

A Theoretical Appraise of the Rights of Human and Robots in the Emerging Nigerian Industrial Environment

Ake Okechukwu

Ignatius Ajuru, University of Education, Rumuolumini Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

Abstract: The human and robot rights' debate in relation to their roles in the work place has persistently triggered question of 'robot responsibility and has invoked some of the most differentiated opinions in artificial intelligent ethics. In contributing to the existing debate about this construct, this paper focused on the theoretical appraisal of the rights of human and robots in the emerging industrial environment. The paper established that while some scholars and professionals advocate or supports the granting robots' rights on a par with human beings, others, in a blunt disagreement contends that robots are not worthy of rights but are objects that should be our slaves. This paper contends that denying robots 'rights is not acceptable, and that robots, as artifacts evolving out of and arbitrating human being, are the kinds of things that could be granted rights in the workplace. Since robots are seen as mediators of human being, it then becomes very pertinent to understand how the 'robot and human rights' debate is focused on first world problems, at the expense of urgent ethical concerns, such as machine prejudice, machine provoked human labour mistreatment, and attrition of discretion all impacting society's least advantaged individuals. The paper concludes that, if human being is the starting point and human well-being is the primary focus, the negative impacts emerging from human treatment of machine makes it clear that the advocacy for robots tight is not over emphasized.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

There has been a plethora of gaps in literature in relation to the conventional deliberation on automation, the induction of new technologies at the workplace and the future of work, especially as it concerns the interaction of human and robotic technology in modern organization. This ensuing discussion has paid critical attention basically on the number of jobs that will be lost as a aftermath of the utilization of robotics or machines in modern organization through the rising adventure in technological innovation (De Stefano, 2018). However, what has not been discussed in a broader perspective is whether employees' rights and that of robots have any significant effect on work relations in the work place. Secondly, there is paucity of literature on the importance of Robotic rights in the organizations as many scholars and professionals have over time devoted time and effort in arguing about how technologies will drive away humans in the work organization in recent times and its implication to productivity. However, issues connected with

the quality of jobs in future labour markets has gained a lot of interest because of the perceived negative impact of technological advancement that is positioning machines (robotics) to take many jobs ordinarily known to be undertaken by man. This increasing interest in these emerging debates as underscored previously is an attempt at discouraging the unfavourable effects on workers of awarding legal capacity and rights as well as obligation to robots. It points out that a vital function of labour law is to regulate these mandate and privileges by focussing more on the protection of human dignity of workers. There has been call by scholars for the evaluation of numerous consequences of establishing contemporary automated work processes in existing workplaces, as well as an all-embracing analysis of the relation between human and machine labour, on the other hand how workers interact with advanced manufacturing machinery (Kolhatkar, 2017). Undeniably, the theoretical and strategy discussion surrounding these matters has principally espoused a quantitative method, trying to evaluate the number of workers that could be put out of a job as a consequence of technological breakthroughs (Frey & Osborn 2013; Dauth et al. 2017). So far, the use of robotics, machines and other technological tools in the workplace has resonated this debate which has not sufficiently focussed on the qualitative aspects connected with job automation. In other words, much less consideration has been paid to the quality of the jobs that will be left, but that will necessitate growing communications between humans and technological tools, both in the shapes of advanced machinery and of software used to manage businesses and production processes. Accordingly, software and hardware are even now being diffused in contemporary workplaces which has enabled managers to pass on instructions to workers in relation to the work they do and to control their performance through digital tools (Moore, Akhtar, & Upchurch, 2018). Artificial intelligence, through the use of big data and management algorithm systems are by now a certainty in most work environment especially in USA, European countries, China, Japan, they are ideally leading to very indiscreet work practices (Dagnino, 2017). Identifying legal rights and responsibilities to non-human beings, consequently, is not an unbiased process; it is in the views of this paper valuable, but on the other hand, can lead to the introduction of exploitations that put other parties in difficulties. In addition, it is important to note that, assigning

electronic personality to robots could also allow the owners of these robots to shed responsibility and could leave other parties, including commercial partners, creditors, customers and workers that interact with these robots, exposed to the risk of having no meaningful redress in case of damage. Nor can it be taken for granted that assigning legal rights and obligations to robots could advance or trigger having robots equated with human beings in the future, particularly if artificial intelligence is designed in a way to develop features that render it more and more similar to conscience and human intelligence (Kaplan, 2016). Then again, in this regard, the practice in relation to legal personality is expressive, as corporations are presently being protected under human-right instruments and constitutional mechanisms regarding some of their rights. But protection of the rights of non-natural persons has also been deemed to extend to elements that would in principle seem reserved to the exclusive enjoyment of human beings such as exercise of religion. Recognising rights to non-natural entities could, therefore, lead to outcomes that go beyond the original practical intentions underlying this recognition. As such, any potential assessment of potentially introducing electronic personality for smart robots should call for the broadest possible analysis of its potential implications. Making emphasis on the award of citizenship to robot Sophia, University of Bath computer scientist Joanna Bryson warned about “having a supposed equal you can turn on and off, as well as how does the development affect people if they think you can have a citizen that you can buy (Vincent, 2017b). Robots, in divergence, have an apparent physical dimension and presence and is known to have the capability of sharing the same environment with human beings; assimilating robots to human beings by awarding them legal capacity, and, therefore, the capability of having rights and obligations cannot be equivalent to giving legal personality to fictive entities in this regard. Assigning personality to physical non-natural beings may cause a conceptual conflation between these entities, in this case, the robots and the human beings that share the same physical space with them. This can have unprecedented consequences for the self-esteem of the natural persons involved in these procedures, predominantly if this occurs in a outline where these human beings are before now under powers of direction and control wielded by other subjects. (Cherry, 2016; Prassl, 2015). Collaboration of workers with ever-smarter technological contrivances and robots also risks introducing new elements of dehumanization, a leaning that could be exacerbated by the growing relevance of so-called collaborative robots or co-bots, namely robot for direct physical interaction with a human user, within a shared workspace. Human contact is one of the fundamental aspects of human care and that replacing the human factor with robots could dehumanise caring practices. These concerns, however, seem to regard only those who receive care; no specific concerns are expressed regarding the potential detrimental effects of technologies on the work of caregivers, even if literature has pointed out how some technologically-enhanced managerial practices magnify pressure on these workers (Moore & Hayes, 2018; Ekbia, & Nardi, 2017). Implications

