

## AI in the workplace

Is the use of data and AI in the workplace in service of the  
employees?

### Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1 Presentation of the dynamics behind the use of Data Science in the workforce</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Data resources available to employers . . . . .	3
1.1.1 Nature and acquisition modalities of data . . . . .	3
1.1.2 Utilization of this Data . . . . .	4
1.2 Artificial intelligence potential for upheaval . . . . .	4
1.2.1 Notion of Weapons of Math Destruction . . . . .	4
1.2.2 Alteration . . . . .	5
<b>2 Cases of AI implementation in the workforce, beneficial or detrimental impacts to employees?</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Example of a case where data has reinforced existing statuses . . . . .	6
2.1.1 Increased surveillance of workers . . . . .	6
2.1.2 Employee datafication and inference in the workplace . . . . .	7
2.2 Cases when AI implementation benefits workers . . . . .	8
2.2.1 Transformation of professional opportunities . . . . .	8
2.2.2 Union representation . . . . .	8
<b>3 Differentiation of Artificial Intelligence from previous automations and the notion of fairness in the development of the use of AI in the workforce</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Differentiation of AI from previous automation . . . . .	10
3.2 Viewing "fairness" of AI as the ability to bring about a change in power dynamics	11
3.2.1 Shifting power dynamics: moving beyond fairness if AI to structural change . . . . .	11
3.2.2 Charting the path: analyzing Joe Biden's Executive Order on AI and its implications for workers' rights and fairness . . . . .	12
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>14</b>

# Introduction

The application of data science in the workforce has become the subject of numerous studies, with notable contributions from scholars such as Felten, Manav, and Robert. Their recent studies in 2023 and 2020 delve into the effects of AI on various occupations and industries, introducing the concept of AI Occupational Exposure. While the potential applications are vast, they all converge towards the thesis of a profound upheaval induced by artificial intelligence (AI) in the workforce. In our dissertation, we aim to scrutinize the extent to which the use of data and AI in the workplace serves the interests of employees.

We will initially present our examination of the dynamics behind the utilization of Data Science in the workforce. Subsequently, we will delve into documented cases of AI implementation in the workforce distinguishing between impacts that are beneficial or detrimental to employees. Finally we look at the differentiation of Artificial Intelligence from previous automations and reflect on the notion of Fairness in the development of the use of AI in the workforce.

# 1 Presentation of the dynamics behind the use of Data Science in the workforce

## 1.1 Data resources available to employers

### 1.1.1 Nature and acquisition modalities of data

In the context of technological progress, the landscape of information accessible to employers has undergone a notable transformation. In their paper Ajunwa, Crawford, and Schultz (2016) [1] trace the historical trajectory wherein American employers have demonstrated a growing propensity to monitor the activities of their employees. They offer an illustration of how this scrutiny has evolved over time, transitioning from the utilization of Pinkerton private detectives in the 1850s, progressing through the era of closed-circuit cameras and email surveillance in the 1990s, and culminating in the contemporary era with the deployment of applications designed to quantitatively assess workforce productivity.

To establish the foundation of our reflection, a review of the data available to employers appears relevant.

Firstly, through the recruitment process, employers acquire demographic data related to the individual's identity and civil status, such as date and place of birth, gender, and address. These are pieces of information that the employer can utilize within the framework of personnel administrative management. Additionally, more sensitive information may be collected depending on the country, such as the individual's criminal record and evidence of their level of education or qualification. This information is obtained transparently and is generally provided by the employee. In addition to these details, which could be deemed basic if limited to them, our analysis reveals situations where employers gather more sensitive data.

In a subsequent phase, we can highlight how employers gather information derived from essential workplace tools. For jobs based on hourly wages, the arrival and departure times, as well as break durations, undergo timestamping. This enables the recording of an employee's working hours. These data are crucial for payroll processing and their utilization can be traced back to the late 19th century with mechanical models, including the perforation system models popularised by Willard and Harlow Bundy. Subsequently, electrical and electronic models became prevalent in the 20th century. Thus, the collection of employee working hours is facilitated by the benefit derived by the employee: receiving a salary reflecting the hours worked. Regarding salaried office jobs, where work is based on a fixed rate, information about periods of activity and the office applications used is accessible. These data are collected by the necessary work tools used by employees, providing not only information about the duration of work but also detailing the tools employed during the tasks.

