

Algorithmic Social Justice and Gender Equality: Child Labour, Welfare Inequalities and Access to Justice in the Era of Intelligent Governance

A.R. Asha Juliet¹

Dr. D. Rajasekar²

Abstract:

The increasing implementation of algorithmic governance in public welfare institutions is transforming how states address social inequalities, particularly in the areas of child welfare and the justice system. While artificial intelligence (AI) is often praised for its potential to enhance efficiency, predictive accuracy, and scalability, there is mounting evidence that these systems may reinforce or exacerbate existing gender and socio-economic disparities. This research examines the connection between algorithmic decision-making, gender equity, vulnerability to child labour, and access to justice.

This study utilizes a mixed-method research design that includes secondary datasets, policy analysis, and comparative case studies from both developing and developed welfare systems. Research indicates that algorithmic tools used for welfare targeting, risk assessment, and service allocation often contain historical biases within their training data. These biases disproportionately impact marginalized populations, particularly girls, resulting in higher rates of exclusion errors, increased risk of misclassification, and limited access to protective services.

The study presents an Algorithmic Equity Model that emphasizes transparency, bias auditing, the inclusion of gender-sensitive data, and governance based on child rights. This model aligns with global development priorities and underscores the need for regulatory oversight and ethical deployment of AI in welfare systems. The research contributes to ongoing discussions about equitable digital governance and provides policy recommendations for creating justice-oriented, inclusive algorithmic systems.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming public governance by reshaping the delivery of welfare services and justice systems. Governments increasingly use algorithmic decision-making to identify vulnerable populations, allocate welfare benefits, assess social risks, support child protection, monitor education, and assist judicial processes. While these technologies enhance administrative efficiency and evidence-based policymaking, they also raise important concerns regarding fairness, transparency, accountability, and social justice.

Algorithmic governance refers to the use of AI and data-driven systems to support public policy and administrative decisions. Although these systems are often viewed as objective, they rely on historical data that may contain biases related to gender, socio-economic status, caste, ethnicity, and geographical disparities. Consequently, algorithmic decisions may unintentionally reproduce existing inequalities, resulting in unequal access to welfare programmes and public services.

These concerns are particularly significant in welfare administration, where predictive models determine eligibility for healthcare, education, social protection, and child welfare schemes. Biased or inaccurate algorithms can exclude deserving beneficiaries, disproportionately affecting women and girls who already face structural barriers such as discrimination, unequal educational opportunities, unpaid care responsibilities, and limited digital access. Similarly, ineffective identification of vulnerable children may weaken welfare interventions and increase the risk of child labour and exploitation, especially among economically disadvantaged communities.

Algorithmic governance is also influencing access to justice through predictive policing, automated risk assessment, electronic case management, and digital legal services. Although these innovations improve service delivery, they may also create barriers for individuals with limited digital literacy or inadequate

¹ Research Scholar, AMET Business School, AMET University, Chennai, Email: ashajuliet18@gmail.com,

² Professor, AMET Business School, AMET University, Chennai, Email: rajasekar.d@ametuniv.ac.in

access to technology. Such challenges particularly affect women, children, and marginalized populations, restricting their ability to access legal remedies and public services.

Against this backdrop, this study examines the relationship between algorithmic governance, gender equality, child labour vulnerability, and access to justice within intelligent governance systems. It proposes an Algorithmic Equity Model founded on the principles of fairness, transparency, accountability, inclusiveness, and child rights protection. The framework aims to support ethical AI adoption and provide policy recommendations for developing equitable, human-centred governance systems that advance social justice and sustainable development.

2.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To examine the role of algorithmic governance in transforming welfare administration and justice delivery within the framework of intelligent governance.
2. To analyse the impact of AI-driven welfare systems on gender equality, with particular emphasis on women's access to welfare benefits and public services.
3. To investigate how algorithmic bias influences the identification of vulnerable children and contributes to the risk of child labour and exploitation.
4. To evaluate the implications of algorithmic governance for access to justice, particularly among women, children, and other marginalized communities.
5. To examine the ethical, legal, and governance challenges associated with AI-based decision-making in welfare and justice systems, including issues of fairness, transparency, accountability, explainability, and human rights.
6. To develop an Algorithmic Equity Model that provides policy recommendations for designing transparent, inclusive, accountable, and socially just AI-enabled governance systems that promote gender equality, child protection, and equitable access to justice.

3.0 NEED OF THE STUDY

Governments around the world are increasing their use of AI technologies to make decisions that cut across multiple sectors—including healthcare, welfare distribution, education, policing, and judicial administration. While technology offers efficiency and speed, the concern for fairness and accountability in digital governance systems is increasing.

