusivity in the legal system by doing so.

Technology influence research emphasizes the need for proactive governance and ethical norms to handle developing technological concerns. Legislative and regulatory agencies must build comprehensive frameworks for AI, robot, and biotechnology research and application. This can reduce technological risks and provide ethical and social benefits. The study's legal implications suggest legislative reform. This literature can help policymakers and attorneys create fair and comprehensive legal systems through legislation. Politicians who defend non-human animals' moral and legal rights can assist create legal systems that respect all life. Active participation by individuals or groups with a vested interest in an issue is necessary to maintain legal systems that can adapt to society's evolving values and ambitions and to implement major legal changes.

6.1.2 Theoretical Implications

This discovery supports legal personality and has many theoretical implications. It initially offers factual information to theoretical frameworks on cultural, technical, and legal factors affecting personhood. This study examines how cultural perspectives affect legal frameworks and emphasizes cultural sensitivity in legal decisions. Theoretical considerations of legal personhood's cultural relativity are also its goal. A study of technological influence illuminates the ethical and legal implications of technological growth, adding to technology, ethics, and society debates. This essay also discusses personhood legislation's limitations and offers legal restructuring to enable legal reform discussions. This study supports theoretical arguments for legal personhood by promoting non-human animal moral and legal rights. It also stresses the significance of proactive legislation and ethics to address developing issues. This study provides empirical data and insights into the complex interaction of cultural, technical, and legal factors that shape personhood, improving theoretical understanding of legal persons.

6.2 Limitations and Future Direction

6.2.1 Limitations

This research illuminates cultural, technological, and legal dimensions of legal personhood, but it has limitations. Due to the small study sample, the findings may initially be limited in their applicability. The limited sample size may not accurately represent legal personhood opinions, despite efforts to ensure diversity. Further research using a larger and more diverse sample can help explain legal personhood. Additionally, this qualitative

study may struggle to demonstrate causal links between variables. Thematic analysis provides valuable insights into participants' experiences and ideas, but it does not prove causality. Future mixed-methods research could improve understanding of legal personhood by integrating qualitative and quantitative data. This study concentrated on cultural, technological, and legal characteristics of legal individuals, ignoring other factors that may affect personhood. The study did not thoroughly explore social, religious, and historical elements that influence personhood views, despite their potential importance. Additional studies could examine additional traits to better understand legal personhood. The particular cultural and legal setting of the study may limit its implementation. Cultural attitudes, legislative frameworks, and technical developments vary across countries and regions, limiting the generalizability of study findings. Cultural, technological, and legal aspects of legal personhood must be explored across legal systems and civilizations to confirm the findings.

6.2.2 Future Direction

Despite its limitations, this study presents many research opportunities. Further research could examine how cultural, technological, and legal elements affect legal personhood. Researchers can better understand legal personality difficulties by studying these interactions. Future research should study how social rank, religion, and history affect legal entities. Taking a broader picture of legal people and their development will help researchers understand the numerous perspectives. Future research could use mixed-methods to improve qualitative findings with quantitative data. By triangulating data from multiple sources, researchers can better understand legal personhood and show cause-and-effect relationships. Legal personhood for non-human species, communities, and ecosystems could be studied further. Academics can evaluate legal systems' justice, equality, and long-term viability by examining how legal personhood affects different parties.

References

Allison, T. A., Gubner, J. M., Oh, A., Harrison, K. L., Pham, K., Barnes, D. E., Johnson, J. K., Covinsky, K. E., & Smith, A. K. (2022). Meaningful activities and sources of meaning for community-dwelling people living with dementia. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, *23*(7), 1191-1196. e1191.

Andaya, E., & Campo-Engelstein, L. (2021). Conceptualizing pain and personhood in the periviable period: perspectives from reproductive health and neonatal intensive care unit clinicians. *Social Science & Medicine*, *269*, 113558.

Anderson, P., Davidson, G., Doherty, F., Hanna, H., Harper, C., Lynch, G., McClelland, R., & McKenna, C. (2023). Legal capacity, developmental capacity, and impaired mental capacity in children under 16: Neurodevelopment and the law in Northern Ireland. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, *87*, 101872.

Arstein-Kerslake, A., & Black, J. (2020). Right to legal capacity in therapeutic jurisprudence: Insights from critical disability theory and the convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, *68*, 101535.

Arstein-Kerslake, A., O'Donnell, E., Kayess, R., & Watson, J. (2021). Relational personhood: A conception of legal personhood with insights from disability rights and environmental law. *Griffith Law Review*, *30*(3), 530-555.

Blair, H. (2023). Saving India's rivers: Ecology, civil society, religion, and legal personhood. *World Development Sustainability*, *3*, 100068.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Confalonieri, R., Lucchesi, F., Maffei, G., & Catuara-Solarz, S. (2022). A unified framework for managing sex and gender bias in AI models for healthcare. In *Sex and gender bias in technology and artificial intelligence* (pp. 179-204). Elsevier.

