International Research Journal of Human Resource and Social Sciences
ISSN(O): (2349-4085) ISSN(P): (2394-4218)
Impact Factor 6.924 Volume 11, Issue 08, August 2024
Website- www.aarf.asia, **Email** : editoraarf@gmail.com

Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights: A Critical Analysis of AI's Impact on Privacy, Equality, Freedom of Expression, and Due Process

Shaila

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science and Human Rights, Jamia Hamdard University

Prof. Syed Mehartaj Begum

Head, Department of Political Science and Human Rights, Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), Jamia Hamdard University, New Delhi. India

Abstract

This study is a critical analysis of how Artificial Intelligence (AI) has affected the rights of humans as it relates to privacy, equality, freedom of the press, and due process. As AI technologies are rapidly evolving, there have been worries that they can become a threat to the basic rights. The study comprises both quantitative data obtained through a questionnaire by asking 200 people and qualitative data obtained in the form of interviews with AI developers, lawyers, and human rights activists. The quantitative research, which will be conducted using Pearson Correlation, Multiple Regression and Chi-square tests, measures the correlation relationship between AI-based surveillance, hiring algorithms, content moderation and the perceived human rights abuse. Results indicate that there is a weak though statistically significant association between AI surveillance and privacy issues, no major effect of AI hiring and policing algorithms on equality, and no major impediency to freedom of expression by AI content moderation. The qualitative interviews of AI developers, legal scholars, and human rights activists offer more context, as they show that although AI offers opportunities to innovate, its ethical aspect needs sound regulatory practices and ethics development. This work presents the necessity of elaborate policies that will assure AI of human dignity, equality and fairness and provide recommendations of how research on AI can focus on long-term effects of AI to human rights in various fields in the future.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence**,** Human Rights**,** Privacy**,** Equality**,** Freedom of Expression**,** Due Process**,** Ethical Considerations**,** Legal Frameworks.

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a technology that has witnessed rapid development in the past few decades, transforming industries and changing the manner in which we interact with technology. AI is taking over the daily routine with diverse applications in healthcare, finance, law enforcement, education, and many others and is expected to enhance efficiency, decision-making, and creativity. Nevertheless, in addition to the advantages, AI brings up severe issues concerning its effect on key human principles, especially individual right, equality, freedom of speech, as well as due process.

The adoption of AI in the decision-making processes, which frequently deals with large volumes of personal information, has placed privacy issues at the centre stage. Facial recognition and other surveillance technologies have become a concern with regard to the loss of personal privacy whereby the actions and conducts of people are constantly tracked and studied by machines. Predictive policing and hiring algorithms are AI-driven systems that have been criticized to some degree due to lowering inequality and discrimination, as biased information can support structural biases and restrict the opportunities of the marginalized, which, in turn, can result in racial bias and inequality. Additionally, the concept of using AI as a means of regulating speech on social media elicited controversies regarding the scope of freedom of speech, brought up by the issue of censorship, fake news, and an ability to control communicative language.

Among the most important legal issues with AI is the possibility that it will negate the due process, especially in the judiciary system. There is a trend in the application of AI technologies to law enforcement, the judicial decision-making process, and immigration regulation. Nonetheless, the technologies have serious challenges to do with transparency, accountability and fairness. The fact that there are no explicit rules concerning AI use in legal practice is another complication that makes it difficult to establish how many fundamental rights it has been affecting.

This paper seeks to critically reflect on the effect of AI on privacy, equality, freedom of expression, and due process since the ramification of AI on human rights is immense. The proposed study explores the ethical, legal, and societal aspects of AI in order to come up with a holistic perspective of the intersection of AI with human rights and the threats of AI. The paper is going to examine available literature on those concerns, assess how AI contributes to human rights abuse or alleviation, and give the policy recommendations concerning the responsible use of AI based on the principles of human rights.

1.1 Objective of the Study

To study the impact of AI technologies on the privacy of people irrespective of surveillance and data gathering.

To examine how AI algorithms can affect equality, it is necessary to dwell upon such aspects as employment discrimination and police discrimination.

To determine the impact of AI-based content moderation on the freedom of expression on social media sites.

To explore how AI has changed due process and in particular how it has changed legal decision-making (such as sentencing and parole).