Finally, our literature review highlights data collected through devices specially designed for this purpose and made to be worn by employees. In their paper, Ranganathan and Benson explored the quantification of work and study the implementation of an Radio-Frequency Identification (RFID) measurement technology aiming to quantify individual workers' output. The technology transformed previously unquantified individual output into real-time quantified metrics at a large garment-manufacturing factory in India.

This last category of data nature and collection method highlights how extensive is the data held by employers.

Having outlined the nature of this data, it is worth discussing and exploring how it can be used.

### 1.1.2 Utilization of this Data

One primary use of the data involves computing descriptive statistics for reporting purposes. This includes the creation of data-driven publications or advertisements. The data serves as a valuable resource for presenting a comprehensive statistical overview of various aspects of a company. Moreover, for larger companies, it may play a crucial role in enhancing the company’s value, as numerical data lends credibility to the presented figures, capable of positively influencing intangible assets, such as the goodwill of the business.

Secondly, a major use of the employees data is statistical inference. Employers harness the power of data science for forecasting purposes, delving into predictions about future behavior, productivity, and interactions. The applications extend to the formulation of strategic plans, human resource management, performance identification, and targeting potential high-performing individuals. As Mateescu [9] underscores, the data is often presented as holding promises for enhancing productivity and fostering workplace happiness.

## 1.2 Artificial intelligence potential for upheaval

### 1.2.1 Notion of Weapons of Math Destruction

Our study led us to take an interest in the sociology of quantification which has been discussed by Berman and Hirschman [3]. This paper highlights how the utilisation of data in the workforce holds significant implications. Berman and Hirschman highlight the contribution of mathematician Cathy O’Neil’s book *Weapon of Math Destruction*[12]. Cathy O’Neil guides us through instances of decision-making models characterized by three key attributes: opacity, harm, and scalability. She introduces the concept of Weapons of Math Destruction (WMDs) to characterize such models. WMDs often make decisions based on statistical associations that are nevertheless not causal, or they reflect structural inequalities.

A striking example is that of the proprietary Level of Service Inventory-Revised model (LSI-R), which predicts a prisoner’s chances of recidivism from a questionnaire and can be used to decide whether to grant parole or keep the prisoner behind bars. Berman and Hirschman explain that this LSI-R model uses secret methods and is grounded in factors strongly associated with race and other forms of disadvantage. In this example prior arrests are associated with neighborhood, which in turn is associated with race. A model predicts that a prisoner from a poor, highly policed neighbourhood will be more likely to be rearrested, leading to keeping him in prison longer. This example shows how the accuracy of the LSI-R model as a predictor of recidivism may have nothing to do with individual culpability. Similarly, we understand how, in a professional context, the implementation of algorithms aimed at measuring performance or talent retention can capture factors that are not linked to the individual capabilities of the employee. In accordance with O’Neil’s guidance, three

pivotal inquiries arise: Does the model exhibit opacity in its workings? Is it characterized by scalability, implying its capacity for widespread application? Lastly, does the model possess the potential to inflict harm through its operational implications?

### 1.2.2 Alteration

Among the disruptive effects of data science is the ability to alter the data being measured. Quantification itself, irrespective of previously emphasized mechanisms, holds the capacity to impact subjects behavior and productivity significantly. This underscores the 'reactivity' of individuals when subjected to evaluation, observation, and measurement, as extensively studied by Espeland and Sauder in 2007.[7]. We found three relevant examples worth noting.

The first example drawn from Espeland and Sauder's study pertains to the rankings of American Law Schools. The existence of these numerical ranking encapsulates a significant issue, the repercussions of which prompt a shift in the behavior of involved parties. These rankings fundamentally "transform power relations within schools, day-to-day organizational practices, and the ways professional opportunities are distributed" (Espeland and Sauder, 2007). On one hand, applicants utilize these numerical indicators as a navigational tool for decision-making, yet possess limited recourse over the criteria. Conversely, deans invest substantial efforts attempting to influence and improve these rankings. The comment offered by [3] in their meta analysis is the following "as long as numbers have consequences, people will try to game them, and transparency facilitates this."

The second example relates to [14]'s study of the implementation of RFID chip technology and a textile factory. An identical aspect emerges wherein data has the potential to influence employee behavior: the collection of data plays a pivotal role in shaping employee actions, leading to auto-gamification.

