## Core issues and risks for public values in educational tooling

Profiling and targetting for adds and service personalisation

**Behavioral predictions** 

Personal lock-in

**Organisational lock-in** 

Societal lock-in

Privatisation of collective effort

**Privacy risk** 

**Risk for democracy** 

Risk for sovereignty

Normalization of unethical tools

Risk to academic freedom

**Financial risk** 

**Risk of dependency** 

**Unethical practice** 

Risk of monopoly



# Profiling and targetting for adds and service personalisation



## **Privacy risk**

#### **Issues**

Data is combined from many sources.

Data in cloud services is routinely scanned for content that violates terms of service, risking a block of the account, also for false positives

Service personalisation is intransparrent. Often there is no opt-out.

If data is not traceable to a person, data is no longer considered 'personal data' thus the AVG does not apply.

## **Explanation/ example**

- Data is combined with datasets from main Google services like Gmail/docs.
- Data is combined with datasets from 3th parties.
- Data is combined with datasets from basic "free" tools. For example Google offers tools that are very easy for developers, but the actuale purpose is data collection. (Fonts, Firebase, analytics, DNS, templates, etc.)

This is broad dragnet surveillance, executed by private companies, mixing law enforcement and protection of business interests. Search should only take place when there is a cause and a warrant for it, not always and systematically.

Even if users are aware that personalization is happening, there is no way to figure out how and why. Example, YouTube recommendations and results from search engines are presented as neutral results. In reality results and recommendations are optimized to serve business interests.

The user cannot switch of personalisation.



## **Behavioral predictions**

Risk for democracy

Risk for sovereignty

#### Issues

## **Explanation/ example**

When using surveillance capitalist services you must provide data to "improve our services".

What is meant by that is your (meta)data will be used to train Al algorithms in which you have no say.

Facebook (no accountability nor transparency in how they let collected data be (mis)used by third parties) leading to the Cambridge Analitics scandal (abuse of Facebook data for propaganda).

Microsoft and Google, personalising services without transparency nor accountability while, presenting themselves as "neutral" services, eg on Youtube, leading to **radicalisation** and **polarisation** by algorithmic recommendation of next video clip, sending people "down the rabit hole".



## Personal lock-in

**Risk of dependency** 

Normalization of unethical tools

#### Issues

Migration is made difficult.

Non-compatible with competing products.

Bundling of products.

Blocking of accounts.

## **Explanation/ example**

You invest time and energy in figuring out how to do things, adding your data, building your network, if you move away you loose this investment.

The user is dependent on the features the vendor is inclined to offer. Supplier of those "free" services may decide to terminate the service any time. See

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Discontinued Google services

For example, if you start using Microsoft 365 you get the whole package, incl. MS Teams integrated, setting competitors at a disadvantage.

When an inappropriate picture is found in MS Onedrive or Google Drive, you risk losing you entire Microsoft or Google account, so no access to O365, e-mail, Teams, Xbox, games and even your PC, or G-Drive/mail/meet, Youtube etc and even your phone. For example a case of the user ending medical pictures and of a user receiving unwanted porn pictures.

https://tweakers.net/reviews/9094/account-geblokkeerd-wat-nu.html



## **Organisational lock-in**



#### **Financial risk**

#### Issues

## **Explanation/ example**

Migration is made difficult.

Bundling of products.

Non-compatible with competing products.

Open standards are ignored, so switching to an alternative comes with huge migration costs. As soon as exit cost are extreem due to becoming locked in, licence cost go up, often to extreme levels.

If your organisation has licences for Microsoft 365 you get the whole package, incl. MS Teams integrated, setting competitor at a disadvantage. So why invest in a Jitsi or BigBlueButton server?

The user is dependent on the features the vendor is inclined to offer. (vendor lock-in) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Discontinued\_Google\_services



## Societal lock-in

Normalisation of unethical tools

Risk to academic freedom

#### Issues

Even if an institute properly did al the GDPR homework, with DPIA, proper implementation and a data processing agreement with lots of nice promises (even then CLOUD -act still applies) al the GDPR guaranties ONLY apply to the tools used at school or university.

With using cloud services of USA-companies, export restrictions that are result of USA politics get **influence over what universities** can discuss or research.

This applies to any conversation, video, document or research data processed by a USA cloud provider.

## **Explanation/ example**

It is not realistic to expect that students as soon they want to do something themselves (outside university) read the EULA, study the GDPR, conclude that their private accounts come with lots of privacy violations, and then start using something completely different, while university has taught them that these kind of surveillance products are OK. Otherwise they would not teach these kind of services, right?

Most well known example of this is Zoom cancelling an academic debate:

https://theintercept.com/2020/11/14/zoom-censorship-leila-khaled-palestine/



## Privatisation of collective effort

**Unethical practise** 

Risk of monopoly

#### **Issues**

Millions of people contribute their corrections and suggestions to suppliers, mostly without being aware of this. (Somewhere deep in the EULA or data processing agreement is "your data may be used to improve our services".)

The first party that conquers the market can collect the most data, and can thus create a monopoly. As soon as market dominance is achieved, licence prices will sky rocket.

Proprietary adaptive learning systems not only teach students, also the student is teaching the adaptive system. This is a form of labor that mainly benefits the dominant market player.

### **Explanation/ example**

Google/Bing translate, and the spellings checkers of Google and Microsoft work really well, this is because millions of people contributed their corrections and suggestions to them, mostly without consenting to this use.

Due to the **network effect** the dominant party is almost impossible to catch up with. Schools, meanwhile, have become dependent and will swallow the price increases.

Example "rekentuin" uses a ranking system for both students and questions. When a student answers a question wrong, the difficulty rank of the question goes up. Most schools and students are not aware and are not compensated for this free labor they are providing. The results of this collective effort belong in the public domain!



How to restore public values in educational tooling?

Above all:

# It matters what you teach!

If you teach unfree surveillance services, that is what you will get:

A surveillance society, ruled by BigTech

### By design:

- -Privacy
- -Public Values
- -Ethics

**Data ownership** 

**Open standards** 

Free, open source software

Attribute cost for lock-in: "polluter pays"

**Teach ethical and open source tools** 

Strengthen the public domain!

It all starts with the design. Do the tools you choose strengthen the core value's that your school or institution stands for? Choose ethical tools!

Schools an institutions should recognise the value of data. Data created by pupils and students is not theirs to sell

Use services build on open standards, that allow you to leave with all of you data, and network relations.

Like: Mastodon on the fediverse

Chose ethical and opensource tools, that an organisation can also selfhost. *Like Jitsi, BigBlueBotton or NextcloudTalk* 

Cost for an exit strategy should be attributed to the party that created the lock-in, not to the service that an organisation is migrating to.

Since it really matters what tools you teach students or pupils, the tools taught in school will also be used and after college or school. Even if you can force BigTech to act GDPR compliant in school, it's unethical to teach those services if those terms are out of reach out of school.

When we with millions of people collectively train an algorithm, the result of this should be in the public domain, thus use open source algorithms and open data sets.