

<https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/conv/proposal-fields>

Type of Session: Standing Group--Sponsored Panel

Proposal Level: All

Title of Session: Information and Intellectual Property Literacy in an Age of Bots

Abstracted Description (less than 140 characters)

- Speaker: Tim Amidon, Colorado State University, amidont@gmail.com, 970-491-6428 **Speaker 3: navigating surveillance environment**
- Speaker: Kim Gainer, Radford University, kgainer@radford.edu **Speaker 2: PDS**
- Speaker: Alex Nielsen, Old Dominion University, anielsen@odu.edu, 757-726-3158 **Speaker 1: introducing bots**
- Respondent: Dànielle Nicole DeVoss, Michigan State University, devosdda@msu.edu **Respondent 2: conclusion**
- Respondent: James P. Purdy, Duquesne University, purdyj@duq.edu, 412-396-1293 **Respondent 1: YouTube**

Description (1,000 words):

Briefly describe the goals of the proposed session and the means by which those goals will be pursued. What should the audiences/participants take away from the session, and how will you help them accomplish that goal?

This panel will facilitate an exploration of information literacy in a digital age. Included will be a discussion of intellectual property (IP) issues such as the impact of bots on student ownership and control of their data and texts. Panelists and audience will discuss strategies for developing student awareness of bot-generated content, which should be part of our students' information literacy skill-set in a digital age. The panel will encourage attendees to explore the question: How can we help our students develop skills to interpret and evaluate bot-generated texts? In addition to discussing how we may educate students as consumers in an era of bot-generated content, the panel will ask educators to consider the implications of bots for our students as generators of content, including privacy implications. "Content" will be interpreted broadly as including data that students generate as they move about in the digital world. Speaker 1 will share state-of-the-art information about bots. Topics will include the capabilities of bots, methods for deploying bots, and recent successes and failures in attempts to deploy public-facing bots. Discussion of the status of bots will provide the audience with examples of detection strategies for bot-generated content as well as

disambiguation as to what bots are and what they do in the context of Natural Language Processing, data parsing, sentiment analysis and intervention, and human-bot-synthesis in marketing and PR applications. Speaker 2 will discuss automated plagiarism detection services (PDS) as one form of bot that has an impact in the area of intellectual property. Topics will include ownership and control of student-created data and texts, including implications for student privacy when data and texts are commodified and mined by a PDS. One scenario to be discussed will be the sale of one company to another, a situation in which students likely will not have explicitly or knowingly authorized the use of their data or work by the new company. Initially, while enrolled in a course, students may have authorized access to their data or texts either innocently or via compulsion. The recent purchase of a major PDS is an example of a case in which student data and texts now fall under the control of a company that was not a party to the original educational “contract.” Respondent 1 will discuss a second case in which bots play a significant role in IP decision-making and in mediating the publication of student work: YouTube. After explaining YouTube’s Content ID system, the respondent will address IP consequences as well as possible student and educator responses. Through its Content ID system, YouTube scans videos against a database of files containing content submitted by entities that may be able to claim copyright. When there is a match between a video and the database, the copyright owner has the opportunity to decide what happens to the video. These consequences can include blocking the video (i.e., taking it down), monetizing the video (i.e., sharing ad revenue), and muting claimed portions (e.g., suppressing song audio). However, like a PDS, YouTube’s matching algorithm cannot distinguish properly cited material or compositions abiding by Fair Use. Because YouTube refrains from being an arbiter in such decisions, uploaders, including students posting course projects, can thus be subject to specious copyright claims and lose the opportunity to argue for Fair Use. YouTube bots are continually monitoring videos uploaded by our students to its platform. Speaker 3 will address other forms of monitoring that automatically generate data about students as they navigate a surveillance environment in which they may be trading privacy for digital experiences, as for example, when they post to social media sites or don wearables that may collect and share information about their locations and activities. Even when not posting, students create what Estee N. Beck calls an “invisible digital identify” as they visit web sites that utilize web beacons and place cookies on their e-devices (Beck 2015). Students also may be surveilled via what Lauren Cagle calls strangershots, a genre “produced not by individual rhetors, but by assemblages of humans and non-human technologies” (Cagle 2019). Students also may be surveilled by bots that, through algorithms, make decisions about what they can or cannot access--“digital redlining,” a concept significant for information literacy as students learn how to establish agency as consumers and creators of information (Chris Gilliard & Hugh Culik, 2016). Respondent