Finally, another potential alteration emerges from our review: numbers currently established affect what we will measure in the future, resulting in data deemed unnecessary to no longer be measured. This is the concept of "data inertia" developed by Sally Engle Merry [10]. One interesting illustration is the decision to exclude the value of domestic labor from Gross National Product, made in the 20th century. Because of this choice, housework has never really been accounted for, despite its clear economic contribution. This shows how numbers affect their own future meaning, as they produce "reactivity" among those subject to them, and come to measure something different.

The utilisation of data in the workforce holds significant implications. Simultaneously, the growing proficiency in data exploitation has led to a surge in employers engaging in data collection through tools of varying specificity. These datasets, coupled with mathematical modelling, facilitate inference for diverse purposes. This scenario underscores the profound impacts stemming from Artificial Intelligence (AI) and anticipates a datafication trend among employees—a thesis advocated by Mateescu [9]. The ensuing investigation in our dissertation aims to unveil the ramifications of this datafication trend on employee dynamics and organisational landscapes.

## 2 Cases of AI implementation in the workforce, beneficial or detrimental impacts to employees?

### 2.1 Example of a case where data has reinforced existing statuses

#### 2.1.1 Increased surveillance of workers

The development of AI is paralleled by an increase in surveillance algorithms which can be particularly harmful for employees, particularly with regard to salaries, as Zephyr Teachout develops in her article [16].

The use of employee data can lead to situations where employees are no longer paid by the task but according to an algorithm computation which is often a black box for employees. For example, at Uber the remuneration depends on the driver and the needs of the platform. This relinquishing to algorithms no longer only regards remuneration but also other aspects such as planning shifts or social benefits. This phenomenon of piece-rate and no longer fixed remuneration is spreading and taking on an increasingly important proportion. According to Zephyr Teachout [16] analysis, between 10% to 30% of Americans are affected.

Teachout suggests a practical taxonomy aiming to shed light on the functioning of AI in work environments and with a view to foster regulation. The author highlights five different forms of algorithmic salary differentiation : productivity-based wage adjustments, gamified wages shifted through incentive bonuses and demerits, behavioral wages, dynamic wages, and wages shifted to conduct an experiment.

- Productivity-based wage adjustments is based on Extreme Taylorism. Traditional Taylorism considers that the only motivation of workers is the salary and that it is therefore necessary to control the work of employees by monitoring them. Extreme Taylorism uses the same principle but with extreme precision. Instead of measuring overall productivity, employers now monitor very specific details of employee behavior.
- Gamified wages comes from the gamification of work. For example Amazon has integrated games into its warehouses and the success allows a change in salary and employees can pay in game currency. Uber integrated game dimensions into the races such as point-scoring, levels, competition with others, and ratings, this allows engagement and possibly fun, but also allows them to use the irrational tendencies, such as gambling.
- Behavioral pay would mean that the salary is based on the behavior of the employee in their professional or personal life. One could imagine that employers could combine data from their sites with personal data purchased on other sites, which collect and aggregate activity on social networks for example. Employers could use data on a worker's debt to give them a lower salary because the worker has less flexibility to change jobs. Dynamic labor pricing involves paying more for labor in times of low supply or high demand, and vice versa. One could imagine real-time labor pricing based on demand.
- Wages shifted to conduct an experiment is a growing phenomenon. In the 1920s, a study was conducted to find out whether raising wages increased productivity. For this, the

employees' salaries have been modified for experience. The answer of the study was no but above all it showed that employees were subject to experiments and manipulations on the part of employers which reduced the feeling of stability at work.

As employee surveillance systems are booming with scanners, badges, cameras, geolocation, or sensors, softwares monitors productivity but also employee behaviour and their emotional state. For example, a software from the company Cogito gives real-time indications on how employees should behave and gives the summary of the analyses to the supervisor who is at liberty to use it for remuneration. Thus, this phenomenon has more significant consequences than just salary instability. It amplifies economic and racial inequalities, undermines work solidarity, restricts freedom of expression, and compromises the autonomy of employees, while exposing workers to potential humiliation in relation to their boss.

