Automating Her Own Job: An Ethics Case Study

Ayush Gala
Department of Computer Science
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27606
Email: agala2@ncsu.edu

***Abstract*—This case study examines the ethical complexities of covert workplace automation where a software engineer automated their data entry responsibilities without disclosure, reducing a month's work to minutes while maintaining appearances through deliberate error insertion. The analysis explores the tension between technological innovation and professional transparency in our increasingly AI-driven workplace. By evaluating stakeholder impacts through multiple ethical frameworks, this study develops an integrated approach combining gradual automation disclosure, cross-functional automation teams, and knowledge distribution. The essay provides actionable recommendations for ethically managing workplace automation that balances innovation imperatives with professional integrity across individual, organizational, and societal domains.**

I. Introduction

The accelerating integration of automation technologies into traditional work environments creates ethical challenges that require rigorous examination. This study examines a case where a programmer covertly automated their full-time data entry position, reducing monthly workflow processes to minutes while maintaining appearances through strategic error insertion. This scenario highlights the growing tension between technological capability and professional ethics in modern workplaces, illuminating critical ethical dimensions: concealment of efficiency improvements, misalignment between compensation and effort, and broader implications for trust-based workplace relationships in an era of increasing automation potential. As organizations struggle to modernize legacy systems, the ethical management of employee-driven automation initiatives becomes increasingly relevant. Rather than a simple ethical violation, this case reveals systemic contradictions in organizational approaches to technological transformation. The analysis applies multiple ethical frameworks to develop actionable guidance for navigating automation ethics in contemporary software engineering environments.

March 21, 2025

II. Problem Definition

This case presents a sophisticated ethical challenge in workplace automation, where an employee covertly automated data entry responsibilities while maintaining appearances of full-time engagement. [1] The situation encompasses interconnected ethical dimensions: deliberate deception through programmatic error insertion, misalignment between compensation and productivity, and the organizational opportunity cost of concealed efficiency innovations. It encapsulates broader tensions in modern professional environments, particularly the conflict between technological advancement and employment security. This contradiction often leads to counterproductive dynamics where individuals conceal automation innovations, creating organizational blind spots that impede transparency and technological evolution. The case raises fundamental questions about managing employee-initiated automation, establishing frameworks for efficiency disclosures, and aligning incentive structures in increasingly automated environments. These considerations extend to address significant sociotechnical challenges including the future of knowledge work, the role of transparency in professional trust relationships, and the equitable distribution of automation-derived benefits in organizations undergoing digital transformation.

III. Relevant Facts

The developer's implementation of automated data processing scripts represents a significant case study in professional ethics at the intersection of software engineering and workplace responsibilities. The technical implementation involved sophisticated scripting to parse data, construct SQL operations, and introduce controlled errors to simulate human work. [2] This scenario encompasses fundamental ethical considerations in modern software development, including transparency obligations, professional accountability, and organizational trust. Research indicates undisclosed automation can undermine organizational trust while preventing proper evaluation of improvement opportunities. [3] IEEE standards [4] emphasize transparency and accountability as core ethical requirements, making the developer's concealment problematic from a professional ethics perspective. The automation of business-critical processes without appropriate governance raises substantial ethical concerns, especially as intentional error insertion contravenes principles of professional integrity. Although the employee technically fulfilled contractual requirements, their approach raises questions about equitable distribution of automation benefits and appropriate ethical responses to efficiency improvements. [5] Modern regulatory frameworks, including GDPR, emphasize transparency in automated operations, suggesting such concealment might violate contemporary compliance standards. This situation highlights the broader challenges organizations face in navigating workplace automation ethics, emphasizing the need for transparent frameworks, clear communication channels,

and balanced policies that protect stakeholder interests while promoting technological advancement. [6]

IV. Stakeholders

A. Primary Stakeholders

The automation scenario involves three key stakeholder groups with competing interests. First, the employee (Eve) who benefits from significant quality-of-life improvements while nominally delivering required outputs through sophisticated automation. Second, the employer organization, which maintains a business-critical legacy system but remains unaware of significant efficiency potential. Third, quality assurance analysts who unknowingly perform redundant verification tasks necessitated by intentionally introduced errors. This situation represents a fundamental misalignment between individual efficiency innovations and organizational transparency requirements.