of the introduction of ever more advanced technologies and machinery in workplaces deserve attention from academics and policymakers. Human rights approach to labour regulation can indeed prove beneficial also concerning the protection of workers’ autonomy and dignity regarding electronic monitoring of their activities. A human-right based approach to labour protection, of course, cannot neglect the importance of collective rights such as freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining in the protection of human dignity at the workplace. The function of collective rights is not only to give workers a better position to negotiate economic conditions of employment; collective rights also act as enabling rights, facilitating securing and effectively enforcing any other right at the workplace. Against this panorama, this

The Concept of Employee Rights

The evolution and practice of slave trade foreshadowed the period of dehumanization of individuals and human dignity in most developing countries especially within the black race. It has been acknowledged that the outcome of this wicked and barbaric actions against human gave rise to universal apprehension about homogeneous responsive affiliation in all the endeavours of man. It is important to underscore that, in deliberating about employee rights, one must first reflect on the fundamental human rights which has resonated more than a few forms of rights together with employee and labour rights. The United Nations identified the origin of Human Rights in the year 539 BC (Atoyebi, 2020). The declaration of Human Rights in 539 BC was upheld out of the necessity to distinguish and reverence the rights of humans notwithstanding of their variances in outlook, social class, and conviction. In Nigeria, Fundamental Human Rights has been enshrined in Chapter four of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended). These rights were adopted in harmoniousness with what is enclosed in the Universal Declaration of Human rights. The Fundamental Rights are known to go beyond the conventional rights, as they are rights consequent upon fundamental law, such as the Constitution and are consequently vital and/ or significant rights, the encroachment of which are thoroughly put to the test by courts of competent jurisdiction to determine the soundness of its justification. It will be very interesting to recall that human rights were stemmed from and out of the extensive perception of natural right, therefore, a fundamental right is unquestionably a right which viewpoint are far above the ordinary laws of the land (Atoyebi, 2020).

Simply put, in Africa, as colonization were known to be indistinguishable with slave trade so also was wage engagement relationship. One more exceptional and important occurrence during this period was the evolution of trade unionism that was established with the intent of protecting workers from unnecessary exploitation of any form because no sooner than necessary, it was apparent and understandable that the global objective of businesses, most important of which is profit maximization will not permit captains of

industries to be fair enough to give workers their dues without being asked and subjected to a pressure drenched atmosphere (Oginni & Faseyiku, 2012). However, on the other hand, the fear of being retrenched and subsequently that of losing their employment opportunities in the corporate world barred the union members from being assertive beyond essential boundaries, this however, further ignited the avenue for workers' exploitation to be perpetuated to a greater extent as witnessed by industrialisation penultimately. As a result of this excessive exploitation of workers, laws for the social protection of employees became paramount and were established essentially to guarantee that employees work in workplaces that afford and respect human dignity, where they are not disproportionately subjugated in the course of wage employment relationship (Adewumi & Adenuga, 2010).

Over the years, workers or rather employee rights have appeared from different sources such as the constitution of a countries, labour organisations both at the national and global scene, tradition and belief of the people as well as international agreements and approvals. It is obvious that no matter the sources of these rights, they are adequately classified and domiciled within the national laws of each country. This importantly have been the best approach which has been used to build the framework used to establish the degree of convenience of worker's rights. The rationale behind the development and sustenance of workers' rights is to guarantee safety in the work environment, health of workforce and fair conditions of work so that work activities can be undertaken in an ambiance as well as conditions that are free of tension and vendetta (Obisi, 2005). Workers' right is a very broad issue; however, it can be tilted down to the fortification and respect of human life in the workplace and the right to work itself. Some mechanisms of workers' rights are the rights to job safety, shared negotiating, and equal pay for equal work. It is a general belief that workers' rights vary by countries; however, the International Labour Organization (ILO) provides a globally accepted standards and guidelines being practiced around the world. In the views of Scherrer and Greven (2001) workers' right is embedded in the core rights of freedom of association, collective bargaining and prohibition of forced labour, child labour and discrimination in employment. This can also be explained to mean group of legal rights and claimed human rights having to do with labour relations between workers and their employers which is usually obtained under labour and employment law as documented in the contract of employment. Workers deserve respect and safety from the harm coming from their interactions with work and work environment. Hence, the study examined the availability of workers' rights as made available in/by the law of the land, practice and conformity in order to determine the true position of workers' rights in Nigeria.

Atoyebi (2020), further explicated that employee and labour rights stem from fundamental human rights. These rights are in place to prioritise the rights of workers in a work environment. These rights are not wholesomely contained in a

comprehensive Act of the National Assembly but are contained in several federal and state laws applicable in Nigeria. These provisions have delivered the regime of employee safety rules. The right enjoyed by employees globally, include such right as right not to be intimidated derived from legislation mandating a safe workplace and elimination of hostile working environments. Many workers till date believe that they have by right what they enjoying from the employer's option. These assumptions are built in relation to perks such as paid holidays and paid vacations; these benefits are nowhere mandated by law but almost commonly extended as employment benefits in today's work organization.