All of this has profound implications for democratic values. It accentuates the supervisory dynamic and diminishes the importance of employer-employee relationships. Higher-level management benefits from continuous monitoring and control over lower-level workers. This tends to create an environment of rational paranoia among employees who are unaware of the real motivations behind the changes. They don't know if it's an experiment, a punishment, a reward, a change in needs, or work requirements.

Increased surveillance also obviously poses problems of confidentiality breach and restrictions on fundamental freedom and labor rights. We can note the risk of political reprisals if an employee expresses themselves freely on certain topics. Even if these techniques are not ubiquitous, it is essential to consider employee protection measures and legislation to protect them from discrimination.

### **2.1.2 Employee datafication and inference in the workplace**

Employers are increasingly using data science for inference to draw conclusions about future employee productivity, behavior and interactions within the company. Despite promises of improved productivity and happiness at work, reality often reveals a punitive dimension of the tools, thus reinforcing old dynamics of exploitation and control. A concrete example of this dynamic manifests itself in companies like UPS, where sanctions based on quantitative measures are implemented. On this matter, [9] laments a phenomenon of employee datafication that can be detrimental to them if not checked.

The use of data science and artificial intelligence algorithms can, however, under certain conditions, promote shifts in power dynamics and foster the reduction of inequality. Our review has enabled us to underscore the increase in professional opportunities made possible by the adoption of artificial intelligence algorithms and how artificial intelligence can contribute to mitigating arbitrariness and supporting workers, particularly in contexts where shareholders are integrated into the decision-making and data governance processes.

## 2.2 Cases when AI implementation benefits workers

### 2.2.1 Transformation of professional opportunities

Artificial Intelligence opens up opportunities for transforming professional activities through which social inequalities, particularly along the gender axis, can be addressed. A study from 2022 commissioned jointly by UNESCO, OECD, IDB [6] illustrates the positive impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on employees and the ensuing reduction in gender-based inequities.

The first major contribution of AI worth highlighting is its impact on the professional life cycle through personalized pathways constructed based on available personal data. Implementing data science in the workforce facilitates guiding and assisting individuals in making choices at various stages: from qualification and hiring to career progression. AI can even highlight specific needs related to skill improvement in the workplace, as emphasized in a study, notably revealing requirements for skill enhancement on the job [6].

Secondly, against a backdrop of widespread use of digital tools and a job market undergoing significant change, data science provides opportunities to people who are currently far removed from the digital world. Active promotion and reskilling and upskilling programmes can help close the gender digital divides, as well as the North/South pay inequality and mitigate the resulting monetary and material gaps.

Furthermore, this same report points out that in countries such as the USA, the monitoring tools installed in company equipment make it possible to collect massive activity data in real time. These data reflect employees' behaviors and contribute to nourishing an understanding of the imperatives faced by primary caregivers. These systems can contribute to improving the quality of work-life balance for everyone and to a shift in corporate culture, resulting in less divergent career trajectories based on gender.

Finally, artificial intelligence is at the core of technological innovations that benefit workers by improving physically demanding working conditions. A pertinent example of AI-driven automation is the development of automated irrigation systems by an inventor from Berger University [6]. Automation benefits agricultural workers and makes their work less strenuous and more lucrative.

### 2.2.2 Union representation

The protection of employees in the era of ubiquitous data poses a significant question regarding their involvement in data governance. It has been reported that, to preserve their reputation, Amazon influenced the reporting of occupational injuries, downplaying them in administrative forms accessible to the public. Employees without union representation could only witness repeated cases.

Surveillance indeed interferes with workers' ability to organize. A striking example is documented by Jay Peters [13], illustrating how Whole Foods, which is owned by Amazon, employed a data-driven heat map for its stores identified as "at risk" of unionization. This map included a "diversity index" that marked stores with significant racial and ethnic diversity as focal points for their efforts against unionization. This perversion of algorithms makes [5]'s thesis on algorithm resistance relevant. It is crucial to examine how algorithms in



decision-making are used rather than focusing solely on the instruments themselves. She highlights a gap between the intended and actual effects of algorithms, termed as "decoupling." In doing so, she underscores the strategies used by employees, she focuses on journalists and legal professionals in her paper, to mitigate the impact of algorithms in their daily work, such as foot-dragging, gaming, and open critique. "Dragging your feet" involves ignoring or downplaying the importance of tools like analytics programs. "Gaming" strategies involve the manipulation of rules or numbers to achieve desired results, and "open criticism" involves contestation of the reliability and impact of the tools they use.

