Algorithmic Surveillance and Inequality

Sol Mierzwa
CSCI 101
Professor Eve
October 4, 2025

Algorithmic Surveillance and Inequality

In the modern digital age, algorithms shape nearly every aspect of daily life, from the content we see online to the decisions that shape our opportunities. As technology becomes more advanced and deeply embedded into society, algorithmic surveillance—where computers monitor and evaluate human behavior—continues to expand. While many technologies are introduced as neutral tools for efficiency and safety, they often reinforce social inequalities and harm the most vulnerable communities. These systems are not merely technical mechanisms; they are reflections of the values, assumptions, and biases embedded in the society that creates them. As a result, algorithmic surveillance does not simply observe society—it actively shapes it. This paper explores how algorithmic systems disproportionately target marginalized groups, create inequality, and reduce human autonomy, drawing connections between real-world examples and class concepts.

One of the central concerns surrounding algorithmic surveillance is its impact on historically marginalized communities. Predictive policing systems, for example, use data to determine where crime is most likely to occur and who might commit it. On the surface, this may seem like a neutral and effective strategy for crime reduction. However, because the data fed into these systems reflects years of biased policing practices, they often reinforce those same patterns. Areas that have historically been over-policed—often low-income neighborhoods and communities of color—are labeled as high-risk zones, leading to increased monitoring and police presence. This creates a cycle: more surveillance leads to more arrests in those neighborhoods, reinforcing the data and making it appear that those communities are inherently more criminal. In reality, what the system is detecting is not criminal behavior but the legacy of discrimination. Research by Angwin et al. (2016) shows that algorithms like COMPAS often rate Black defendants as “high risk” at nearly double the rate of white defendants with similar records, illustrating how supposedly objective tools can perpetuate historical racial disparities.

Algorithmic bias extends beyond policing and into the criminal justice system itself. Risk assessment tools influence decisions about bail, sentencing, and parole, often determining the freedom or confinement of individuals. These tools, while designed to be impartial, rely on historical crime data that already reflects systemic bias. As a result, minority communities face

Algorithmic Surveillance and Inequality

Sol Mierzwa
CSCI 101
Professor Eve
October 4, 2025

heightened scrutiny, more severe penalties, and reduced opportunities for rehabilitation. This highlights a fundamental problem: algorithms are not inherently fair or neutral; they mirror the inequalities already present in society. Whittaker and Crawford (2018) argue that policing algorithms often operate without public oversight, making it difficult for communities to challenge discriminatory outcomes or hold institutions accountable. Consequently, people who are already marginalized bear the brunt of algorithmic decision-making.

These inequities extend into the economic sphere. Corporations increasingly rely on algorithms to manage pricing, loans, credit approvals, and hiring decisions. Pandey et al. (2021) demonstrate that ride-hailing algorithms often charge higher prices and assign longer wait times in low-income or predominantly minority neighborhoods, creating what researchers call a form of digital redlining. Similarly, banking and retail algorithms can target or exclude individuals from deals or financial opportunities based on their purchasing history, location, or other predictive metrics. What appears to be "efficiency" is often structural economic discrimination, where marginalized communities are systematically disadvantaged in ways that are invisible to most consumers. The effect is a widening wealth gap, perpetuated not by explicit intent but by automated systems trained on biased data.

Employment and hiring are other areas where algorithmic surveillance amplifies inequality. AI-based recruitment tools evaluate résumés, screen candidates, and even rank applicants based on perceived "fit." While these tools promise speed and efficiency, they often rely on historical hiring data that reflects existing workplace biases. Chen et al. (2023) found that AI hiring software disproportionately filters out candidates from underrepresented backgrounds due to biased data inputs. These systems evaluate factors such as the language used in résumés, the schools attended, and even the name of the applicant—factors that correlate with race and socioeconomic status. As a result, qualified candidates may be unfairly excluded from job opportunities, reinforcing occupational stratification and limiting social mobility. This process converts social prejudice into quantifiable metrics, giving the appearance of objectivity while perpetuating inequality.

Healthcare is another sector affected by algorithmic bias. AI tools in medical diagnostics, patient monitoring, and treatment recommendations rely heavily on large datasets. When these datasets underrepresent minority groups, the resulting algorithms are less accurate for those populations. Agarwal et al. (2023) show that medical AI models can predict worse health outcomes for minority patients because the training data does not fully reflect their

Sol Mierzwa
CSCI 101
Professor Eve
October 4, 2025

physiological and socioeconomic realities. Misdiagnosis, delayed treatment, and unequal access to care can result, illustrating that algorithmic inequality can have physical consequences. In a society that increasingly relies on technology for essential services, these disparities are particularly alarming.

Despite these challenges, some critics argue that algorithms are neutral tools and that bias arises only from human misuse. However, studies such as Grother et al. (2019) demonstrate measurable disparities in algorithmic accuracy across demographic groups, particularly in facial recognition. These disparities exist even when human intervention is minimal, showing that bias is embedded in the technology itself. While human oversight can reduce some negative outcomes, it is not sufficient. Systemic reform, including diverse data collection, algorithmic audits, and public accountability, is essential to address inherent bias. Without structural change, neutrality remains an aspirational ideal rather than a practical reality.

To address these issues, several solutions have been proposed. Policymakers can require transparency in algorithmic decision-making, mandating public audits and reporting of potential biases. Corporations can diversify datasets and incorporate fairness metrics into model development. Interdisciplinary collaboration among computer scientists, sociologists, ethicists, and policymakers can ensure that algorithmic systems are designed with equity in mind. Public awareness campaigns can educate communities about their digital rights and the implications of algorithmic surveillance. Taken together, these measures create a framework for accountability and fairness that moves beyond simple technical fixes.

In conclusion, algorithmic surveillance has far-reaching implications for social justice and equality. It influences policing, criminal justice, employment, healthcare, and commerce, disproportionately impacting marginalized communities. Algorithms are not inherently neutral; they replicate existing inequalities, often invisibly and automatically. To create a more equitable digital society, stakeholders must prioritize transparency, accountability, and inclusivity in algorithm design and implementation. Only through deliberate reform can technology serve as a tool for empowerment rather than a mechanism of discrimination. By understanding and acting on these challenges, society can ensure that algorithmic systems benefit everyone, not just those who already hold power.

Algorithmic Surveillance and Inequality

Sol Mierzwa
CSCI 101
Professor Eve
October 4, 2025

References

Agarwal, R., et al. (2023). Addressing algorithmic bias and the perpetuation of health disparities in AI/ML for healthcare. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence.

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias. ProPublica.

Chen, Z., et al. (2023). Ethics and discrimination in artificial intelligence-enabled recruitment. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10(1), 79.

Grother, P., Ngan, M., & Hanácek, J. (2019). Face recognition vendor test (FRVT), part 3: demographic effects. NIST.

Pandey, A., et al. (2021). The disparate impact of price discrimination and algorithmic decision-making in ride-hailing and platform markets. ACM.

Whittaker, M., Crawford, K., & AI Now Institute. (2018). AI Now Report 2018.