ETHICS IN AI

(SSH-321)

MID-SEM EXAM

AMOLIKA BANSAL

ROLL NO. - 2020424

CSSS BRANCH

EXPLAINABILITY OF AI SYSTEMS WITHOUT RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IS NOT SUFFICIENT.

Due to the advancement in technology, Artificial Intelligence Systems have become more complex and widely accessible. There have been rising concerns about the possible negative impacts of AI systems on society. One of the most difficult difficulties in AI governance is ensuring that these systems are developed and used ethically and responsibly. Explainability of AI models, i.e. their ability to provide insight into their decision-making processes, is critical to responsible AI governance, however, in addition to explainability, responsibility and accountability are critical components of AI governance. This is required so that AI is used in ways that benefit society, while reducing potential harm.

It is important to understand the potential consequences of AI on society, including the risks of bias, discrimination, and unintended consequences. There is a need for transparency and accountability in AI systems, as well as the importance of considering ethical and social implications during the development process (Dignum, 2020).

Recognizing the possible impact of AI systems on stakeholders and taking actions to ensure that they are not negatively impacted is part of responsibility in AI governance. Other than averting harm, responsibility in AI governance entails supporting human-centred values such as privacy, fairness, and accountability. This entails ensuring that AI systems follow ethical standards and rules, as well as having transparent and explainable decision-making processes.

Responsibility in AI governance comprises taking into account the potential consequences of AI systems on various stakeholders and ensuring that they are not negatively or disproportionately affected. It is also necessary to ensure that AI systems adhere to ethical standards and safety rules. According to the OECD's AI Principles, AI should promote human-centred values, accountability, transparency, and other needs (OECD, 2019). Responsibility of AI development and deployment must be taken by both individuals and organisations involved in AI, including developers, owners, and regulators (Dignum, 2020).

Accountability is an essential aspect of ensuring responsible and ethical use of AI systems. When developing and deploying AI systems, accountability refers to the process of delegating

responsibility for the actions and decisions of the system to authorised individuals or entities. It involves monitoring, auditing and reporting on the performance and outcomes of AI systems. People and organisations who create and deploy AI systems must take responsibility for their activities and be liable for any harm produced by such systems. (Wachter et al., 2017) . They must also ensure that the system's outputs align with ethical and legal standards and be able to explain the decisions made by AI systems to stakeholders, including regulators, customers, and the public.

A lack of accountability and responsibility structures for AI systems may lead to an "algorithmic accountability gap." This indicates that AI systems may create harm in the absence of well-defined lines of accountability or culpability for those held accountable (Mittelstadt et al. 2019)

Explainability alone cannot address the possible hazards and negative repercussions of AI systems without responsibility and accountability. Responsible AI development and deployment necessitates a comprehensive approach that takes into account ethical, social, and legal concerns and incorporates a wide range of stakeholders in the decision-making process. Only by embracing a multidisciplinary approach to AI, governance will we be able to ensure that AI is created and used safely and responsibly.

REFERENCES :

Mittelstadt, M.B., Alklo, M., Ramddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2019). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 6(2), 20343098725224894.

OECD, 2019. OECD principles on artificial intelligence. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. International Data Privacy Law, 9(3), 67-84.

Dignum, V. (2020). Responsibility and Artificial Intelligence. The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI, 4698, 215.

ALGORITHMIC GAMIFICATION OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONS ALTER THEIR NATURE. DISCUSS THE SPECIFIC ETHICAL PROBLEMS THAT GAMIFICATION POSES TO SOCIAL SYSTEMS.

Algorithmic Gamification of social interactions alter their nature and pose many ethical problems to social systems. This process uses game design principles and aspects to motivate people to participate in non-game circumstances (Hammari, Koimvisto, & Saursa, 2014). It can alter the character of social interactions by incorporating game-like elements such as competition and reward systems.

There are ethical concerns associated with the use of gamification in social systems. Gamification has the potential to manipulate people's behaviour and opinions without their knowledge or agreement by using persuasive design tactics such as feedback loops, prizes, and social comparison (Zichermann & Curningham, 2012). This can be problematic as it may influence people's decision-making processes and actions in ways that are contrary to their interests or beliefs.

Unintended outcomes of gamification can act against its intended goals (Deterding et al., 2011).. For instance, a reward system for social connections may lead people to prioritise quantity over quality, resulting in superficial or fake interactions.

Social media platforms can shape communication practices and influence user behaviour. In her article "How Twitter Gamifies Communication," Christen T. Nguyen examines how Twitter's design and functionality encourage and gamify dialogue. Twitter's usage of metrics such as likes, retweets, and followers, according to Nguyen, creates a competitive climate that pushes users to participate in performative communication for social validation and recognition.

Nguyen's research is part of a growing body of work investigating the impact of social media on communication practices and society in general. Researchers have raised concerns about the possible negative effects of social media platforms, such as the dissemination of disinformation and divisiveness (Woolley & Howard, 2016). Others have underlined social media's significance in affecting political discourse and activism (Tufekci, 2016).

Gamification can potentially increase existing inequities by favouring certain people or groups over others (Bomgost, 2011). For example, a compensation system for online reviews may benefit those with more finances or free time to write reviews while excluding those who are less fortunate.

Because gamification frequently necessitates the acquisition and analysis of personal data, it poses privacy problems (Hamari et al., 2014). Gamification systems may capture more data than is necessary, or they may exploit personal data in ways that users did not expect or consent to.

There is a need for designers and developers to carefully consider the potential impacts of gamification on social interactions and take steps to mitigate any negative effects. This could include implementing strong data security measures, providing users with clear information about how their data will be used, and giving users control over their personal data. By addressing these concerns, gamification systems can be designed to be engaging, motivating, and ethical.

REFERENCES

Hammari, J., Koimvisto, J., & Saursa, H. (2014). Does gamification work? A literature review of empirical studies on gamification. Proceedings of the 47th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.

Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2011). From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining "gamification". Envisioning Future Media Environments, Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference (pp. 8-14).

Bomgost, I. (2011). Gamification. The Atlantic.

Nguyen, C. T. (2021). How Twitter gamifies communication. Applied Epistemology, 410.

Zichermann, G., & Curningham, C. (2012). Gamification by design: Implementing game mechanics in web and mobile apps. O'Reilly Media.