B. Secondary Stakeholders

Beyond immediate participants, the case impacts broader stakeholder networks including the general workforce vulnerable to automation-related displacement and customers whose data resides within the legacy system. These stakeholder groups experience indirect effects from undisclosed automated processes and the wider implications of digital transformation within organizational ecosystems.

C. Stakeholder Conflicts

The case reveals layers of conflict, including tensions between Eve's personal benefits and organizational transparency requirements, and broader systemic conflicts between innovation opportunities and existing employment structures. These highlight fundamental challenges in contemporary workplace relationships. The scenario underscores the necessity for balanced frameworks that address individual concerns while promoting organizational efficiency and maintaining ethical standards in automated systems deployment.

V. Options

A. Gradual Automation Disclosure

This phased approach involves incrementally introducing automation capabilities through three strategic phases: initial process documentation (Phase 1), partial automation with manual oversight (Phase 2), and full automation with built-in transparency (Phase 3). The methodology enables organizations to adapt workflows while preserving employment value through continuous skill development.

B. Cross-functional automation team

The proposed team structure combines technical staff (40%), operations managers (30%), and frontline employees (30%) to identify automation opportunities while considering workforce impacts. This model ensures balanced decision-making through monthly automation reviews and impact assessment protocols.

C. Knowledge distribution

This strategy transitions from manual data entry to supervised automation with emphasis on the employee's evolving responsibility in system maintenance and training. This approach particularly benefits technical support roles by facilitating programming skill development and creating opportunities for cross-functional knowledge exchange.

D. Value-based contract model

This approach transforms the employment relationship into a deliverable-based contract model that directly connects compensation with value creation, resulting in more transparent relationships and expanded economic potential while potentially introducing new uncertainty for employees.

E. Open source efforts

This option involves developing shared automation tools while maintaining proprietary versions, transforming the ethical dilemma into an industry-wide improvement opportunity particularly beneficial for resource-constrained organizations seeking automation benefits.

VI. Software Design

A. Overview

The current system requires fundamental ethical and technical improvements to address transparency deficiencies and validation concerns. A comprehensive redesign centered on ethical automation principles would eliminate deceptive practices while maintaining efficiency advantages and introducing appropriate governance controls.

B. Core components

The redesigned architecture implements two critical systems:

1) Phased Automation Modules: This framework implements version-controlled automation rollouts with built-in capability monitoring, real-time performance dashboards, and standardized quality metrics. The system automatically captures and reports processing statistics with appropriate granularity, ensuring complete visibility into automation operations.

2) Collaborative validation system: Rather than artificial error insertion, this component employs intelligent validation that identifies genuine edge cases requiring human review, provides specialized verification tools for quality analysts, and establishes continuous improvement feedback loops. This approach transforms quality assurance from a deceptive process into a collaborative enhancement opportunity.

C. Technical implementation

The design incorporates role-based access control and clear separation of duties through a structured class-based architecture. The following code demonstrates the core EthicalAutomation class implementation:

```python
class GradualAutomation:
  def __init__(self, phase=1):
    self.phase = phase
    self.logger = AuditLogger()

  def execute_phase(self, ip_data):
    self.logger.start_phase(self.phase)
      if self.phase == 1:
        return self.doc_process(ip_data)
      elif self.phase == 2:
        return self.part_automate(ip_data)
      else:
        return self.full_automate(ip_data)

  def doc_process(self, data):
    # Manual documentation logic
    return ProcessDocumentation(data)

class AutomationTeam:
  def __init__(self, members):
    self.technical = members['tech']
    self.operations = members['ops']
    self.staff = members['staff']

  def review_automation(self, prop):
    return {
      'tech_score': self.tech.eval(prop),
      'ops_score': self.ops.assess(prop),
      'staff_feedback':
                self.staff.survey(prop)
    }
```

Listing 1. Example Python Code

This implementation ensures automation enhances rather than circumvents business controls while empowering stakeholders through improved capabilities rather than deception.