Involving and including employees in data governance would make it possible to counter unilateral benefits in the event of divergent integrations between employer and employees. On this matter, Bales and Stone [2] provide insights in their paper where they aim to tackle the issue of union representation in the era of algorithmic decision-making. They indicate that the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in favour of unions, stating that they should have access to the data. According to the law, unions are theoretically in a position to have significant influence.

Thus, in this favourable legal framework, it can be conjectured that the expansion of AI will be accompanied by greater compliance on the part of employers in terms of the transparency of employees' personal data, hence our choice to outline the evolution of trade unionism among the cases where Artificial Intelligence is beneficial to employees. As highlighted by [9] The answer lies partly in data collected by workers, with unions playing a central role in this process. By actively participating in workplace negotiations in a context where they have a seat at the decision-making table, unions defend workers' rights, ensuring transparent and ethical data collection. Workers, through their union representatives, can guarantee objective and comprehensive data collection, thus ensuring ethical use of data in the professional world.

### 3 Differentiation of Artificial Intelligence from previous automations and the notion of fairness in the development of the use of AI in the workforce

#### 3.1 Differentiation of AI from previous automation

Differentiation of AI from previous automation has been a subject of our reflection.

In the early 1800s, the advent of the steam engine marked a pivotal moment in industrialization. Unlike previous manual processes, the steam engine introduced a new source of power, enabling mechanization and transforming industries. However, this shift was met with resistance from the Luddites, workers who feared the repercussions of this automation on their livelihoods. [15]

As the 20th century unfolded, a new phase of automation emerged with the introduction of production lines around 1900. This innovation brought about a systematic and organized approach to manufacturing, allowing for mass production through the division of labor. Unlike earlier forms of automation, production lines significantly increased efficiency and output. Moving into the mid-20th century, the concept of factories became more entrenched, consolidating industrial activities in centralized locations by 1950. While factories were not a novel idea, the scale and specialization within them marked a differentiation from previous industrial eras, emphasizing concentrated and large-scale production.

The 1960s witnessed a transformative leap in automation with the introduction of computers. Unlike earlier mechanical systems, computers allowed for complex calculations, data processing, and automation of various tasks. This technological advancement not only revolutionized industries but also paved the way for increased efficiency in various sectors.

Each of the innovations has brought increased productivity to companies and a transformation in the working conditions for employees. For example, in the case of mining, the health impact on coal miners due to pneumoconiosis has highlighted the human cost associated with certain forms of automation, particularly in hazardous working conditions. Simultaneously, concerns related to child labor and social reproduction underscored the ethical and societal challenges intertwined with industrialization.

AI in the workplace holds promise for similar transformations; however, in our view, a major distinction is that traditional automation systems were often pre-programmed to perform specific tasks, with the expected outcome determined in advance and known to all parties. With AI, the rules of production are less transparent, yet they exert an ever-increasing impact on employees' working conditions. Thus, the differentiation lies not only in technological innovations but also in new ethical and social considerations, emphasizing the need for fairness in the deployment of AI in the workforce.

## 3.2 Viewing "fairness" of AI as the ability to bring about a change in power dynamics

### 3.2.1 Shifting power dynamics: moving beyond fairness if AI to structural change

We asked ourselves the question of whether the AI was "good or fair" towards the employee but we should rather ask "how it shifts power". Indeed, can we really establish fairness measures and correction strategies without questioning the deeper structural inequalities? These are the ideas developed by Pratyusha Kalluri in "Do not ask if AI is fair, ask how it shifts power" [8].

We often think that AI is neutral and beneficial and if it is not, it is only because the data is biased and comes directly from the unjust society. Reality is more complex. It is above all a question of the relationship of powers and services to the powerful. Kalluri advocates for all people working in AI to move to include people who are discriminated against, whether in collaboration, quotes or financing. In doing that, they will restrict ties with powerful institutions benefitting from people surveillance.

Hence, Kalluri founded the "Radical AI network," defining "radical" as "grabbing things at the root" (A. Davis). This statement aims to convey the idea that the root problem is that power is unevenly distributed. This network focuses on listening to those discriminated against by AI and promotes non-oppressive technologies. This includes on one side individuals whose data is collected without consent and on the other side manual data labelers receiving inadequate pay.

