

Assignment 1

Fundamentals, principles, and values

Part 1: Ethical dilemma case study

1. Who are the direct and indirect stakeholders for this case study?

DIRECT STAKEHOLDERS	INDIRECT STAKEHOLDERS
Children	Child psychology researchers
Mettel Company	Parents
The algorithm development team	

2. What are some potential embedded values in the GFM?

Following are some potential embedded values in the GFM:

- **Transparency** - It is clear/transparent with its intention of listening to the fears of the children.
- **Accuracy** - GFM is accurate to know when the child says it has no more fears to talk about.
- **Security** - GFM's idea is to make the child feel secure by helping it get rid of its monsters.
- **Privacy** - It keeps the secrets of the children, whatever they are telling to the GFM.
- **Trade Secret** - It keeps the data for the betterment of its own technology and not for trading it to other potential users of the data
- **Fairness** - GFM is fair towards children of different genders and those who speak different languages.

3. Identify three potential value tensions and describe why they might occur. What are the potential impacts of these value tensions on the various stakeholders?

Following value tensions might occur:

- **Accuracy & Fairness** - The accuracy will have to be traded off if a child speaks a different language. There are instances when children might use 2 languages at a time (For example - hindi and english) to convey their thoughts. Also, “No” in english means “No” but “No” in russian means “But” whereas in japanese means “Of”. Therefore, GFM needs to be accurate without compromising its ability to understand different languages.
- **Transparency & Trade Secret** - Children are sharing their fears with the GFM because they trust it, as they think it is transparent and it wont convey their thoughts to anyone else. But as the case study reported, the data that is being collected by the GFM is already being shared with parents and child psychology researchers. For the betterment of the technology and for the child as well, the data needs to be traded.
- **Privacy & Security** - The idea of security of the child comes at the cost of privacy. One needs to invade the child’s privacy to learn if it is safe or not, as when children share their fears, their parents and psychologists will understand if the child’s safe or not. It can be used for surveillance of the child but at the cost of privacy.

Value Tension	Stakeholder	Impact
Accuracy & Fairness	Child	The technology might not be able to understand or serve the purpose if it doesn’t understand the language or is not accurate enough
	Parents	Incorrect data might be collected and provided to the parents.
	Child psychology Researchers (CPRs)	Incorrect data might be collected and provided to the CPRs for research which might lead to incorrect results.
	Mettel company & algorithm development team	Incorrect data will lead to incorrect updates to the technology which will eventually affect the GFM and then if we get inaccurate results it will affect the sales of the company.
Transparency & Trade Secret	Child	The child’s secrets (data) are being sent to people for whom it is not meant for, on the other hand the child is trusting GFM and sharing its fears with it. If the child comes to know about this, it might not use the toy anymore.
	Mettel company	If the child comes to know that its data (secrets/fears) are being shared with its parents or whoever, it might not use the toy anymore

		which will affect the sales of the company eventually.
Privacy & Security	Child	The child feels secure around the toy as it provides the child with its private space. Since GFM also shares the data with the child's parents, the child might not feel secure because if the child would have wanted it would have already shared it with its parents but it chose the GFM over parents, this shows it wasn't willing to share the fear with its parents.

4. From a utilitarian perspective, can you justify the proposal of the toy makers to distribute free GFMs to children living in homeless shelters? Elaborate on why you can or cannot justify this proposal and what are the potential implications of this decision.

The proposal of the toy makers to distribute free GFMs to children living in homeless shelters can be **justified** from a utilitarian perspective. The idea of giving away toys for free to underprivileged children is in alignment with the utilitarian theory as it will make the children happy. Firstly, they'll have a toy to play with. Secondly, they'll have someone to talk to, coming from shelters, we never know what the child is going through.

Potential implications :

- This act will increase the sales of the company, as it will come out as a good deed on the company's part, the act of giving away toys for free to needy children.
- They will have the data from different sections of the society, so they will be able to train the model in a better manner, which might help with mitigating bias.
- The children in these shelters will be happy to get such "fancy" toy for free. They'll feel cared for and loved.

5. From a deontological perspective, can you justify the Metell company's marketing strategy? Elaborate on why you can or cannot justify their strategy and what are the potential implications of this decision.

From a deontological perspective, no the marketing strategy of Metell company **cannot be justified**. This is because it was not the company's duty, nor were they obliged to do

such a thing. They were result focussed. They already knew the consequences to some extent. The main idea behind doing this thing was to boost their sales and improve their AI model by learning from different types of populations.

Potential implications :

- They were result focussed therefore, such an act would increase their sales but they will also be criticized for doing such a thing considering it as a “publicity” stunt .
- The children might be afraid of the toy that “talks”, since they have never had the privilege to use or play with such toys. Thus, showing that their idea might backfire.

6. From a virtue ethics perspective, what do you think of the Metell company’s decision to give the data from GFM with child psychology researchers?

From a virtue ethics perspective, the Metell company's idea to give away the data from GFM to child psychology researchers is **not justified**. The company more or less shared the data without consent. The idea of invading someone’s privacy and then sharing the data with researchers without informing the parents or the children is almost equivalent to a dishonest act. By this act, the researchers will benefit as they will have data to conduct research with, which will in turn help the company. The company will learn from the results of these researches to modify their toys. In this manner, they are using innocent children for their own benefit at the cost of morality.