

When Should Algorithms Resign?

Umang Bhatt*^{1,2} and Holli Sargeant*^{3,4}

¹Center for Data Science, New York University

²The Alan Turing Institute

³Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge

⁴Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society

Abstract

This short article discusses *algorithmic resignation*, a strategic approach for managing the use of artificial intelligence (AI) systems within organizations. Algorithmic resignation involves the deliberate and informed disengagement from AI assistance in certain scenarios by embedding governance mechanisms directly into AI systems. Our proposal is not merely about the disuse of AI but includes guiding when and how these systems should be used or avoided. We discuss the various benefits of algorithmic resignation, spanning economic efficiency, reputational gains, and legal compliance. Further, we outline how to operationalize resignation through methods such as positive and negative nudges, stakeholder incentive alignment, and careful consideration of the level of AI engagement. By using techniques like barring access to AI outputs selectively or providing explicit disclaimers on system performance, algorithmic resignation not only mitigates risks associated with AI but also leverages its benefits, ensuring the responsible and effective use of AI systems.

Introduction

Tesla recently won a pivotal lawsuit related to its Autopilot system. Jurors held that a fatal accident was not the fault of Tesla’s driver-assistance system because all drivers were informed they must maintain full control over the vehicle [1]. The driver was ultimately held responsible, and the verdict absolves Tesla’s Autopilot system at a pivotal moment for autonomous vehicle technology. Importantly, this case raises critical questions about the complex interplay between human operators and AI systems and underscores the legal challenges of humans and AI systems working together.

When organizations grant members access to AI systems, they are responsible for members’ use of such tools. Although some members may use AI judiciously, human oversight does not inherently guarantee proper use. Even partial automation may lull some members into complacency [2]. Just as most drivers are not drunk, many members may use AI appropriately; however, the stakes of AI misuse are high. Members who fall prey to complacency expose organizations to unforeseen risks, including lowering their bottom line or suffering reputational damage. Research shows that over-reliance on AI systems often leads users to perform worse on tasks compared to the performance of the user or the AI system working alone [3–6].

Unlike ex-post enforcement against drunk drivers, we advocate building governance mechanisms into AI systems directly. We argue for **algorithmic resignation**, a phenomenon where organizations resign algorithmic assistance in favor of (unaided) human decision-making. Algorithmic resignation places governance into system design and provides concrete guidance for appropriate use, distinguishing permissible levels of automation from inappropriate or unlawful ones. Such an approach allows organizations to control when and how AI systems are used.

*Both authors contributed equally. Correspondence to: umangbhatt@nyu.edu

What is Algorithmic Resignation?

Algorithmic resignation is the strategic disengagement or limitation of AI assistance in specific scenarios. This concept is not merely about the disuse of AI but is about embedding governance mechanisms within AI systems, guiding when and how these systems should be used or avoided. Organizations can embed algorithmic resignation directly into the AI systems they build, procure, or deploy. Deciding when to mandate the disuse of AI systems depends on a variety of factors [7].

One set of factors may depend on the AI system’s performance. For instance, when an AI system encounters scenarios it has not been trained on (known as “out-of-distribution” instances), or when the system is highly uncertain in its predictions, resignation can act as a safeguard against displaying potentially erroneous predictions. Identifying under which conditions an AI system should resign will be context-specific. Nonetheless, existing tools in the computer science community can be repurposed to implement algorithmic resignation. In machine learning research, the notion of deferral begets AI systems that abstain from providing predictions on specific data [8–11]. If AI systems were uncertainty-aware and knew their own shortcomings, then organizations could decide a threshold after which AI systems should not be accessible. Well-calibrated models are confident when correct and uncertain when incorrect: they instantiate resignation if uncertain predictions are ignored in favor of human judgment [12]. Displaying uncertain AI system predictions to members would likely degrade member performance on various decision-making tasks. Resignation is a veil of selectivity that organizations can use to empower members to make decisions in specific settings without the aid of a potentially misleading AI system [influenced by Rawls’ veil of ignorance 13, 137].

Beyond factors that depend on the AI system itself, organizations can consider resignation depending on the user of the system. As preferences and expertise may differ across members, organizations can enable each member to have access to AI systems when most appropriate for them [14]. Junior doctors may benefit from assistance more than senior physicians; however, even for the latter, nudging experienced doctors to view predictions from AI systems may counteract overconfidence [15]. Resignation protects organizations from members who overestimate their expertise by forcing AI system assistance upon them or those who undermine their abilities by revoking AI system access. AI systems can also resign in a way that only complements, not reinforces, an expert’s skills. One practical application could be selectively enabling non-native English speakers to use large language models, like ChatGPT, for composing clearer communications, while prohibiting its use for critical decision-making tasks [16].