This study was developed from the realization that many algorithmic systems are implemented without sufficient examination of their social impact. Vulnerable populations—most notably women and children—are frequently impacted by exclusion errors and biased predictions. In developing nations, welfare systems already deal with issues of poverty, illiteracy, gender inequality, and lack of institutional assistance. Adding to these difficulties by using biased automated systems in developing countries will likely increase pre-existing inequalities.

Child labour is still a significant issue and, as such, finding solutions to combat this ongoing form of social injustice is important. Data-based targeting mechanisms are employed by various welfare programs for identifying families who are at-risk of child labour; if these systems do not have the ability to identify hidden forms of deprivation, children may be deprived of accessing welfare services as well as facing greater potential for labour exploitation.

Along with this, many of today's justice systems are becoming increasingly digitalised. For example, online courts, automated court systems, and predictive policing have emerged, all serving to change traditional methods of operation within justice institutions. These changes can create barriers to access to justice for already marginalised populations due to a lack of digital literacy and the potential for algorithmic discrimination.

The current reality necessitates thorough examination into whether intelligent governance systems genuinely provide social justice, or whether these intelligent systems perpetuate existing inequalities using a technological lens.

4.0 PROBLEM OF THE STUDY

Although many people believe that Algorithmic systems are objective, neutral tools, multiple research studies have shown that these Algorithms can harbor historical and social prejudice stemming from their composite training data. Additionally, Algorithms built upon Predictive Analytics in Welfare Systems have

the potential to incorrectly classify poor families, deny them access to benefits, or overlook vulnerable children.

Young girls, and other marginalized populations, are particularly harmed by Algorithmics since pre-existing social inequalities frequently saturate the fabric of core social systems. The extent of the problem is compounded by the difficulty in challenging Algorithmic decisions as a result of the lack of accountability and transparency in making them.

A second concern is the lack of gender-sensitive, Child-Centered approaches to AI governance; there is a prevailing preference for efficiency over the welfare of humans in the vast majority of AI Governance Systems. This creates risks associated with discrimination, exclusion, and inequitable access to services.

Therefore, the research will examine the manner in which Algorithmic Governance may result in increased welfare inequalities; increased child labor vulnerabilities; and increased barriers to justice, rather than promoting equitable approaches to social development.

5.0 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The study of algorithmic government has seen an increase in activity in recent times, with research being focused on the advantages and disadvantages of artificial intelligence support systems in terms of public administration.

O'Neil (2016) found that many algorithms are essentially "tools for the destruction of math," because they support furthering inequities through the use of processes that do not allow citizens access to see how the decisions were arrived upon.

According to the author, the use of automated systems for welfare, education as well as criminal justice frequently gives the upper hand to poor communities.

According to Eubanks (2017), digital welfare systems can do harm to people in poverty via automated decision-making processes, which is supported by Eubanks' (2017) investigation of welfare technology targeting marginalized populations using surveillance methods.

Noble (2017) also explored algorithmic discrimination and the impact of search algorithms and digital systems on reproducing racial/gender disparities. Ethical AI governance structures were an area which Noble (2017) strongly suggested require more emphasis and attention to detail.

Barocas & Selbst (2016) address issues of discrimination through big data systems, arguing that data-driven algorithms produce inequitable results unintentionally when there was no intent to discriminate against individuals.

According to UNICEF (2020), Artificial Intelligence (AI) is impacting children and should support the four child rights: child rights, fairness, privacy, and accountability. The report noted the negative impact of biased AI systems on the most at-risk children.

In discussing machine learning (Binns, 2018) fairness, transparency itself will not provide for social justice. You also need to have ethical governance and accountability mechanisms.

The results of studies on gender inequality indicate that girls and women continue to be under-represented in data sets, which will continue to lead to unintentionally biased AI systems. Data gaps about women, as explained in Criado-Perez (2019), have a continuing effect on public policy and the design of technologies.

Poverty, social exclusion, and lack of access to education remain the main contributing factors for child labour according to research done by the International Labour Organization (ILO). Hence, welfare systems are critical for supporting children in decreasing their chances of becoming vulnerable.

In the area of justice, Angwin and others (2016) investigated predictive risk assessment systems and discovered Racism was evident in the algorithms used by the criminal justice system. The findings raised serious questions about whether or not automated decisions made within the justice system are fair.

The literature has made it clear that there are both positive and negative aspects associated with algorithmic governance; however little research has been conducted to connect algorithmic justice, gender equality, child labour, and welfare governance. The purpose of this research is to develop connections between these issues.