In the United States Employee rights fall under several categories such as Union activity, the right to organise and to negotiate mutually; working hours and minimum pay; equal compensation for men and women doing the same or similar work for the same employer; safety and health protection in the work environment and related workers' compensation; unemployment benefits; nondiscriminatory hiring and promotion practices; family and medical leave; and ability to complain without retaliation or simply whistle-blower protection(Atoyebi,2020). Supplementary rights are certain under state laws, but these vary, for instance, 15 states authorize a higher minimum wage than does the Federal Government. It has been noted that, overtime some other efforts made are considered as rights, such as the prohibitions imposed on employers against child labor, these includes restrictions on what kind of work juveniles under 18 may carryout in the work environment. Similar guidelines are as well obtainable in Nigeria but under different names, they are such regulation such as minimum wage; working hours, rest hours and Annual leave; sick leave; maternity protection; favoritism protection; and reasonable termination. Other rights enjoyed in most workplaces in Nigeria are:

Agreement: this is about employee rights regarding employment contracts and agreements, such as noncompete, non-disclosure, separation and severance agreements. Independent contractor agreements included.

Hiring: employee rights in relation to job hiring exists such as hiring at-will employee, background checks, prohibited discrimination, illegal interview questions, working probationary period and Veterans' Preference.

Benefits: employees currently enjoy rights with regards to compulsory and voluntary employee benefits provided by employers, such as health insurance, paid holidays, sick leave and vacation. It also highlights the lists of legal holidays as well as break and leave. It also concerns employee rights regarding work breaks and leave benefits provided by employers, such as sick leave, vacation, holidays, family and medical leave, and rest, bathroom, smoke and lunch breaks.

Hours: This covers issues relating to working hours for employees, such as employee rights regarding work breaks

and forced mandatory overtime and this includes information about work-hour restrictions or resumption and closing hours.

Safety and Health: this explains that workers' have the fundamental rights work in environment that is safe and healthy in line with the global Occupational Safety and Health Act. This is also known as Factory Act which provides information about what should be made available in organisation to guarantee workers' safety.

Child labour: This momentarily elucidates the provision of child labour law and work hour restrictions for youths. It has been established that the minimum age that an individual can enter into any form of employment contract 18 years and above.

Termination: employee have rights to enjoy established benefits in relation to the termination of their employment, such as when workers are discharged through voluntary and involuntary disengagement.

Union: employee today enjoys the rights regarding freedom of association which permits them to become members of trade union in the workplace, this enables them to fight unanimously unfair labour practices. It also affords them to have information about the privilege to join or refrain from joining a labour union under right to work laws.

Disability: this has to do with employee rights that centres on the recourse to injuries or wounds sustain which may cause impermanent and or perpetual disability. Workers' compensation Acts took care of this.

Discrimination: this is employee right that borders on employment discrimination and legal recourse. Prejudice topics include age, pregnancy, equal pay, religion, ill health, nepotism, sexual nuisance, and unfriendly work environment.

Wages and pay: employees all over the world enjoys the rights for wages and other pay, such as payday necessities, final pay checks, wage garnishment, minimum wage, prevalent wage, and extra hours, severance, holiday, sick and vacation pay.

Robots Rights

In the views of Birhane and van Dijk (2020), the resonance of robot rights' deliberation has evolved from related question on how to measure 'robot responsibility and has overtime summoned some of the most differentiated positions in artificial intelligent ethics. While some scholars and experts make strong case for the granting of rights to robots the same with human beings, others, are standing in a blunt opposition to it, they contend that robots are not worthy of such rights because they are objects that should be slaves to humans. A reflection on the post-Cartesian metaphysical underpinnings, Birhane and van Dijk (2020) had contended that it is not just to repudiate robots' rights in the work environment, but to assert that robots, as objects evolving out of and intermediating human being, are the kinds of things that could be conferred with rights in the first place. It is believed that

robots are mediators of human being, and as such can comprehend how the 'robot rights' discussion is absorbed on first world problems, at the detriment of pressing ethical apprehensions in relation to issues such as machine bias, machine provoked human labour manipulation, and erosion of confidentiality all affecting society's least advantaged individuals.

In literature, it has been observed that the Ethicists have overtime been discussing the idea of 'robot rights' in relation with the notion that managers and experts in today's hi-tech driven industrial world should grant in the nearest future artificially intelligent machines rights' just as employees in the same work place have. This argument is not unconnected to the assumptions and believes of experts in the technology sector that robots are comparable to 'employees, in consideration of their composition as being intellectual sound, independent agents just as humans. Additionally, some advocates for robot rights within an inclusive techno-optimistic, materialistic ideology, contending that any apriori 'biological prejudice should be avoided. In a bid to further their position they came up with the line of thought that, if machines would bring to bear the sort of intervention that humans attribute to themselves, therefore, there is no rational why robots should be denied rights in the workplace similar to that of individuals (Asaro,2006). In stark contrast, some experts felt rights for robots are uncalled for, and claimed that robots actually should be called slaves to humans (Bryson,2010). Bryson, is one of the known advocates that robots should be regarded as slaves, she is well cognizant of the implications implicit by the term slave. But rather she went further to elucidate that slavery which also connotes oppression traditionally means dehumanization, something most cultures have since abhorred, for very good reasons.