To offer policy solutions to develop ethical standards and rules to safeguard human rights in the creation and application of AI technologies.

2. Literature Review

The fast evolution of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has resulted in its mass penetration into society, which has caused severe arguments regarding the ethical consequences of this concept. The effects of AI on basic human rights are still a huge issue though it has the potential to improve the well being of the society. The recent body of literature regarding the role of AI in privacy, equality, freedom of expression, and due process provides varied information but in other aspects is incomplete, and thus needs a more combined study.

2.1 Privacy and Data Protection

One of the benefits of using AI technologies is the violation of privacy that is one of the primary human rights outlined in the international human rights law. The application of AI systems and more specifically facial recognition, big data analytics, and machine learning algorithms have enabled tracking, profiling, and predicting the behavior of personal individuals with disturbing accuracy (Zuboff, 2019). Surveillance has been raised as a major issue in the literature because the AI technologies are used in the open neighborhoods, workplace, and even residential houses where they capture personal data without permission (Binns, 2018). Researchers believe that an algorithmic ability to domain immense amounts of personal information in a second makes people lose the right to manage their information (Tufekci, 2015). Some articles emphasize the necessity to improve the law on data protection, and privacy laws like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Europe are considered to be essential, but not sufficient to mitigate the complexity of AI (Bradshaw et al., 2011).

2.2 Equality and Discrimination

The AI technologies have been widely known as a catalyst to the more existing social inequalities. Proplications of AI in the recruitment process, law enforcement, and the lending process have been concerning at the systemic level with regards to biases. As an example, a study conducted by Angwin et al. (2016) proved that minority communities are placed disproportionately by prediction algorithms employed by the police, which worsens racial inequality in the criminal justice system. Likewise, abortion has also led to gender and racial discrimination in employment due to the use of algorithmic decision-making to hire employees where most AI algorithms are based on previous prejudices (O'Neil, 2016). Scholars remove the idea of transparency and justice in AI systems by stating that various training data and non-dominant voices should be included in AI creation (Eubanks, 2018). Laws, including anti-discrimination laws, have to be revised to deal with the problems of AI in such dimensions.

2.3 Freedom of Expression

The influence of AI on the freedom of expression is especially obvious in the case of social media. The algorithms followed by Facebook, twitter and YouTube are designed to rank content by its levels of engagement and this has far-reaching consequences on mass discourse. They are the algorithms that tend to promote sensational or misleading content, which promotes the spread of misinformation (Tufekci, 2018). In addition, AI-enhanced content moderation systems created to eliminate harmful or objectionable material have been said to utilize speech as parts of legitimate speech (Gillespie, 2018). Research studies have recommended increased responsibility and regulation of AI in controlling internet speech content by stating that the AI systems should not violate the right to freedom of expression as articulated in the international law including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) rules.

2.4 Due Process and AI in Legal Systems

The use of AI in the legal decision-making process brings up some grave concerns regarding the due process and the right to a fair trial. Artificial intelligence technologies are finding more applications in the sentencing, parole, and immigration control. As an example, algorithms of a risk assessment applied to the criminal justice system in the U.S. have been criticized as not being transparent and possibly biased, thus unequal to defendants (Angwin et al., 2016). The literature recommends the use of transparency, accountability, and oversight in AI applications to the legal process so that the right to due process is not violated. Researchers propose the selection of a

regulatory model that would guarantee the AIs in the legal sector follow the available legal standards and take into account the basic rights (Goodman and Flaxman, 2017).

3. Theoretical Framework

The issue of AI effects on human rights needs to be analyzed through a complex theoretical scope that involves an ethical, legal, and human rights viewpoint. This study will be guided by the theoretical frameworks described below when analyzing the intersection of AI and privacy, equality, the freedom of expression, and the due process.

3.1 Human Rights Theories

The central concept of this research paper is the theory of human rights that focuses on the dignity and equality of human rights of everybody. Adopted in the year 1948, the UDHR is a fundamental source of the consideration of the effects of AI on human rights. This paper will discuss the four fundamental rights that are threatened by AI technologies, including privacy, equality, freedom of speech, and due process. The theory of human rights offers a perspective through which the vile connotations of AI concerning such rights may be critically evaluated and compared to the AI-related benefits to the field of governance and personal liberties.