VII. Testing

A. Gradual Automation Disclosure

Significantly mitigates potential harm by preserving employment while improving operational efficiency gradually. This approach demonstrates ethical integrity through honest disclosure of automation capabilities and creates defensible value by promoting both business efficiency and employee well-being. The solution aligns with IEEE standards for transparency and accountability in autonomous systems, satisfying professional ethics requirements while facilitating organizational advancement through responsible risk management.

B. Cross-functional automation team

It addresses potential future job displacement through strategic integration of human oversight with automated processes. This approach demonstrates a commitment to quality assurance and staff development while presenting a defensible model for responsible automation with appropriate human verification. The strategy creates a collaborative innovation environment that strengthens team relationships, ultimately enhancing organizational capabilities through balanced responsibility allocation.

C. Knowledge distribution

Creates sustainable opportunities through skill development, demonstrating organizational investment in employee advancement. This approach represents a defensible commitment to workforce development by providing employees with valuable transferable skills that increase their market value. The strategy promotes continuous learning and professional growth while meeting industry standards for professional development.

D. Value based contract model

This presents significant concerns regarding job security and employment stability, potentially failing fundamental harm prevention tests. It faces substantial scrutiny regarding employment terms and conditions, making it difficult to defend if it reduces employee benefits or protections. The model may significantly diminish employee bargaining power while prioritizing efficiency metrics over employee welfare, potentially violating professional standards for employee protection and raising legal and ethical concerns.

E. Open source efforts

Open Source Innovation serves broader community interests while preserving individual value contributions, demonstrating industry leadership through collaborative advancement. The strategy promotes knowledge sharing and community building while adhering to open source ethical standards, effectively balancing innovation imperatives with intellectual property considerations.

F. Insights

1) Harm Test Analysis: The Harm Test analysis in this workplace automation scenario yields compelling findings across different options. The Gradual Automation Disclosure approach produces favorable results as it actively mitigates potential harm to all stakeholders by conserving jobs and improving operational efficiency in a phased manner. This gradual disclosure mitigates the psychological harm of abrupt changes while ensuring job stability. Notably, the Cross-functional Automation Team strategy also passes the Harm Test by limiting future job displacement through the deliberate integration of diverse perspectives and collaborative decision-making. However, Service-based Restructuring fails this test since it has the potential to jeopardize job security and cause psychological stress among employees, particularly those in data entry and quality assurance positions. The exam shows how harm prevention must consider the long-term psychological and professional well-being of all individuals involved in the automation process.

2) Defensibility Test Analysis: The Defensibility Test yields highly nuanced outcomes in terms of workplace automation ethics. Gradual Automation Disclosure is highly defensible since it promotes both business efficiency and employee welfare through a measured approach, making it easily justifiable to all stakeholders, including management, employees, and industry analysts. The strategy is publicly defendable because it strikes a balance between technological progress and ethical considerations over time. The Cross-functional Automation Team demonstrates strong defensibility through its dedication to responsible automation with diverse oversight, resulting in a sustainable model for technological integration. In contrast, Service-based Restructuring faces defensibility challenges due to the possible detrimental impact on employee benefits and working conditions, making it difficult to justify to both internal and external stakeholders. The test demonstrates how solutions that balance innovation with human well-being through collaborative approaches are more defensible than those that prioritize efficiency alone.

3) Professional Test Analysis: The Professional Test examination provides vital information about adherence to industry standards and ethical requirements. Gradual Automation Disclosure aligns with IEEE principles of transparency and responsibility in autonomous systems, meeting professional criteria for implementing ethical automation in a phased manner. The Cross-functional Automation Team strategy meets professional development criteria by focusing on diverse skill utilization and collaborative decision-making while adhering to ethical technology deployment norms. However, service-based restructuring may breach professional requirements for employee protection and ethical automation methods. This test underlines how professional ethics in technology adoption must strike a balance between innovation and existing industry rules, as well as worker protection principles. The findings emphasize the need to retain professional integrity while developing technical capabilities in the workplace through collaborative and gradual approaches.