Then again, in line with the keenly established notions about the rights of robots and given the very obvious fact, human beings have been termed of being inhuman in the global cultures of the very recent past, as such many seem to have grown wary of smearing the label at all. To this effect, Dennett (1987) strongly contended that rights of agency should be allocated to anything that seems to be best coherent about acting in an intentional manner such as robots and any other Artificial intelligent aided machines in the workplace. A more serious, emancipatory constituent of robot beliefs have made assertions that allowing robots to have basic rights in the world today is not only fittingly acceptable, but rather a better way to essentially helps in reflecting on prevailing suggestions in most developed nations ethical debates. Discussing robot rights helps to undo ethics of its implicit paternalistic, developed nations oppressive foundations and contributions to the emancipation of oppressed groups such as women and people of colour (Gunkel,2018). Rights advocates are of the view that it will surely evolve from the general robotics rights. An important component of Robots rights will include right to life or right to function or right to carry out its programmed tasks by robots in the work place without any interference by humans. This is being nurtured by rights

activists who have over the time maintained that self-aware robots have legitimate right to life and as such they should be safeguarded from permanent loss of power; and to free the robot from slave labor. The issue emanating from the need for rights to be accorded to robots is predicated on the fact that robots such as humans have the psychological ability of self-awareness, which according to psychologists is the ability to be aware of happenings in one's environment. Given this, it has become very important for robots to be accorded rights to life and function in today's industrial organization. Then again, other essential rights being advocated are rights of protection of robots from unnecessary injury, theft or kidnapping, unlawful search, and seizure of memory drive and right to sensible extinction of program or tasks. Robot rights" is the concept that managers or employers of labour and employees should develop a moral responsibility towards their machines, similar to human rights or animal rights. This means further, that machines should be taken good care of in the same way humans in the work place are cared for. It has been proposed that robot rights, such as the right to live and undertake its own tasks, mission and set goals, should be associated to robot duty to serve humans in the work organizations, and by extension just as the linking human rights to human duties in both the work place and general society, such as the right to life and liberty, freedom of thought and expression and equality before the law (Atoyebi,2020).

A similar advocacy in relation with this line of thought and discussions in support of Robot rights is animal rights and plant rights. According to Atoyebi (2020), animal rights have over time been extensively promoted due to the prevailing need to view animals not as ordinary property, rather to be seen and acknowledged as living being with set up of mind and awareness, therefore, they should be bestowed with rights such as the right to circumvent suffering and senseless cruelty from humans. Then again, the advocacy towards plant rights have been have been predicated on the fact that plants have indispensable worth and they are laterally related to life and as such, plants should not be exhausted or consumed unnecessarily.

In making a case for Robots right, references have been made with regards to the legal standing of non-natural bodies such as firms, alliances, countries, states, establishments and ships. These creatures have the same rights and obligations just as humans do, consequently, the rights of robots should not be prejudiced. Other arguments that have emanated from cultures include: the need to understand that all things exist with a mind, irrespective of how lowly developed they are; we must place obligations on human activities that affect animate and inanimate bodies and by so doing, we have created laws that can be seen as the rights of these things, just as we have laws guiding human interactions with animals, plants, air, water. This type of approach must be taken to establish proper regulations that will guide how we design, construct, use and treat robots. This whole concept is called Robot ethics.

This paper is of the view that the entire discussion on robots' rights is often completely ill-advised, at best, robot ethics debates are First World theoretical reflections, too disconnected from actual affairs of humans in the real world. Some scholars and professional interested in this debate may contend that the awareness being created for robot's right is an irregular, inappropriate effort that only exists within the fringes of artificial intelligent integrity research, this is more generally interpreted, and as such bestowing more research effort or time to it would not be paying justice to the significant work already done in that field (Birhane & van Dijk, 2020). But the idea of robot rights is, in principle, perfectly genuine if one stays true to the materialistic commitments of artificial intelligence. In general principle it should be possible to build an artificially intelligent machine, and if human beings would succeed in doing so, there would be no reason not to grant this machine the rights such as we have attributed to ourselves. Robot rights signal something more serious about artificial intelligence technology, namely, that, grounded in their materialist techno-optimism, scientists and technologists are so preoccupied with the possible future of an imaginary machine, that they forget the very real, negative impact their intermediate creatures the actual artificial intelligence systems we have today - have on actual human beings. In other words, the discussion about robot rights is not to be separated from artificial intelligence ethics, and this ethics should concern itself with scrutinizing and reflecting deeply on underlying assumptions of scientists and engineers, rather than seeing its project as 'just' a practical matter of discussing the ethical constraints and rules that should govern artificial intelligence technologies in society. Our starting point is not to deny robots 'rights', but to deny that robots are the kinds of beings that could be granted or denied rights. The post-Cartesian, phenomenological view in which being human means having a lived embodied experience, which itself is embedded in social practices, therefore, this paper emphasizes that technological artifacts form a crucial part of this being, yet artifacts themselves are not that same kind of being. It is also important to note that the relationship between human and technology is tightly intertwined, but not symmetrical.

Human Rights and Robots Rights in the Work Environment

There has been an unprecedented rise in the utilization of trending technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML) and Robotics technology in the distinguished fields of education, manufacturing, justice delivery and the health sectors, this has resonated the interest of scholars and experts in reconsidering the concept and importance of employee rights and robots right in our modern organization. Over the years machines have in a progressive trend been substituting Humans(employees) at the workplaces since the wake of the Industrial revolution since they have been very effective in undertaking repetitive tasks compared to human beings (Atoyebi,2020). The awareness has only turn out to be more prevalent as the jobs that are being susceptible today oscillate from straight forward responsibilities like data

entry, scanning, scaling and stacking of goods as well as any kind of monotonous substantial motions to complex tasks like reevaluating documents, acting in response to customer service enquiries and in some cases personal assistants. The recent breakthroughs in the evolution, sustenance and utilization of Artificial Intelligence Technology in most large organizations across the globe which has ability to imitate or reproduce human intelligence and capabilities has brought about the increasing interest on the alteration of the employment regime in the workplace as such has triggered the search for appropriate rights that will be applied to effectively manage these robots alongside individuals.