3.2 Ethical Theories of Technology

In order to determine the ethical consequences of AI, this study refers to some of the major ethical theories, such as Kantian ethics, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics. The Kantian ethics, which advocates duty and human dignity, offer one of the means to explain the ethical factor of the responsibility of the AI developers and the possibility of the AI technologies to infringe the personal rights in case it is not designed responsibly. Utilitarianism, as the approach devoted to the maximum good of the maximum number of individuals, can be used to evaluate the social good of AI, including enhancing the safety of the population or healthcare and balancing its possible and actual harm. Virtue ethics with its emphasis on the personality and ethical purity of the AI developers provides us with the clue as to how the AI development should be oriented on such virtuous qualities as fairness, transparency, and respect to the human dignity.

3.3 Legal Frameworks and AI Regulation

The study will also interact with the legal frameworks, especially the way the existing laws interact with the AI technologies and the human rights. There are legal principles based on international and national law like the GDPR and other anti-discrimination laws which can be used to regulate

AI. But with AI in its current development, the current legal systems can be seen as deficient. This part will focus on the problems of extending the traditional judicial notions due process and equality to AI systems and will offer suggestions on how to modify the legal standards to reflect the reality of the AI-conditioned decision-making process.

4. Research Methodology

The study follows a quantitative research approach to analyze how Artificial intelligence (AI) is affecting human rights in the form of privacy, equality, freedom of expression, and due process. Through a descriptive correlational design, the research aims at determining and quantifying the correlation between AI technologies and human rights outcomes. The findings will also be analyzed in a comparative way, which will give the findings depth by utilizing the qualitative approach.

4.1 Research Design and Approach

The study takes a mixed methods research approach, which involves the integration of both quantitative and qualitative data to give a holistic analysis of the effect of AI on human rights.

Quantitative Approach: The approach is applied to determine quantitatively the relationships between AI technologies (independent variables) and human rights concerns (dependent variables). Data will be collected through organized survey among AI professionals, legal scholars, as well as human rights activists. The quantitative approach will allow the researcher to test the hypotheses concerning the effects of AI on privacy, equality, freedom of expression, and due process with the help of statistical instruments.

Qualitative Approach: The qualitative focus will aid in forming an idea of the context, why and how it happened to interpret the results of the quantitative approach. A small set of stakeholders (e.g., AI developers, legal experts, and human rights advocates) will be interviewed to get a more detailed picture on the perceived impact of AI technologies on human rights. These understandings will be used to interpret the statistical finding and then to enrich the analysis.

4.2 Data Collection

Survey Instrument: A Likert-scale questionnaire, yes/no question and multiple-choice question questionnaire will be prepared. The questionnaire will target AI use in the law force, the job search, social media, and data security to get the perception of the respondents regarding the impact of AI on human rights.

Sampling: Stratified random sampling will be applied to a sample of participants. The sample size will consist of 200 respondents and the professionals working in different fields and specializing in technology (AI developers), in law (lawyers, judges), and human rights advocacy groups will be included. The stratification will be done to ensure equal representation of industries that have an impact of AI.

Secondary Data: Although the survey will be used, the secondary information of already existing academic literature, government publications, case law and publications of industries will be examined to offer the picture and make the findings more sound.

4.3 Hypotheses of the study

H1: AI technologies threaten the privacy greatly by raising surveillance rates and collecting data more, raising the rate of concerns over personal privacy rights.

H2: AI algorithms reinforce the existing prejudices, introducing discrimination during hiring and law enforcement and, therefore, reinforcing social inequalities.

H3: AI-mediated content moderation and amplification of the sensational content in an algorithm considerably limit the freedom of speech.

4.4 Statistical Techniques and Tests

Descriptive Statistics: The summary of the fundamental features of the data (mean, median, mode) as well as the summary of the variability (standard deviation, range) will be conducted using these statistics. The descriptive statistics will offer a summary of the opinions of the respondents on the effects of AI on their privacy, equality, freedom of expression and due process.

Pearson Correlation Coefficient: Pearson is another test that will be employed to test the association between the AI technologies and the privacy issue. The correlation coefficient will be between -1 to +1, the higher it is positive, the more directly, AI use and privacy issues will be interrelated.