Beyond individual personalization, organizations can elect to create broad policies for algorithmic resignation. These policies may depend on internal organizational norms (e.g., documentation practices) or external industry-wide regulations (e.g., professional conduct rules). A law firm may allow the use of ChatGPT for internal research or communications but not for external client interactions or for routine tasks by paralegals but not for attorney’s legal advisory work. The use of an AI system should not interfere with lawyers’ responsibility to deliver competent legal services, although using new technology may be relevant to upholding their duty of competence [17]. Therefore, organizations should craft a strategy to decide not only how much AI assistance to provide to members but also to which members in particular.

Operationally, resignation can be implemented in various ways. It can range from completely barring access to AI outputs in certain scenarios to softer measures like explicit disclaimers or guidance. For instance, a large language model might refuse to provide responses to queries that border on legal advice, instead offering general legal information that is unregulated. On the other hand, instead of barring access, an organization may resign an AI system by adding friction to the member’s experience when using the system. For example, this might entail providing a reminder of organizational policy or showing a warning on the AI system’s level of uncertainty. Figure 1 provides examples of use across the different potential levels of access. By promoting




Figure 1: Examples of varying levels of member access to AI systems across an organization.

the disuse of AI systems via resignation, organizations can prevent misuse or, worse, abuse of AI-assisted decision-making.

Benefits of Resignation

Algorithmic resignation offers a range of benefits spanning economic, reputational, and legal domains. These advantages not only improve the operational efficiency of organizations but also align with broader ethical and regulatory expectations.

Financial

From a financial perspective, algorithmic resignation can lead to significant cost savings and increased efficiency. By enabling selective use of AI, organizations can optimize decision-making processes, ensuring that AI systems are used where they add the most value and avoiding costly errors associated with over-reliance on AI. By providing structured choices on when to use AI, a firm helps employees exercise better control and judgment when they otherwise may not act in the best interests of the firm [18]. The selective approach is a strategy to align the interests of various stakeholders, thereby optimizing overall performance and minimizing the friction and costs that arise when different parties' interests diverge. By ensuring the selective use of AI tools, organizations can optimize for better decision-making processes. This optimization is not just about the efficiency of decisions but also the perception of decision-making. Beyond making AI-assisted decision-making accurate, cost-effective, and efficient, organizations can help members better perceive when AI-assistance would harm their decision-making and can improve third parties' understanding of how the firm uses AI systems.

Reputational

Implementing algorithmic resignation will demonstrate a commitment to responsible AI, setting a precedent for meaningful commitment to the conscious application of technology. Such commitment is a display of trustworthiness, as stakeholders and the public more broadly observe the organization behaving in *good faith* [19]. By channeling algorithmic resignation to govern the conscious use of AI systems, stakeholders are assured that these technologies act as supplements to, rather than substitutes for, human judgment and expertise. Moreover, the reputational backlash associated with the misuse of AI is both significant and well-documented, with numerous instances being subject to legal scrutiny and resulting in reputational damage [20]. Therefore, a

proactive stance towards responsible AI preempts risks and contributes to building a sustainable and positive brand image in the long term.

Legal

In the face of increasing calls for external AI regulation, there is a strong incentive for organizations to develop internal governance mechanisms like algorithmic resignation. Algorithmic resignation allows organizations to self-regulate meaningfully by embedding governance mechanisms directly within AI systems. This concept then offers a proactive, self-regulatory approach that aligns with, and even anticipates, external regulatory demands [21]. Emerging legislation, such as the European Union’s Artificial Intelligence Act and the US Executive Order on AI, is concerned with responsible use and categorizing the risk of using different types of AI systems [22, 23]. By embedding principles of algorithmic resignation into their operations, organizations can proactively address these emerging legal requirements. Not only does this aid in compliance, but it also reduces the risk of legal challenges stemming from over-reliance on AI, such as those related to errors, privacy breaches, or unethical decision-making. The advent of legislation marks a critical juncture for organizations to reevaluate their AI strategies and adopt internal mechanisms like algorithmic resignation to ensure responsible and compliant AI use.

By strategically implementing algorithmic resignation, organizations can harness the power of AI systems while maintaining control, ensuring ethical compliance, and enhancing their reputation in the market.

Considerations of Algorithmic Resignation

The successful deployment of algorithmic resignation requires careful consideration of several factors. These considerations ensure that resignation aligns with organizational goals and regulatory requirements.

Directionality of Selectivity

Directionality refers to the guidance provided for AI use or disuse. Organizations will decide how to nudge members towards intended use. Encouraging the use or disuse of AI can be achieved through various methods. Nudges can have a positive or negative effect, depending on their intended effect and the context in which they are applied [24]. Positive nudges are crafted to coax individuals gently towards choices that are beneficial both for their personal well-being and the greater societal good. Conversely, negative nudges, while still preserving the essence of choice, subtly discourage actions or decisions that are deemed harmful or less desirable. Such nudges work on the premise of dissuasion rather than prohibition, leveraging human psychology to steer behavior away from less favorable outcomes.