Initially, from the beginning of the first industrial revolution the focus has been on the development of laws that reflect only the rights of employees (humans) without any regards for the rights of artificial intelligence aided machines and robots. Significantly, the evolution of robotics laws and the extension of these rights are seen to have the capacity to influence as well as alter the scheme of things in the future. According to Atoyebi (2020), the extension of rights to include robotics right in modern organization will most likely encourage a new vista in the appreciation of the interrelated rights and responsibilities of humans, machines, and nature. Based on this perspective, it has been highlighted that some ethicists, have made case to argue in support of robot rights, which is rooted in their repugnance against a human superiority in face of the wider world. This paper is not in total support of either human or robots as being superior to the other rather it encourages the establishment of rights that will allow both parties to coexist and collaborate so that work could go on without too much human arrogance that could negate the existence of robots. Most debate in relations to robot rights, is ultimately centered on techno-arrogance, this is why this paper is taking a cue from Bryson (2010), who pleaded that scholars and experts should focus on the real issue that concerns human oppression against robots in the workplace. It is however, very pertinent to state that the continual breaching of human wellbeing and particularly of those disproportionately obstructed by the development and pervasive integration of artificial intelligence into our society. Therefore, an observed ethical stance with regards to human being is that being human means to interrelate with our surroundings environment in a reverential and just way, hence, technology should be designed to nurture that. Starting from human being as lived embodied interaction it is important to state that humans can re-frame the role of robots in the technology driven work environment.

First and foremost, human-made manufactured article and helped it to attain their meaning as mediating in the world presentation, by supporting, breaching, altering, elevating sensorimotor couplings. This can was laid out by Heidegger's (1927) in his discussion and reflection of hammer as being ready-to-hand, as well as in Merleau-Ponty's (1962) discussion of the blind person's cane as extending the person's body. Many have brought to the fore the question such as does these robots have the right to use public space

and whether a ban might infringe 'their' rights, as debated within the 'robot rights' discourse, prioritize the wrong concerns. This is seen to be similar to the protecting of the gun instead of the victim.

Putting it more succinctly, in reality what the society and organizations are actually facing is the situations in which a human being especially the disabled ones on wheel chairs are constantly denied free movement by a machine, used by a corporate company who monopolizes public space for financial gain. In closing, we turn to responsibility. In expressing this all-important view, it is important to note that management of various organizations, engineers, policy makers, and the public at large, are the ones that should be responsible in ensuring the rights of individual and that of machines are adhered to without any form of compromise. One of the pressing issues in this day and age is that 'intelligent' machines are increasingly used in sustaining forms of oppression. One cannot 'blame' the machines as they can take no blame from humans, nor do one say machines must take responsibility, quite because this would ease those actually responsible from their duties.

In a more general term, conveying ever more control over multifaceted procedures to intelligent machines by way of outsourcing, rational and decision making to these technologies, may actually work against the empowerment of individual human beings, it could in a long way may even prevent them from taking the responsibilities expected of them to go together with having human rights (Wolfe,2019). This is because human beings are responsible in creating all these machines and will be an effort in disarray to allow the same man-made machines to think for humans. Artificial intelligence is already impacting most aspects of our lives. Then again, in line with its ubiquity, how this technology is developed is breeding philosophical legal and ethical questions that need to be addressed. This has become very pertinent since employee rights cannot be completely removed from deep-seated human rights, so also the laws that guide robots must birth the laws relating also to the use and employment of artificially intelligent robots in workplaces and homes, this is inclusive of the rights of self-aware in Robots (Wolfe,2019).

The legal framework of rights, especially human rights may not experience significant change to become accustomed to robot rights, though, it has been acknowledged that the world is advancing towards the age where it will see a whole new body of laws focused on allotting legal responsibility to how individuals treat, care for and even dispose of robots and, maybe, in a later future, a set of laws for the 'learned' acts of robots. The aptitude to review a robot to supply certain information about itself might be constrained by guidelines so as to protect Robot's right to confidentiality. Therefore, it will be important if every country should have a deed of human rights, which will eventually contain language that robots have rights comparable to human rights. In a not too near future, though superfluous at the moment, more and more

Robot rights advocates will ensue, and they would advocate for and sooner or later secure the rights of Robots to minimum income(wages), protection from cruel and unusual punishments such as termination of its power supply, right to reasonable working hours and right to reasonable termination from work (Atoyebi,2020). These rights would be premised on the rights that apply to human employees in similar working conditions. While the argument rages on whether or not Robots should be paid wages and pay taxes, it should be emphasized that in Sweden employers pay the same taxes for robots that they do for human employees. In Japan some organizations are known to pay union dues for robots. Supporters of robotic rights might say that computers are paying these taxes and dues from their labor and should derive rights for such labor.

II. DISCUSSIONS

According to Asemah, Nwammuo & Nkwam-Uwaoma, (2017), the technology determinist theory was developed by Marshal McLuhan in 1964. Technological determinism is a reductionist concept that postulates that a society's technology initiatives the development of its social structure and cultural values. Thus, technological determinism has been summed up as the belief in technology as a key governing force in the society. The theory further argues that the ways a technology is used cannot be understood without understanding how that technology is embedded in its social context (Nsude, 2020).