2 will provide a summary of key points from the discussion of how bots and the surveillance environment create challenges for our students, both as consumers and creators of data and text. After summarizing the key points, the respondent will encourage the audience to generate takeaways for future consideration. In the area of teaching, how can we help our students develop information and intellectual property literacy in this digital age? In the area of research, what additional questions must we pose to develop an understanding of how digital-era communication works, particularly with regard to the role played by bots? In the area of academic activism, what policies and legislation might we advocate to help our students maintain agency, i.e., ownership and control over the data they generate and the texts they create?

- Speaker: Tim Amidon, Colorado State University, amidont@gmail.com, 970-491-6428 **Speaker 3: navigating surveillance environment**
 - Speaker: Kim Gainer, Radford University, kgainer@radford.edu **Speaker 2: PDS**
 - Speaker: Alex Nielsen, Old Dominion University, anielsen@odu.edu, 757-726-3158 **Speaker 1: introducing bots**
 - Respondent: Dànielle Nicole DeVoss, Michigan State University, devosda@msu.edu **Respondent 2: conclusion**
 - Respondent: James P. Purdy, Duquesne University, purdyj@duq.edu, 412-396-1293 **Respondent 1: YouTube**
-

Miscellanea:

Inspired from discussion in Roundtable 5: Emerging Issues in IP, such as Bot-Authors and Data Ownership—Tim Amidon, Kyle Stedman, and Danielle Nicole DeVoss. Here is the [CCCC call for proposals](#). **[April 19 Google group email: Kyle Stedman doesn't plan to be on panel]**

From Kim Gainer

Given the recent purchase of Turn-It-In, any chance the data-ownership and privacy elements might allow us to revisit the issue of student ownership of their work in light of the databases created by PDS companies?

Potential Speakers for future panel

From Tim Amidon:

list of people who could be invited to speak *re* bot authors/algorithms/data ownership:

- Krista Kennedy's work on data, wearables, and surveillance
- Estee Beck's work on digital visible identity
- Lauren Cagle's work on stranger shots
- Casey Boyle's stuff on #sensecommons
- Chris Gilliard's work on digital redlining
- Jeff Grabill and/or Bill Hart Davidson on bot authors and bot ethics
- Jim Ridolfo and/or Bill Hart Davidson's work on #rhetops

Reyman and Sparby's new collection on *Digital Ethics* just came out; probably some great scholars included who would be good invites.

Turnitin continues to be a good example to discuss so folding in in some way would seem to be pertinent

Jeff Grabill's remarks re Turnitin as a bad robot at C&W at Rochester, NY, particularly insightful.

From Clancy Ratliff:

John Jones at Ohio State does relevant work.

From Alex Nielsen, on CCCC Intellectual Property Facebook page

he's doing some work on Social Media manipulation.

State of the Art in terms of capability, methods, and successes/failures in the past year to deploy public-facing bots. Such a status-oriented presentation would also likely include examples of detection strategies for bot generated content as well as disambiguation of what bots are and do relating to NLP, data parsing, sentiment analysis and intervention, and human-bot-synthesis in marketing and PR applications.

Scholarship:

Beck, Estee N. "The Invisible Digital Identity: Assemblages in Digital Networks." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 35, March 2015, pp. 122-40. *Science Direct*, doi: 10.1016/j.compcom.2015.01.005.

Beck, Estee N. "Writing Educator Responsibilities for Discussing the History and Practice of Surveillance & Privacy in Writing Classrooms."

<http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/20.2/topoi/beck-et-al/beck.html>

Cagle, Lauren E. "Surveilling Strangers: The Disciplinary Biopower of Digital Genre Assemblages." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 52, June 2019, pp. 67-78. *Science Direct*, doi: 10.1016/j.compcom.2019.01.006.

Gilliard, Chris, and Hugh Culik. "Digital Redlining, Access, and Privacy."

<https://www.commonsense.org/education/privacy/blog/digital-redlining-access-privacy>