6.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a mixed-method research design based mainly on secondary data analysis, policy review, and comparative case study examination.

Sources of Data

The study uses data collected from:

- Government reports
- International organization publications
- Research journals
- Policy documents
- UNICEF and ILO reports
- Academic books and conference papers

Research Approach

The study will use both descriptive and analytical approaches to create an understanding of the relationship between social inequalities and algorithmic governance.

Comparative Analysis

The research analyzes the welfare and criminal justice systems in both developed and developing countries to find out how they differ and have similarities in implementing algorithms.

Conceptual Framework

The research creates an Algorithmic Equity Model with an emphasis on:

- Transparency
- Fairness
- Gender-sensitive data
- Bias auditing
- Child-rights protection
- Ethical governance

6.1 Algorithmic Governance and Welfare Systems

As algorithms become more widely used by governments to administer their welfare programs, they perform the following main tasks: Identify who will be receiving benefits, detect fraud, allocate funds/resources and monitor how well services are being delivered.

By digitizing their systems for administering their welfare programs, government agencies can save time and provide better services to their clients. The more automatic the decision-making process is, the more fragile and dangerous the digitized model becomes.

Numerous welfare algorithms are based on historical socio-economic data, if there are historical disparities from said data the system may perpetuate these trends, resulting in a higher likelihood of individuals from poorer households; migrant households; rural communities; and female-headed households experiencing "exclusion."

Their often-automated nature also reduces the levels of human interaction during the decision-making process, thus leaving beneficiaries without a firm answer as to why they were excluded from receiving assistance. The result is reduced trust and accountability of public systems.

6.2 Gender Equality and Algorithmic Bias

Major concerns regarding AI governance arise from gender bias throughout the use of algorithms. Since algorithms utilize existing social datasets to learn, gender bias can be present in the data being used, which will have an impact on how automated systems make decisions about individuals (such as women) who may be treated unfairly.

Girls experience many types of hidden deprivation that do not show up in existing datasets. One example is the fact that unpaid work done by girls around the house may not be captured in welfare datasets, and thus, welfare systems would likely overlook girls' vulnerability related to these tasks.

Women also experience obstacles related to digital accessibility, education, and financial inclusion. Such obstacles further compromise the reliability and availability of gender-related datasets.

Gender bias in welfare systems can be seen in:

- Educational support allocation
- Healthcare access
- Social protection eligibility
- Legal aid availability
- Employment support programs

Hence the need for gender-sensitive policy design in AI governance systems.

6.3 Child Labour and Intelligent Governance

Child labour is still a very real problem for many developing countries. Economic hardship, the burden of family debts, migration, having dropped out of school, or economic factors that cause children to have no place in society lead many children into the workforce.

Smart government systems are able to use predictive analytics and risk identification tools to impact child welfare in order to identify families that qualify for welfare and families that qualify for protective services.

A child not benefiting from a welfare programme by reason of erroneous algorithmic classification may be at a heightened risk of experiencing child labour as an outcome. Girls may be even more vulnerable to this because they are more likely than boys to be doing informal or household work.

When responsibly applied, technology can help reduce child labour. Artificial intelligence can assist with identifying at-risk school dropouts, monitoring labour violations and improving targeting in welfare projects. Obtaining both transparency and inclusivity is necessary for systems to be able to perform these functions.

6.4 Access to Justice in the Digital Era

Digitization of the entire justice system has markedly increased in litigation and law enforcement with the shift toward AI-supported case management and legal analytics. Digital systems offer enhanced efficiency and adaptability. Conversely, when dealing with disadvantaged/marginalized individuals without adequate digital access, new forms of inequality can develop as a product of this transition. Individuals from low-income communities experience lack of internet access, lack of digital literacy, and lack of awareness of their rights within the legal system. Each time social barriers exist, the burden for women and children in obtaining justice increases. Use of algorithms and artificial intelligence in law enforcement has posed fundamental issues around the ethics and responsibility of ethical conduct. There is a strong risk of systems being designed to focus on and target marginalized communities. Access to justice should be based on the principles of human rights and the need for justice, not on the convenience of technology.

6.5 Algorithmic Equity Model

The study presents an Algorithmic Equity Model to facilitate equitable governance systems.

Key Elements of the Model

1. Transparency

It is important that citizens to be familiar with how algorithms function to make decisions.

2. Bias Auditing

There should be ongoing assessments to identify where discrimination exists in both data sets and outcomes.

3. Gender-Sensitive Data

Data collection systems should specifically consider the vulnerabilities of people by gender.