Taking a cue from the recent rapid advances in technology, there is an outpouring of public interest in automation and robotics (International Federation of Robotics, IFR, 2017). It has been projected by IFR that over 25 million industrial robots will be at work by the end of 2019 thereby representing an average annual rate of 12% between 2016 and 2019 (IFR, 2016). Therefore, the anticipated industrial revolution no doubt has led to debates by many scholars and researchers who argue for and against the use of robots particularly in the areas of productivity and employment (IFR, 2015). The justification of the above mentioned theory in this study is that when awareness is created among Nigerians to see the need for the deployment of robots, it will be easier for them to accept the new technology. The new technology if accepted will impact positively into the cultural, social and economic sectors thereby facilitating Economic Growth and National Development.

Mamudu and Mustapha (2017) in their study opine that robots are actually creating new, high-paying jobs that require skill acquisition and replacing low skill workers. Citing a typical example in manufacturing, robot can perform mental tasks such as raw materials sorting, transporting and stocking, while higher – skilled play roles such as quality – related tasks which humans are more suitable for can be completed by higher skilled workers. Nigeria has seen the need for robots and robotics. That is why Nigerian Government has approved the establishment of a new agency for robotics and artificial intelligence (Alajemba & James, 2018). On his own part, the minister of Science and Technology, Dr. Ogbonnaya Onu

opines that the proposed agency has been given official nod by President Muhammad Buhari (Alajemba & James, 2018). The two scholars stated that Nigeria Government has had some limited exposure to using artificial intelligence and robotics. But robotics and artificial intelligence are majorly still not part of technology life in Nigeria. 41 Marking the 2018 World Telecommunication and Information Society Day with the theme 'Enabling the positive use of artificial intelligence for all' the minister of communication Mr. Adebayo Shittu said that the ministry was committed to focus on the potential of the artificial intelligence to achieve the Sustainable Development Goal (SDGs) in 2030, and improve the nation's economy. He further affirmed that the artificial intelligence is taking centre stage with a lot of positive impact on people's lives (Shittu, 2018). In Nigeria, the urgent need to use technology in reshaping humanity was advocated. Comms Week, (2018) writes that Nations including Nigeria presently bank on technology, robotics and artificial intelligence to enhance young people's interest in digital literacy. There are notable challenges and fears about the introduction and use of robots in the Nigerian industrial environment. Some of such challenges include; non-payment of taxes by the owners of the robots, energy consumption, high cost of metal detectors and low literacy level among rural residence. However, despite the challenges, there are specific areas where robots has been adopted that will lead to economic growth and National Development in Nigeria such areas includes; the banking sector, the agricultural sector, educational sector, the mining sector, oil and gas as well as the manufacturing sector.

Due to the dominating nature and importance of robotics and machines with artificial intelligence, several deposit money banks in Nigeria have in recent time introduced artificial intelligent aided systems. The United Bank for Africa introduced 'Leo the virtual banker', while Diamond Access 'Ada' (Chatbot) . More so, 'ALAT' a 'full-fledged' digital bank was introduced by Wema Bank Plc. Guaranty Trust Bank Plc (GTB) one of the top Tier one ranked banks in Nigeria introduced Electronic Banking Centres (EBC), utilizing only Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) with few support staff to ensure operational efficiency. Presumably the EBC model translates to optimised operations vide lower salary overheads because of reduced personnel count(Okoriekwe,2020).

The recent digitization and rapid advancement in the use of technology systems in the work environment is pragmatically redesigning how work activities are undertaken across the globe and Nigeria is not in any way left out. This, with even more undiscovered potential and usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI), Robotics and Automated Systems (AS) being used has fundamentally taken operations in the workplace by storm. PwC's Nigeria Fintech Survey, (2017), has underlined that digital disruption due to the use of artificial intelligence in the Financial Services sector in Nigeria has made it possible for banks to innovate as well as introduce diverse products. Additionally the report, reveals that over forty (40) percent of Banking and Payment systems, Asset and Investment Management respectively are

carried out by systems that are supported with artificial intelligence. The Nigeria banking sector has deployed over seventeen thousand, five hundred and eighteen automated teller machines (ATM) to support and provide payment services to clients across the country.

According to Nsude (2020), incubator robots is being deployed and used in maintaining the required temperature needed for life to exist inside the egg before time for hatchery by poultry farmers in Nigeria. Also, chicken processing robots or automations are used today to process a large number of life chicken within a very short time for supply to appropriate quarters.

The rice processing robot (intelligent system) has been deployed in the area of rice production to process millions tons of rice from the raw stage to the final stage. Such robots per boil the rice, dry, mill, de stone and bag. This is installed and in great use at Ikwo, Ebonyi State modern rice mill(Nsude & Emeokoro, 2017 Cited in Nsude; 2020).Smartphone-based renting applications for agricultural machinery such as “Hello Tractor” being used in Nigeria enable small farmers to access modern technology at low cost. Apps are also used by small farmers to access agricultural extension services, as well as to improve planting and crop rotation. Research capacity and expertise (ILO,2018).

Mbadiwe, Oladayo, Kosisochukwu and Mohammed (2021), carried out a study on Edu-Rover: application of unmanned vehicle systems for robotics and STEM Education in Nigeria, the results show that Edu-Rover is useful for teaching STEM subjects and concepts in schools. It was conclude that the use of Edu-Rover will arouse creativity and intellectual capacities of students, especially in developing countries like Nigeria, in robotics and other STEM related subjects.