Nudging in respect of AI systems can be implemented through restraints, disclosures, and guidance to members using AI systems [25–27]. A positive nudge could remind members to use AI systems by forcing members to view an AI system recommendation before proceeding or subtly indicating with visual cues that AI system prediction may help. For example, hospital administrators could add a prompt in a clinical decision support system encouraging doctors to review AI suggestions for patient treatment. On the other hand, a negative nudge would deter members from AI assistance, ranging from disclosures about AI shortcomings to restraints on access. Social media companies may embed a warning in an automated content moderation tool indicating high uncertainty in AI predictions, suggesting manual review. This strategic approach ensures that AI is used where it adds the most value, avoiding over-reliance while capitalizing on its benefits [28].

Incentives and Stakeholder Trade-offs

The successful implementation of algorithmic resignation requires an understanding of the various incentives driving different stakeholders. Within organizations, individuals (like managers or employees) may have personal motivations that differ from those of the organization’s directors or owners. These personal motivations may lead to blatant or careless misuse of AI systems. There are economic costs that arise from the inefficiencies or losses incurred due to misaligned objectives [18, 29, 30]. These differing incentives mean that each stakeholder may desire a different level of use. To manage individuals acting in their best interest, there is often a need for oversight and incentives to encourage behavior that is in the best interest of the organization. For instance, in complex healthcare settings, the decision to use tools like EKGs can be influenced by various stakeholders’ interests. Hospitals might favor the use of AI for efficiency and improved diagnostics, while insurers might be cautious about the overuse of AI due to their hefty costs. The challenge lies in balancing these incentives for the use of AI systems.

Level of Engagement

The level of engagement considers the extent to which members use AI systems in their decision-making processes. A high level of engagement (e.g., AI significantly influences an entire outcome) may conflict with regulatory oversight. Algorithmic resignation could have prevented recent misuses of large language models in the legal profession. An attorney in the US was sanctioned for using ChatGPT to draft a brief that generated fake judicial opinions and legal citations [31], and a federal judge in Brazil is facing investigations for a judgment that contained excerpts from ChatGPT, citing non-existent and incorrect details. Though the level of engagement with AI was high in both instances, it is worth considering if legal professional rules would have been breached had the prose from ChatGPT been edited (i.e., if AI were selectively used).

Organizations operating in the EU must ensure their members are not making solely automated decisions with legal or similarly significant effects on individuals unless they do so within specific conditions of GDPR data processing (i.e., for business necessity or with express consent) [32]. Even if a human participates in the decision-making process, it is considered a solely automated decision if they are unable to “influence the causal link between the automated processing and the final decision,” the “automated processing remains the only element justifying the approach” [33]. For decisions subject to regulation, resignation would need to provide restraint and thus bar access to AI to ensure the appropriate level of engagement. Where the level of engagement is low, algorithmic resignation plays a different role, focusing more on guiding members on when and how to effectively query AI systems. For example, it might involve nudging members towards AI assistance in certain situations while ensuring that the final decision remains predominantly in human hands. The level of engagement with AI will influence the scope of algorithmic resignation. Where there is high use of AI systems, there could be regulatory needs for thresholds between automation and human oversight. Resignation can help realize an appropriate level of AI use.

In conclusion, the implementation of algorithmic resignation necessitates a nuanced understanding of the directionality of AI system interaction, the varied incentives of stakeholders, and the level of engagement with AI systems. By carefully considering these aspects, organizations can develop robust strategies for the responsible and effective use of AI, aligning technology use with broader organizational objectives and ethical standards.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Katherine Collins, Adrian Weller, and John Zerilli for their helpful feedback. UB acknowledges funding from the Alan Turing Institute. HS acknowledges funding from the General Sir John Monash Foundation.