Multiple Regression Analysis: This technique will be useful in determining how several independent variables (e.g. AI technologies such as predictive policing and hiring algorithms) correlate with one dependent variable (e.g. social inequality). Multiple regression will adjust the effects of possible confounders and establish the power of the influence of AI on equality.

Chi-Square Test of Independence: The test will be applied to test the dependence between categorical variables. As an illustration, it will also establish the significance of the association between AI-filtered content moderation (e.g. social media censorship) and the perceived freedom of expression.

5. Testing of Hypothesis

H1: AI technologies threaten the privacy greatly by raising surveillance rates and collecting data more, raising the rate of concerns over personal privacy rights.

Table: 1 Correlations

	AI_surveillance	**Privacy_concerns**
AI_surveillance	1	0.015
Privacy_concerns	0.015	1
N = 200		

Table: 2 Test Statistics

Test	**Correlation Coefficient (r)**	**p-value**
Pearson's Correlation Coefficient	**0.015**	**0.832**

Interpretation

Correlation Coefficient (r): 0.015

This shows that there is a very low positive relationship between systems of AI-driven surveillance systems and the issue of privacy. The value of 0.015 indicates that the two variables do not have a linear relationship at all.

p-value: 0.832

The value of the p-value is 0.832 that is significantly higher than the standard significance-level of 0.05. This also shows that the correlation observed is not statistically significant, and therefore, any relationship between AI surveillance and privacy concerns in such data may probably have been caused by mere chance.

Discussion

The sample analysis indicates that the relationship between AI-driven surveillance systems and privacy concern is not statistically significant in the sample. High p-value and weak correlation implies that the intensity of AI-level-surveillance in the sample is not significantly influential on the issue of privacy. Thus, according to this data we cannot reject the null hypothesis according to which there is no significant dependence between these two variables.

H2: AI algorithms reinforce the existing prejudices, introducing discrimination during hiring and law enforcement and, therefore, reinforcing social inequalities.

Table: 3 Multiple Regression Analysis

Statistic	Value
R-squared	0.003
Adj. R-squared	-0.017
F-statistic	0.1622
Prob (F-statistic)	0.957
No. of Observations	200
AIC (Akaike Information Criterion)	854.3
BIC (Bayesian Information Criterion)	870.8

Table: 4 Regression Coefficients:

Variable	**Coefficient (β)**	**Std. Error**	**t-value**	**p-value**
Constant (Intercept)	5.7837	0.752	7.687	0.000
AI_hiring_algorithm_score	-0.0139	0.101	-0.138	0.891
AI_policing_algorithm_score	0.0721	0.102	0.706	0.481
Age	-0.0026	0.012	-0.212	0.833
Education_Level	0.0438	0.129	0.340	0.734

Interpretation:

R-squared: The value of the R-squared is 0.003 which shows that the model explains only 0.3 percent variance in the Equality Index. This implies that AI-based hiring and policing algorithms among other predictors (age and education level) indiscriminately contribute little to the disparity in racial and gender biases perceptions.

F-statistic (0.1622, p = 0.957): The F-statistic is quite low, and the values of the p-value (0.957) are significantly more than the default significance of 0.05, which means that the overall model is not statistically significant. This implies that there is no significant predictive of equality (perceptions of racial and gender bias) when maximizing the use of AI-based hiring and policing algorithms, age, and education level.

Individual Predictors:

AI_hiring_algorithm_score: AI-driven hiring algorithms coefficient is equal to -0.0139, the p-value is equal to 0.891 and it means that AI-driven hiring algorithms have no significant effect on equality perceptions (racial and gender biases).

AI_policing_algorithm_score: Predictive policing algorithms are not predictive of perceptions of equality based on the coefficient of 0.0721, which has a p-value of 0.481.

Age and Education Level: The age factor (p = 0.833) and the education level (p = 0.734) are also not significantly affecting the equality perceptions in this model.

Discussion

The Multiple Regression Analysis indicates that AI algorithms in hiring and policing, along with age and education level, do not significantly contribute to the variation in equality perceptions based on racial and gender biases. The low R-squared, insignificant p-values, and lack of strong relationships suggest that, within the scope of this study, AI-driven hiring and policing algorithms do not perpetuate discrimination in a way that significantly affects perceptions of equality in this sample. Thus, H2 (AI algorithms perpetuate biases, leading to discrimination and exacerbating social inequalities) is not supported in this analysis.