It is necessary to provide means to investigate AI to challenge it, influence it or even dismantle it. Research creates expensive systems that build the capacity of powerful institutions. The advocacy group *Our Data Bodies* offers ways to protect personal data when interacting with U.S. Fair Housing and Child Welfare Services. We could imagine the development of similar means intended for employees.

Researchers must therefore recognize their biased perspective and listen to those adversely impacted by AI. AI systems today are precise and efficient but who benefits from them? Users? Developers? Companies? This involves risks associated with exploitative businesses or oppressive law enforcement. "These systems sometimes mitigate harm, but are controlled by powerful institutions with their own agendas". They are unreliable and may even pose as "ethics washing" technologies that further perpetuate inequalities. The design of "fair" and "transparent" models is often dictated by powerful institutions.

Some researchers argue for regulation, while Kalluri emphasizes the importance of putting marginalized communities at the center of AI research, stressing the need to create systems that meet their needs and knowledge. The goal is AI "by and for the people". One could imagine the AI being faithful to the needs of data subjects and allowing them to freely unsubscribe.

Exploring the intricate landscape of AI use and the resulting power dynamics in the workplace, connecting discourse with recent actions is crucial. Just as concerns about the fairness and quality of AI systems resonate in academic and industrial debates, the practical

field has seen notable development.

Recently, President Joe Biden issued an "Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence", marking an important step toward addressing the complex intersection of technology and governance. This executive order not only highlights the growing importance of AI regulation, but also underscores the recognition of its profound impact on societal power structures. Let's explore how this decree fits into the broader narrative of the "Fairness" angle as the ability to cause a shift in power dynamics.

### **3.2.2 Charting the path: analyzing Joe Biden's Executive Order on AI and its implications for workers' rights and fairness**

"Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence" is issued October 30, 2023 by Joe Biden.[4] Before signing it, he said : "This landmark executive order is a testament of what we stand for: safety, security, trust, openness, American leadership, and the undeniable rights endowed by a creator that no creation can take away". The order aims to ensure powerful AI systems are safe and used responsibly by building on the administration's previous efforts.

There are several points in this order. We can note, for example, that companies are asked to inform the government if they form a foundation model that could present serious risks and share the results. The federal government is also asked to establish guidelines and training to avoid algorithmic bias and strengthen their privacy requirements and support privacy-preserving AI training techniques. Another topic covered in this order: Generative AI. The main concern is whether the image, text or sound is real or not. To do this, the US Department of Commerce is being asked to "develop guidelines for content authentication and watermarking to clearly label AI-generated content".

This order aims to address the hopes and fears of various stakeholders, from tech CEOs to civil rights advocates. It also explains how Biden's vision for AI fits into his overall vision. It also shows the limits of the power of the executive branch. Indeed, the order goes beyond the voluntary commitments Biden has secured from some of the biggest AI companies. But many provisions do not and cannot have law behind them, and their effectiveness will depend solely on how stakeholders execute them.

Although many experts say the decree is a significant step forward, others express reservations as shown in the article "Seven reactions to Biden's executive order on artificial intelligence". [11]

For John Mark Newman, this decree is a very good decree, particularly compared to previous ones because work has an important place in this decree, unions are considered stakeholders and workers are cited many times and it is expressed that negotiation collective is essential to the development of prosocial applications of AI. However, he regrets the lack of answers regarding generative AI and the fact that the work of many people is copied without compensation or recognition and that their use then harms the same workers who were copied, leading to unfair competition.

According to Veena Dubal, in this context, Joe Biden's executive order does not take the

direction of "fairness" particularly because of the increase in digital surveillance (30% to 60%) since taking office. The role of the pandemic and the generalization of remote work should not be overlooked in this increase. The repercussions of the increase do not appear to be in favor of workers. It gives companies the power to: predict the risks of unionism, transmit data to future employers, predict salaries which will have an impact on the economic mobility of employees throughout their lives.

According to Ifeoma Ajunwa, this order does not protect workers' rights well enough despite it being specified "In the workplace itself, AI should not be deployed in ways that undermine rights, worsen job quality, encourage undue worker surveillance, lessen market competition, introduce new health and safety risks, or cause harmful labor-force disruptions." The Order does not specify the roles of the agencies concerned and does not give them the legal powers necessary for effective AI governance.