References

- [1] California Superior Court. *Molander v. Tesla Inc.* No. RIC2002469, (Cal. Super. Ct. Oct. 31, 2023), 2023. [1](#)
- [2] Carey K Morewedge, Sendhil Mullainathan, Haaya F Naushan, Cass R Sunstein, Jon Kleinberg, Manish Raghavan, and Jens O Ludwig. Human bias in algorithm design. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(11):1822–1824, 2023. [1](#)
- [3] Ben Green and Yiling Chen. The principles and limits of algorithm-in-the-loop decision making. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 3(CSCW), nov 2019. [1](#)
- [4] Yunfeng Zhang, Q. Vera Liao, and Rachel K. E. Bellamy. Effect of confidence and explanation on accuracy and trust calibration in ai-assisted decision making. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, page 295–305. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020.
- [5] Christoph Keding and Philip Meissner. Managerial overreliance on ai-augmented decision-making processes: How the use of ai-based advisory systems shapes choice behavior in r&d investment decisions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 171:120970, 2021.
- [6] Zana Buçinca, Maja Barbara Malaya, and Krzysztof Z. Gajos. To trust or to think: Cognitive forcing functions can reduce overreliance on ai in ai-assisted decision-making. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 5(CSCW1), apr 2021. [1](#)
- [7] Raja Parasuraman and Victor Riley. Humans and automation: Use, misuse, disuse, abuse. *Human factors*, 39(2):230–253, 1997. [2](#)
- [8] Peter L Bartlett and Marten H Wegkamp. Classification with a reject option using a hinge loss. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(Aug):1823–1840, 2008. [2](#)
- [9] David Madras, Toni Pitassi, and Richard Zemel. Predict responsibly: improving fairness and accuracy by learning to defer. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [10] Hussein Mozannar and David Sontag. Consistent estimators for learning to defer to an expert. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7076–7087. PMLR, 2020.
- [11] Bryan Wilder, Eric Horvitz, and Ece Kamar. Learning to complement humans. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1526–1533, 2021. [2](#)
- [12] Umang Bhatt, Javier Antorán, Yunfeng Zhang, Q Vera Liao, Prasanna Sattigeri, Riccardo Fogliato, Gabrielle Melançon, Ranganath Krishnan, Jason Stanley, Omesh Tickoo, et al. Uncertainty as a form of transparency: Measuring, communicating, and using uncertainty. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 401–413, 2021. [2](#)
- [13] John Rawls. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press, 1971. [2](#)
- [14] Umang Bhatt. *Trustworthy Machine Learning: From Algorithmic Transparency to Decision Support*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2023. [2](#)
- [15] Cass R Sunstein. *Decisions about Decisions: Practical Reason in Ordinary Life*. Cambridge University Press, 2023. [2](#)
- [16] Auro Del Giglio and Mateus Uerlei Pereira da Costa. The use of artificial intelligence to improve the scientific writing of non-native english speakers. *Revista da Associação Médica Brasileira*, 69:e20230560, 2023. [2](#)
- [17] Jamie Baker. Beyond the Information Age: the Duty of Technology Competence in the Algorithmic Society. *South Carolina Law Review*, 69:557, 2017. [2](#)
- [18] Michael Jensen and William Meckling. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4):305–360, 1976. [3](#), [5](#)
- [19] Onora O’Neill. Linking trust to trustworthiness. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 26(2):293–300, 2018. [3](#)

- [20] Matthias Holweg, Rupert Younger, and Yuni Wen. The Reputational Risks of AI. *California Management Review Insights*, 2022. 3
- [21] Christine Parker. Reinventing regulation within the corporation: Compliance-oriented regulatory innovation. *Administration & Society*, 32(5):529–565, 2000. 4
- [22] European Parliament. *Amendments adopted by the European Parliament on 14 June 2023 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain Union legislative acts, (COM(2021)0206 – C9-0146/2021 – 2021/0106(COD))*. European Parliament, 2023. 4
- [23] Joe R. Biden. *Executive Order 14110, Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence*. The White House, 2023. 4
- [24] Richard H Thaler and Cass R Sunstein. *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Penguin, 2009. 4
- [25] Alberto Alemanno and Alessandro Spina. Nudging legally: On the checks and balances of behavioral regulation. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 12(2):429–456, 2014. 4
- [26] Arto Laitinen and Otto Sahlgren. AI systems and respect for human autonomy. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 4:1–14, 2021.
- [27] Oren Bar-Gill, Cass Sunstein, and Inbal Talgam-Cohen. Algorithmic harm in consumer markets. *Journal of Legal Analysis*, 15(1):1–47, 2023. 4
- [28] John Zerilli, Umang Bhatt, and Adrian Weller. Transparency Modulates Trust in Artificial Intelligence. *Patterns*, 2022. 4
- [29] Richard Posner. *Economic analysis of law*. Aspen Publishers, 2003. 5
- [30] Burrhus Frederic Skinner. *Science and Human Behavior*. Simon and Schuster, 1965. 5
- [31] United States District Court. *Opinion and Order on Sanctions, Mata v Avainca, Inc.* No. 1:22-cv-01461 (SDNY 22 June 2023), 2023. 5
- [32] European Union. *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation)*. OJ L 119/1, 2016. 5
- [33] Court of Justice of the European Union. *Opinions of AG Pikamäe, SCHUFA Holding and Others II (C-634/21)*. ECR, 2023. 5