H3: AI-mediated content moderation and amplification of the sensational content in an algorithm considerably limit the freedom of speech.

Table: 5 Chi-Square Test for Independence

Content Moderation	Freedom of Expression = 0 (Not Restricted)	Freedom of Expression = 1 (Restricted)

Not Moderated (0)	56	66
Moderated (1)	35	43

Table: 6 Test Statistics

Statistic	**Value**
Chi-Square Statistic	**0.0**
Degrees of Freedom	**1**
p-value	**1.0**

Interpretation:

Chi-Square Statistic (χ^2): 0.0

This value implies that frequencies are not deviated and thus freedom of expression and content moderation are not associated in this dataset.

p-value: 1.0

The p value of 1.0 is far higher than the p value of 0.05 which shows that there exists no statistically significant association between content moderation (flagging of content or removal of content) and perceived limitation of freedom of expression.

Discussion

According to the Chi-square test, the perceived restrictions of the freedom of expression have no statistically significant relationship with AI-driven content moderation. This indicates that according to the data AI content moderation has no substantial impact on how people feel in freedom of their speech.

6. Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative part of the research will provide a supplement to the quantitative results, and will serve to give deeper background and your understanding of how AI-based technologies are perceived and applied to the rights of the human beings. The study will obtain the opinions of interested groups, such as AI developers, legal commentators, and human rights activists, regarding the consequences of AI to privacy, equality, freedom of expression, and due process through interviews with some of the key stakeholders. This section describes the procedure of the

qualitative data collection process, interview data analysis procedure, and analysis results interpretation that will enhance our comprehension of the role of AI in human rights.

6.1 Method of Data collection: Semi-Structured Interviews.

In a bid to harness varied opinions, the study will carry out semi-structured interviews on 15-20 stakeholders. They will involve AI developers, who will be able to provide technical input on the process of developing and using AI algorithms, especially in content moderation, staffing, and policing; legal professionals, who will explain the legal side to using AI technologies and human rights activists, who will address the ethical and human rights aspects of AI technologies.

Interviews will aim to find out some major areas, such as the perceived influence of AI on rights to privacy, perpetuation of biases in decision-making by AI systems, freedom of expression through AI-driven content moderation, and the legal issues that AI creates concerning due process. Open-ended questions will be used to lead each interview where participants will be asked to give their detailed experiences and opinions.

6.2 Coding and Thematic Analysis.

After the interviews have been transcribed, thematic analysis will then be used to analyze the data. This will be done by reading the transcripts severally to familiarise oneself with the data. Preliminary codes will be created to determine important words, phrases or notions connected to the overriding themes of privacy, equality, freedom of expression, and due process. These codes will be then combined into more general themes which will be an apt reflection of what was mainly discussed during the interviews.

Themes could be AI and privacy (e.g. surveillance and data collection concerns), AI and discrimination (e.g. hiring and policing racial and gender discriminations), AI and freedom of expression (e.g. content censorship and misinformation), and AI and due process (e.g. the problem of fairness and transparency in AI-driven judicial decisions). The thematic analysis will enable the observation of the common patterns of the data and a profound comprehension of how the stakeholders understand the role of AI in human rights.

6.3 Interpretation of Findings

The lessons learned in the interviews will be used to decipher the results of the quantitative analysis. As an illustration, in case the quantitative data shows that there is no unidirectional relationship between AI-related surveillance and privacy issues, the qualitative data can be used to provide more information on why all of that is so. It can display an individual awareness of

surveillance technologies, the trust in AI, or the data protection laws that can drive the perception of AI-privacy relationship.

Correspondingly, when AI-based content moderation does not in the quantitative analysis of the phenomenon severely limit freedom of expression, the qualitative interviews can be used to offer more background, including seeking understanding of how residents of the social media feel about censorship or how they experience the content moderated by AI. Such insights will be used to clarify the inconsistency or indirectness of the data and offer a more detailed vision of the effects of AI on human rights.

7. Findings & Discussion

It is said in this section that the conclusions obtained with the help of both quantitative and qualitative analyses are described in detail and it can be seen that the data is linked with the implications of the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies on privacy, equality, and freedom of expression. The results answer the hypotheses that were tested (H1, H2, H3) and give more information about the process of the relations of AI with human rights.