4. Child Rights Protection

When AI systems impact children, the welfare and safety of those children is the most important consideration.

5. Human Oversight

All welfare and justice decision-making should continue to include human review mechanisms.

6. Ethical Regulation

Governments must implement the legal structures necessary to manage AI in a responsible manner.

7.0 FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

Major Findings

1. Historically recorded social disparities usually have some degree of influence on algorithmic systems, as such systems are not fully impartial.
2. Welfare applications that employ automation are particularly detrimental to girls and exclude marginalized groups.
3. Misclassifying beneficiaries of the welfare system may increase the risk of child labour.
4. A system of digital governance loses the public's trust when there is a lack of transparency.
5. Digital and socio-economic inequalities prevent equitable access to the justice system.
6. In many countries, there is an ethical deficit in governance.

Suggestions

1. Mandatory bias audits for public algorithms should be introduced by Governments.
2. Gender-sensitive, child-centered data methods should be incorporated into welfare systems.
3. Important welfare and legal decisions should retain human oversight.
4. Vulnerable communities should be taught digital literacy by public institutions.
5. Social justice and human rights should be prioritized by AI governance policies.
6. Fairness of welfare technologies should be assessed by independent monitoring bodies.
7. Ethical AI standards in child welfare systems should be established through international cooperation.

8.0 CONCLUSION

There are clear indications that welfare and criminal justice administrations worldwide are turning into algorithmically governed systems. The opportunities that arise from AI technologies for greater efficiency and enhanced services are fraught with serious concerns about inequality, exclusion, and discrimination.

The research findings revealed that welfare algorithms could in effect exacerbate socio-economic biases and reinforce gender inequality by using flawed or outdated data. Girl children are at greater risk of discrimination, exclusion from welfare benefits, and consequent increased exposure to child labour.

Likewise, the development of digital justice administration could pose further obstacles for marginal groups if aspects of fairness and access are not addressed in the proper way. Technology alone cannot overcome social injustices, human rights standards, accountable governance and human governance will need to be put back into the center of intelligent governance.

The Algorithmic Equity Model proposed points to the absolute need for transparent, equal, child-safe, and gender-sensitive policies. The focus for government/policymakers must be to create technological systems that promote social justice, instead of creating further and more dimensions of inequality.

Future pathways to smart governance must not only focus on technological improvement but the promotion of human dignity, the protection of equality and social justice for all people.

9.0 REFERENCES

- Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671–732.
- Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 81, 1–11.
- Criado-Perez, C. (2019). *Invisible women: Data bias in a world designed for men*. Abrams Press.

- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- International Labour Organization. (2021). *Child labour: Global estimates 2020, trends and the road forward*. ILO.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.
- UNICEF. (2020). *Policy guidance on AI for children*. UNICEF Office of Global Insight and Policy.
- Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias. *ProPublica*.
- United Nations. (2021). *The age of digital interdependence*. United Nations Publications.
- World Bank. (2022). *Digital development report*. World Bank Publications.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. Public Affairs.
- Agarwal, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and public governance: Challenges of inclusion and accountability. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 21(4), 1–10.
- Alston, P. (2019). Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights. *United Nations Human Rights Council*. <https://www.ohchr.org>
- Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code*. Polity Press.
- Bovens, M., & Zouridis, S. (2002). From street-level to system-level bureaucracies: How information and communication technology is transforming administrative discretion and constitutional control. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 174–184.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *The business of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Cath, C. (2018). Governing artificial intelligence: Ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 376(2133), 1–13.
- Citron, D. K., & Pasquale, F. (2014). The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. *Washington Law Review*, 89(1), 1–33.
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). *AI ethics*. MIT Press.
- European Commission. (2020). *White paper on artificial intelligence: A European approach to excellence and trust*. European Union.
- Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707.
- Gillingham, P. (2019). Can predictive algorithms assist decision-making in social work with children and families? *Child Abuse Review*, 28(2), 114–126.
- Keddell, E. (2019). Algorithmic justice in child protection: Statistical fairness, social justice and the implications for practice. *Social Sciences*, 8(10), 1–16.
- Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 1–21.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *OECD principles on artificial intelligence*. OECD Publishing.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.



- Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 59–68.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2022). *Human development report 2021/2022: Uncertain times, unsettled lives*. UNDP.
- Van Dijck, J. (2020). Governing digital societies: Private platforms, public values. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 36, 1–9.
- Veale, M., & Brass, I. (2019). Administration by algorithm? Public management meets public sector machine learning. *Public Money & Management*, 39(6), 368–376.
- 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*, 7(2), 76–99.