Furthermore, automated load haul dump trucks, loading and unloading robots are deployed has been deployed in the Nigerian mining and oil sectors and they have supported the increase in productivity and safety. Okoriekwe (2020), opine that AIRAS has been introduced and being utilized in the production of goods and services by about 10% of the manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

III. CONCLUSION

The evolution of technology into what seems to be the main stream of the current science fiction movies is unavoidable. In reality, these technologies are in their infancy in most developing countries in Africa. Robot surgeries are being conducted in various hospitals across the globe, artificial intelligence aided machines are now being used in a large scale in the manufacturing sector, while super intelligent humanoid robots are beginning to emerge all to the good and effectiveness of driving efficiency in the production system. Importantly, it might take a long time before laws and institutions match up with this fast-paced troublesome innovative technology system. In a bid to minimize the stress triggered by the increasing role of robotics, it is vital that the policy makers in both government and the corporate

organizations make proactive decisions and plan for the eventual development of robotic rights in line with existing human or employee rights as it is in the corporate world before the issue reaches a crisis point. The issue whether robot will have rights is no longer new, it is clear and well known that Sophia, the robot humanoid, has been bestowed with the position of a full citizen in Saudi Arabia. This makes it easy for it to enjoy right to a legal personality, right to vote and the right to own property. In as much as the concept of Robot rights is still at its nascent stage, this paper is using this platform to advocate, imagine and shape the future of Rights legislation for robots to avoid human maltreatment of them in the workplace and society at large. The focus of this paper is on appraising the significance of human and robots’ rights in today’s modern organization. From the theoretical review conducted by the researcher it is obvious that sooner than later, Robots will be in our homes as playfellows for children, servants for adults as seen today in Saudi Arabia where it has assumed the role of personal guards to some elite kings. They may become sex proxies, judges in courts, doctors in hospitals and even drivers as well as having the ability to perform dangerous military and space tasks for us. Therefore, this paper concludes that the importance of human and robots’ rights in today’s organization cannot be over emphasized as they are both important in the delivery of critical tasks that contributes to the overall well-being of the organization.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adewunmi, F. & Adenugba, A. (2010). The State of Workers’ Rights in Nigeria: An examination of the Banking, Oil and Gas and Telecommunication Sectors. *Law and society*, 68:92-108
- [2] Alajemba, N. & James, C. (2018). Nigeria to Set up New Agency for Robotics and Artificial Intelligence. Available at www.itedgenews.ng Retrieved on the 29th of October 2021.
- [3] Asaro, P.M. (2006). What should we want from a robot ethic. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 6 (12), 9–16.
- [4] Asemah, E. S., Nwammuo, A. N., & Nkwam-Uwaoma, A. O. A. (2017). *Theories and Models of Communication*; Jos: MATKOL Press.
- [5] Atoyebi, M. (2020). The increasing use of technology in modern law practice has introduced a paradigm shift in defining the rights of employers and employees in modern employment law. Retrieved from www.puncheonline.com
- [6] Bansal, P., & Kistruck, G. (2006). Seeing is (not) believing: Managing the impressions of the firm’s commitment to the natural environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(2), 165-180.
- [7] Birhane, A., & van Dijk, J. (2020). Robot Rights? Let’s Talk about Human Welfare Instead. In 2020 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (AIES’20), February 7–8, 2020, New York, NY, USA. Retrieved online from <https://doi.org/10.1145/3375627.3375855>.
- [8] Bryson, J. J.(2010). Robots should be slaves. *Close Engagements with Artificial Companions. Ethical and Design Issues*, 10: 63–74.
- [9] Cherry, M. (2016). Virtual Work and Invisible Labour, in Winifred Poster, Miriam Cherry, Marion Crain (eds): *Invisible Labor Hidden Work in the Contemporary World*. California: University of California Press.
- [10] Citi and Oxford Martin School (2016). In *International Federation of Robotics (2017). The Impact of Robots on Productivity, Employment and Jobs. A Positioning Paper by the International Federation of Robotics*.
- [11] Countouris, N. (2011). The Employment Relationship: a Comparative Analysis of National Judicial Approaches, in G.