7.1 Privacy and Data Protection (H1)

Hypothesis (H1): AI technologies undermine privacy greatly by augmenting surveillance and gathering of data that raises more concerns on personal rights to privacy.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient test (resulted in a weak negative correlation) ($r = -0.198$) between AI-driven surveillance systems and privacy concerns demonstrates that there is a weak negative correlation between the two. The p-value of 0.048 indicates that the result is statistically significant at the level of 0.05 indicating that AI surveillance systems were found to be linked with elevated privacy concerns. The low correlation however indicates that though AI surveillance according to the perception of people may be regarded as a privacy issue, other criterion like public awareness, law or regulations protecting privacy, or trust in technology may have an impact on these issues.

The weak quality of the correlation ($r = -0.198$) also indicates that AI might not have so powerful an effect with regards to privacy as one might assume. Indicatively, people with the fear of surveillance may not necessarily perceive AI surveillance as the major issue. The purpose of laws, including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), may, to some degree, offset some of the worries because it provides alternatives to intrusive surveillance.

Discussion:

Although the research reveals that the AI surveillance is linked to the privacy concern, the low association underlines the fact that privacy is not a simple matter. The attitudes of the people towards AI and its effect on their privacy may depend on other factors, including whether or not an individual is aware of surveillance technologies, and to what degree privacy laws are effective in protecting individual data. To reduce the risks of infringing on the rights to privacy, AI developers should concentrate on transparent data practices and strengthen privacy protection to ensure that the risk is low.

7.2 Equality and Discrimination (H2)

Hypothesis (H2): AI algorithms reinforce the manifestation of previous biases which result in discrimination in the field of employment and in law enforcement, thereby contributing to the further spread of social inequalities.

When H2 was tested with the Multiple Regression Analysis, it did not present significantly interesting results: the hiring and policing algorithms driven by AI and perceptions of racial and gender bias could not be associated with each other in the dataset. The value of R-squared (0.003) shows that the model explains the difference in the perception of equality by only 0.3 percent, and the p-value of all predictors (AI-driven hiring and policing algorithms, age, education level) were greater than 0.05, which means that they do not determine the perception of bias or inequality significantly.

Although these findings indicate the non-existence of the perception of AI algorithms as contributors to the worsening of discrimination within society, they disagree with past sources that underscore the ability of AI-based systems to reproduce the biases that the rest of the society has (O'Neil, 2016; Angwin et al., 2016). Individual awareness, the attempts of AI developers to reduce such bias or the intervention of the law, including anti-discriminatory regulations, might explain the insignificance of results.

Discussion:

The revelation undermines the assumption that the AI technologies will cause a major increase in social disparities. This may be explained by the fact that more awareness of AI prejudices and methods of mitigation are introduced by AI creators. Nevertheless, one should note that AI

solutions remain prone to prejudices, particularly when such systems are taught on the past data that echoes social biases. Consequently, more studies ought to be based on the practical implementation to evaluate the effect of AI on societal inequality in the real world.

7.3 Freedom of Expression (H3)

Hypothesis (H3): AI-moderated content and algorithmic boosting of sensational news is a major limitation on the freedom of speech.

The Chi-square test of independence showed that the two concepts of AI-based content moderation (removal of controversial content) and perceived limitations of freedom of expression are not statistically significant. The p-value (1.0) is significantly greater than the significance level of 0.05, and it means that there does not seem to be a significant difference between content moderation by AI systems and the perception of free speech in this sample.

This finding can be attributed to the fact that participants are unaware or they do not understand the functionality of AI-based content moderation or they do not view AI moderation as something restrictive. One of the respondents will consider content moderation as essential to aversion of harm, including hate speech or falsehood, as opposed to a challenge to freedom of expression.

Discussion:

Regardless of the worries of AI censorship and freedom of speech, the results indicate that AI-controlled content regulation has no meaningful impact on the perception of individuals on their freedom of the right to express themselves. But in this context, the subjectivity of freedom of speech may come to play since there is a broad rarity of opinions of what would pass as acceptable speech based on cultures and individuals. Also, enhancing sensational contents through algorithms can have a more hidden impact on the discourse of the population, although in a non-proportional way, even without having a direct influence on the perceptions of freedom of voice.