Elnaiem, A., Mohamed-Ahmed, O., Zumla, A., Mecaskey, J., Charron, N., Abakar, M. F., Raji, T., Bahalim, A., Manikam, L., & Risk, O. (2023). Global and regional governance of One Health and implications for global health security. *The lancet*, *401*(10377), 688-704.

Fernandes, J. V. (2022). Robot citizenship and gender (in) equality: the case of Sophia the robot in Saudi Arabia. *Janus. Net. Vol. 12, n. 2-Thematic dossier-The Middle East. Local dynamics, regional actors, global challeges*, 51-64.

Gellers, J. C. (2021). Earth system law and the legal status of non-humans in the Anthropocene. *Earth System Governance*, *7*, 100083.

Glavovic, B. (2024). Governance Experiences and Prospects in Estuarine and Coastal Communities.

Habuza, T., Navaz, A. N., Hashim, F., Alnajjar, F., Zaki, N., Serhani, M. A., & Statsenko, Y. (2021). AI applications in robotics, diagnostic image analysis and precision medicine: Current limitations, future trends, guidelines on CAD systems for medicine. *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked*, *24*, 100596.

Hepburn, S. J. (2002). Touristic forms of life in Nepal. *Annals of tourism research*, *29*(3), 611-630.

Holzinger, A., Keiblinger, K., Holub, P., Zatloukal, K., & Müller, H. (2023). AI for life: Trends in artificial intelligence for biotechnology. *New Biotechnology*, *74*, 16-24.

Kahui, V., Armstrong, C. W., & Aanesen, M. (2024). Comparative analysis of Rights of Nature (RoN) case studies worldwide: Features of emergence and design. *Ecological Economics*, *221*, 108193.

Kalpokiene, J., & Kalpokas, I. (2023). Creative encounters of a posthuman kind–anthropocentric law, artificial intelligence, and art. *Technology in Society*, *72*, 102197.

Kempeneer, S. (2021). A big data state of mind: Epistemological challenges to accountability and transparency in data-driven regulation. *Government Information Quarterly*, *38*(3), 101578.

Kramm, M. (2020). When a river becomes a person. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, *21*(4), 307-319.

Lazcoz, G., & De Hert, P. (2023). Humans in the GDPR and AIA governance of automated and algorithmic systems. Essential pre-requisites against abdicating responsibilities. *Computer Law & Security Review*, *50*, 105833.

Leary, D., Hu, N.-T. A., & Wu, P.-F. (2021). Gilt Dragons, porcelain and plundered doubloons: A comparative analysis of Taiwan and Australian underwater cultural heritage protection laws. *Marine Policy*, *134*, 104787.

Ma, E., Du, J., Xu, S. T., Wang, Y.-C., & Lin, X. (2022). When proactive employees meet the autonomy of work—A moderated mediation model based on agency theory and job characteristics theory. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *107*, 103326.

Marshall, B. (2023). No legal personhood for AI. *Patterns*, *4*(11).

Motta, A. P., & Veth, P. M. (2021). Relational ontologies and performance: Identifying humans and nonhuman animals in the rock art from north-eastern Kimberley, Australia. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, *63*, 101333.

Neha, T., Reese, E., Schaughency, E., & Taumoepeau, M. (2020). The role of whānau (New Zealand Māori families) for Māori children's early learning. *Developmental Psychology*, *56*(8), 1518.

Nguyen, T. T. T., Malek, L., Umberger, W. J., & O'Connor, P. J. (2022). Household food waste disposal behaviour is driven by perceived personal benefits, recycling habits and ability to compost. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *379*, 134636.

Nowik, P. (2021). Electronic personhood for artificial intelligence in the workplace. *Computer Law & Security Review*, *42*, 105584.

Pain, N., & Pepper, R. (2021). Can personhood protect the environment? Affording legal rights to nature. *Fordham Int'l LJ*, *45*, 315.

Petrossian, G. A., Elwin, A., Sosnowski, M., Nunphong, T., Chiang, H.-T., Riungu, J. K., & D'Cruze, N. (2024). A synthesis of wild animal-related trade laws in some of the World's most biodiverse countries. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *354*, 120141.

Prasad, M. D., & Ansari, S. (2023). Legal and ethical accountability of fossil fuel corporations: Need for a new social contract. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *423*, 138830.

Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges and vulnerabilities. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, *4*, 100005.

Singha, K., Pandit, P., Maity, S., & Maiti, S. (2022). Techno-economic analysis of present process in textile industry. In *Applications of Biotechnology for Sustainable Textile Production* (pp. 23-46). Elsevier.

Stepanov, S. K. (2021). Deconstruction of the legal personhood of artificial intelligence. *Digital LJ*, *2*, 14.

Strohminger, N., & Jordan, M. R. (2022). Corporate insecthood. *Cognition*, *224*, 105068.

Vatter, M., & De Leeuw, M. (2023). Human rights, legal personhood and the impersonality of embodied life. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, *19*(1), 106-125.

Vinnari, E., & Vinnari, M. (2022). Making the invisibles visible: Including animals in sustainability (and) accounting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *82*, 102324.

Worthington, M., & Spender, P. (2021). Constructing legal personhood: corporate law's legacy. *Griffith Law Review*, *30*(3), 348-373.