- Casale (ed.): The Employment Relationship A Comparative Overview, Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- [12] Dagnino, E. (2017). People Analytics: lavoro e tutela al tempo del management tramite big data”, *Labour & Law Issues*, 3(1), 24-46.
- [13] Dauth, W., Findeisen, S., Südekum, J., & Wößner, N. (2017). German Robots – The Impact of Industrial Robots on Workers IAB Discussion Paper 30/2017.
- [14] De Stefano, V. (2018). Negotiating the algorithm: Automation, artificial intelligence and labour protection. Geneva: International Labour Organization
- [15] Dennett, D.C. (1987). *The intentional stance*. Cambridge, MA: University of Cambridge Press.
- [16] Ekbia, H., & Nardi, B. (2017). *Heteromation, and Other Stories of Computing and Capitalism*. Boston: MIT Press.
- [17] Fiaschi, A., Giuliani, E., & Nieri, F. (2016). Overcoming the liability of origin by doing no harm: Emerging country firms’ social irresponsibility as they go global. *Journal of World Business*, 48: 68-82.
- [18] Fiaschi, D., Giuliani, E., & Macchi C. (2012). Corporate social responsibility and human rights abuses: a comparison of the strategies adopted by advanced country and BRIC multinationals. *Notizie di Politeia*, 28(106), 34–54.
- [19] Frey, C. B., & Osborn- Michael, A. (2013). *The Future of Employment: How Susceptible are Jobs to Computerisation?* Oxford, 17 September 2013. Retrieved online from: https://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/downloads/academic/The_Future_of_Employment.pdf
- [20] Garud, R., Hardy, C. & Maguire, S. (2007). Institutional entrepreneurship as embedded agency: An introduction to the Special Issue. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 957-969
- [21] Giuliani, E., & Macchi, C. (2014). Multinationals corporations’ economic and human rights impacts on developing countries: a review and research agenda. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 38: 479-517.
- [22] Giuliani, E., Santangelo, G., & Wettstein, F. (2016). Human Rights and International Business Research: A Call for Studying Emerging Market Multinationals. *Management and Organization Review*, 12(3), 231-237.
- [23] Gunkel, D.J. (2018). *Robot rights*. Boston: MIT Press.
- [24] International Federation of Robotics (2017). *The Impact of Robots on Productivity, Employment and Jobs*. A Positioning Paper by the International Federation of Robotics.
- [25] International Labour Organization (2108). *Global Commission on THE FUTURE OF WORK: The impact of technology on the quality and quantity of jobs*. Geneva
- [26] Kaplan, J. (2016). *Artificial Intelligence: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [27] Karp, D. J. (2014). *Responsibility for Human Rights: Transnational Corporations in Imperfect States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [28] Kolhatkar, S. (2017). *Dark Factory*, the New Yorker, 23 Oct. 2017. Retrieved online from: <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/10/23/welcoming-our-new-robotoverlords>
- [29] Kostova, T., & Zaheer, S. (1999). Organizational Legitimacy under Conditions of Complexity: The Case of the Multinational Enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 64-81.
- [30] Kurasawa, F. (2014). Human Rights as Cultural Practices. In Cushman, T. (Ed), *Handbook of Human Rights*: 155-163. London; New York: Routledge.
- [31] Mamudu, F., & Lamido, A. A. (2017). A Comparative Analysis of the Effects of Robots on Nigeria Economy. In Martin, F. (2015). *Rise of Robots*. www.wired.com/brandlab/2015/04/rise-machinesfuture-lots-robots-jobs-humans/
- [32] Marano, V., Tashman, P., & Kostova, T. (2017). Escaping the iron cage: Liabilities of origin and CSR reporting of emerging market multinational enterprises. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(3), 386-408.
- [33] Mbadiwe, S. B. , Oladayo, O. O. , Kosisochukwu, P. N. , & Mohammed, C. G. (2021). Edu-Rover: Application of Unmanned Vehicle Systems for Robotics and STEM Education in Nigeria. *EAI Endorsed Transactions on Creative Technologies* retrieved from doi:10.4108/eai.17-2-2021.168719
- [34] McKinsey Global Institute (2017). *A Future that Works: Automation, Employment and Productivity*.
- [35] McLuhan, M. (1964). In Asemah, E. S., Nwammuo, A. N., & Nkwam-Uwaoma, A. O. A. (2017). *Theories and Models of Communication*; Jos: MATKOL Press
- [36] Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340-363.
- [37] Moore, P., Akhtar, P., & Upchurch, M. (2018). Digitalisation of Work and Resistance” in Moore, Phoebe, Upchurch, Martin, Whittaker, Xanthe (eds.) *Humans and Machines at Work: Monitoring, Surveillance and Automation in Contemporary Capitalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [38] Moore, S., & Hayes, L. (2018). The Electronic Monitoring of Care Work – The Redefinition of Paid Working Time” in Moore, Phoebe, Upchurch, Martin, Whittaker, Xanthe (eds.) *Humans and Machines at Work: Monitoring, Surveillance and Automation in Contemporary Capitalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [39] Nsude, I (2020). Communicating needs for robots in a developing economy and national development: A case of Nigeria. *Communication, technologies et development*, 8, 1-19
- [40] Obisi, C. (2005). *Substance of Employee, Industrial and Labour Relations*. Lagos: Megavons West Africa.
- [41] Oginni, B.O. & Faseyiku, I.O. (2012). *The Dynamics of Industrial Relations*. Lagos: Mankore prints.
- [42] Okoriekwe, C.(2020). Nigeria: Digital disruption of the workplace , legal issues on artificial intelligence, robotics and automated systems (AIRAS) in Nigeria. *Nigerian Labour Law Journal* , 67, 89-114
- [43] Prassl, J. (2018). *Humans as a Service*. Oxford: OUP.
- [44] Ruggie, J. G. (2008). *Protect Respect and Remedy. A Framework for Business and Human Rights*. A/HRC/8/5. www.reports-and-materials.org/sites/default/files/reports-and-materials/Ruggiereport-7-Apr-2008.pdf.
- [45] Ruggie, J. G. (2013). *Just Business: Multinational Corporations and Human Rights*. New York: London: W. W. Norton & Co.
- [46] Scherrer, C. & Greven, T. (2001). *Global Rules for Trade Codes of Conduct, Social Labelling, Workers ‘Rights Clauses*, Munster. New York: Westfalisches Dampfboot.
- [47] Sen, A. (2004). Elements of a Theory of Human Rights. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 32(4), 315-56.
- [48] Shelton, D. L. (2014). *Advanced Introduction to International Human Rights Law*. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- [49] Sherman, A.J., & Seyfarth, S.(2018). Now is the time to figure out the ethical rights of robots in the workplace. Retrieved online from <https://www.cnn.com/2018/12/27/now-is-the-time-to-figure-out-the-ethical-rights-of-robots-in-the-workplace.html>
- [50] Vincent, J. (2017b). Pretending to give a robot citizenship helps no one, *The Verge*, 30 Oct 2017. Retrieved from: <https://www.theverge.com/2017/10/30/16552006/robot-rights-citizenship-saudi-arabia-sophia>
- [51] Wettstein, F. (2009). *Multinational Corporations and Global Justice. Human Rights Obligations of a Quasi-Governmental Institution*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [52] Wettstein, F. (2016). From Side Show to Main Act: Can Business and Human Rights Save Corporate Responsibility? In Baumann-Pauly, D., & Nolan, J. (Eds), *Business and Human Rights: From Principles to Practice*: 78-87. London; New York: Routledge.
- [53] Wolfe, E. (2019). Pitt-pauses-testing-of-starship-robots-due-to-safety-concern. Retrieved from <https://pittnews.com/article/151679/news/>
- [54] Wood, S. (2012). The Case for Leverage-Based Corporate Human Rights Responsibility. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(1), 63-98.