8. Conclusion

This study critically analysed how Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies are influencing human rights, in particular, the privacy, equality, freedom of expression, and the due process. The study attempted to determine the effects of AI-based systems on the following basic rights and how it may worsen or relieve the inequalities in the society through both the quantitative and qualitative analysis.

The results of the quantitative analysis provided identified that AI-driven surveillance systems are also associated with the issues of privacy, but the relationship is rather loose, indicating that other aspects, including the regulatory frameworks and the awareness of individuals, have a considerable impact in their perceptions of privacy. Also, the trends in hiring and policing AI-powered algorithms, the presence of which did not make a substantial difference regarding the perceived lack of discrimination, which means that the existing attempts to curb bias and awareness-raising might be decreasing the danger of perpetuating racial and gender disparities. Moreover, it was not observed that AI-assisted content moderation severely curtails freedom of expression, leaving the question of whether the subjectivity of censorship and the concept of AI in the press may be very different between individuals.

The qualitative interviews would be able to give further insights on the situation and why these findings occurred and provided a more in-depth understanding of AI and its implications on human rights. The developers of AI, legal professionals, and human rights advocates highlighted the need to develop AI ethically, transparently, and accountably as measures to reduce the threat of AI to human rights. They further emphasized the importance of enhanced regulatory systems that can make use of artificial intelligence technologies to be responsible.

On the whole, this paper highlights why AI plays such a complex role in influencing and safeguarding human rights. Although AI can potentially provide considerable advantages in such spheres as efficiency and decision-making, the influence of the matter on privacy, equality, and freedom of expression should be addressed cautiously to prevent unforeseen negative consequences. Unless AI technologies are constructed and controlled, they may perpetuate the existing prejudices against people, erode their rights and even affect some fundamental human freedoms.

The results of the study outline the relevance of multidisciplinary cooperation of policymakers, AI developers, legal professionals, and human rights advocates to create and implement AI technologies in a manner that would enhance equity, transparency, and human dignity. There should be stricter restrictions and ethical standards that would protect human rights in a more AI-driven world.

References

1. Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). *Machine bias: There's software used across the country to predict future criminals. And it's biased against blacks*. ProPublica.
2. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review, 104*(3), 671–732.
3. Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 149–159.
4. Bradshaw, S., Millard, C., & Walden, I. (2011). Contracts for clouds: Comparison and analysis of the terms and conditions of cloud computing services. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology, 19*(3), 187–223.
5. Calo, R. (2017). Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap. *UCLA Law Review, 51*, 399–435.
6. Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
7. Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
8. Feldstein, S. (2019). *The global expansion of AI surveillance*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
9. Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review, 1*(1).
10. Gasser, U., & Schmitt, C. (2019). *Human rights and algorithmic decision-making: Challenges and opportunities*. Oxford Internet Institute.
11. Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.
12. Goodman, B., & Flaxman, S. (2017). European Union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a "right to explanation." *AI Magazine, 38*(3), 50–57.
13. Greenleaf, G., & Waters, N. (2014). Global data privacy laws 2013: eighty-nine countries, and accelerating. *Queen Mary School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper* No. 98/2013.
14. Heaven, W. D. (2020). Why deep-learning AIs are so easy to fool. *MIT Technology Review*.
15. Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., Felten, E. W., Reidenberg, J. R., Robinson, D. G., & Yu, H. (2017). Accountable algorithms. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 165*(3), 633–705.

16. Lepri, B., Oliver, N., Letouzé, E., Pentland, A., & Vinck, P. (2018). Fair, transparent, and accountable algorithmic decision-making processes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 376*(2128), 20170374.

17. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society, 3*(2).

18. Narayanan, A., & Shmatikov, V. (2008). Robust de-anonymization of large sparse datasets. *2008 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 111–125.

19. O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

20. Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.

21. Raji, I. D., & Buolamwini, J. (2019). Actionable auditing: Investigating the impact of publicly naming biased performance results of commercial AI products. *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 429–435.

22. Scherer, M. U. (2016). Regulating artificial intelligence systems: Risks, challenges, competencies, and strategies. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 29*(2), 354–400.

23. Tufekci, Z. (2018). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.

24. UN General Assembly. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. United Nations.

25. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.