There should have been a workers' rights bill that delineates the limits of worker surveillance using AI. She proposes to set up an audit system for automated recruitment systems, to enforce collective bargaining by worker unions for how AI will be used in all stages of the professional experience. A framework for compensating workers who will be laid off due to automation is also necessary. She also believes that measures must be extended internationally such as global agreements on fair wages and workplace safety to ensure that continued innovation in AI does not become an opportunity to exploit workers from developing countries.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, exploring data science and artificial intelligence in the workplace reveals a dynamic landscape characterized by the availability of data and its extensive utilization of data by employers. This includes the nature of the data, methods of data acquisition and the transformative potential of AI, which can lead to significant disruptions, introducing concepts like "weapons of mathematical destruction" and reshaping the employment landscape.

Even if the use of AI in the world of work demonstrates both beneficial and harmful impacts on employees, the power conferred by data science seems, at the moment, to lean in favor of business owners, thereby exacerbating power dynamics. However, AI-driven automation promises to improve the strenuous work conditions of certain employees, and surveillance tools can be employed in support of workers' syndicalism. Furthermore, resistance to the use of algorithms remains a hot topic, reflecting the ongoing tension between technology-driven automation and human labor.

While we can observe some similarities, AI distinguishes itself from previous automations, underscoring the importance of recognizing the unique characteristics and potential harmful consequences of AI deployment in the workforce, thereby raising new ethical and social considerations. In this context, the concept of "fairness" emerges as a central aspect, providing the opportunity to reshape power dynamics. To achieve it, the development and deployment of AI in the workforce must be approached with a commitment to equity, ensuring that these technologies contribute to a safer and more equitable working environment. It is imperative to consider the ethical implications, potential inequalities, and the broader societal impact of these advancements. Striking a balance between innovation and ethical considerations will be crucial for harnessing the full potential of AI while mitigating its negative effects on the workforce.

## References

- [1] Ifeoma Ajunwa, Kate Crawford, and Jason Schultz. Limitless worker surveillance. *California Law Review*, 105:735, 2017. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2746211>.
- [2] Richard A. Bales and Katherine V.W. Stone. The invisible web at work: Artificial intelligence and electronic surveillance in the workplace. *Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law*, 41(1):57–59, 2020.
- [3] Elizabeth Popp Berman and Daniel Hirschman. The sociology of quantification: Where are we now? *American Sociological Association*, 2018.
- [4] Joe Biden. Executive order on the safe, secure, and trustworthy development and use of artificial intelligence, 2023.
- [5] Angèle Christin. Algorithms in practice: Comparing web journalism and criminal justice, big data & society. *American Sociological Review*, 4(2), 2017.
- [6] Clementine Collett, Gina Neff, and Livia Gouvea Gomes. *The effects of AI on the working lives of women*. UNESCO, 2022. Also available in Español, Français, Português.
- [7] Wendy Nelson Espeland and Michael Sauder. Rankings and reactivity: How public measures recreate social worlds. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1):1–40, 2007.
- [8] Pratyusha Kalluri. Don’t ask if artificial intelligence is good or fair, ask how it shifts power. *Nature*, 2020.
- [9] Alexandra Mateescu. Challenging worker datafication, 2023. Data & Society, November 2023.
- [10] Sally Engle Merry. *The Seductions of Quantification: Measuring Human Rights, Gender Violence, and Sex Trafficking*. University of Chicago Press, 2016.
- [11] John Mark Newman, Veena Dubal, Salomé Viljoen, Ifeoma Ajunwa, Nikolas Guggenberger, Elettra Bietti, Jason Jackson, and JS Tan. Seven reactions to Biden’s executive order on artificial intelligence, 2023.
- [12] Cathy O’Neil. *Weapons of Math Destruction*. Penguin Books, Harlow, England, 2017.
- [13] Jay Peters. Whole foods is reportedly using a heat map to track stores at risk of unionization, 2020. The Verge, April 20, 2020.
- [14] Aruna Ranganathan and A Benson. A numbers game: Quantification of work, auto-gamification, and worker productivity. *American Sociological Review*, 85(4):573–609, 2020.
- [15] Alain Supiot. *Le travail au xxie siècle : Droit, techniques, écroumène*, 2019.
- [16] Zephyr Teachout. Surveillance wages : A taxonomy, 2023.