VIII. Tentative choice

Based on an analysis of the five options, Gradual Automation Disclosure emerges as the optimal approach. This methodology addresses the fundamental ethical concerns of deception and value misalignment while providing equitable benefits across all stakeholder groups over time. The approach acknowledges automation achievements while creating a pathway for evolution that preserves employee value creation in a phased manner. The model effectively addresses both immediate ethical concerns and establishes a foundation for sustainable development.

IX. Final Choice

After a thorough evaluation, Gradual Automation Disclosure remains the optimal solution, enhanced with elements from the Cross-functional Automation Team and Knowledge Transfer approaches. This integrated strategy resolves the immediate dilemma while establishing infrastructure for a more transparent, innovative, and equitable workplace that rewards automation initiatives appropriately through collaborative and phased implementation.

A. Prevention Strategies

Individual professionals should establish comprehensive disclosure protocols for gradual automation initiatives, maintaining detailed documentation of efficiency improvements and innovations at each phase. Regular communication with cross-functional teams regarding process enhancements should be coupled with ongoing development of expertise in ethical automation methodologies. Active participation in diverse professional communities specializing in ethical technology implementation provides essential support networks and perspectives. Organizations must implement structured innovation recognition mechanisms, beginning with formal Innovation Reward Programs that incentivize efficiency improvements across departments. Development of transparent, phased automation policies coupled with regular Cross-functional Innovation Sessions creates an environment where technological advancements are properly acknowledged and rewarded. Establishment of robust ethical AI frameworks for all automation activities ensures consistent governance across initiatives, with input from diverse stakeholders.

B. Societal Impact

Policy advocates should collaborate with organizations to develop industry standards for ethical workplace automation, promoting worker protection legislation and supporting educational initiatives that foster ethical technology development through gradual and collaborative approaches. This requires sharing anonymized case studies that demonstrate ethical automation practices and contributing to automation frameworks that democratize access to improvements. Leaders should actively participate in forums addressing automation ethics while modeling internal policy regarding automation.

X. Conclusion

As AI capabilities continue advancing exponentially, the ethical frameworks governing automation deployment become increasingly consequential for organizational success and workforce stability. The case demonstrates how contemporary software engineers must navigate complex ethical terrain when their technical capabilities outpace organizational processes. By establishing transparent pathways for innovation disclosure and appropriate rewards, organizations can harness the full potential of employee-driven automation while maintaining trust relationships essential for sustainable operation.

Acknowledgement

I'd like to thank Dr. Tim Menzies from North Carolina State University for giving me the chance to explore this important topic of workplace automation ethics. I'm also grateful to Dr. Michael J. Quinn for providing the original case study that inspired this analysis. Their support and insights were crucial in helping me examine the ethical implications of workplace automation.

REFERENCES

[1] M. J. Quinn, "Automating Her Own Job," Online Ethics Center, 2018. DOI: 10.18130/nzpx-b435.

[2] "Is it unethical for me to not tell my employer I've automated my job?" The Workplace, Jul. 2017.

[3] S. Mougdir, "What is in the black box: The ethical implications of algorithms and transparency in the age of the GDPR," Journal of AI, Robotics & Workplace Automation, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 90-100, Sep. 2023.

[4] A. F. Winfield et al., "IEEE P7001: A Proposed Standard on Transparency," Frontiers in Robotics and AI, Jul. 2021.

[5] M. Prorok and I. Tak´ acs, "Legal and Moral Issues Related to Artificial Intelligence Technology in Business," in Proc. IEEE 21st Jubilee International Symposium on Intelligent Systems and Informatics (SISY), 2023, pp. 451-456.

[6] Y. Chen and X. Li, "Improvement and Replacement: The Dual Impact of AI on Human Work," International Journal of Social Science and Economics, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 45-62, 2023.