

**Type of Contribution: STUDENT SHOWCASE PROPOSAL**

## **Disability and Surveillance; Disability Justice as a Framework to Understand Educational Technology**

Alexandra Pucciarelli, Emma May (Rutgers University, USA)

**Keywords: Surveillance, disability, learning technology**

### **Introduction:**

The increased accessibility of technology is often employed as rationale for data extraction and surveillance. This paper examines critical perspectives on surveillance and educational technologies from Library and Information Science (LIS) literature, as well as those from disability studies that concern technology development more broadly. This research aims to understand how a disability justice framework can interrogate both the overall expansion of surveillance technologies and justifications for increased surveillance that argue that data extraction and analytics lead to increased accessibility for disabled users. As an activist approach toward disability advocacy that underscores the connections between white supremacy, sexism and colonialism as central to ableism, disability justice recognizes surveillance technologies as embedded in systems of power that disproportionately harm people of color. Using a disability justice framework, this student showcase proposal argues against the expansion of surveillance technologies—especially in the name of increasing accessibility.

### **Theoretical Framework:**

This essay takes a descriptive research approach to examine the tensions implicit between the expansion of surveillance technology and its supposed promise of accessibility. These promises have historically been broken after the needed information has been extracted from the

disabled. Mills (2009) refers to this phenomena as the “assistive pretext” which operationalizes disability as a resource for technoscientific development. Nagy (2022) expands on this concept in her investigation into how disability can itself be constitutive of new forms of AI and big data-based surveillance. She discusses how new AI survey regimes have historically been weaponized to make the inner lives neurotypical and neurodivergent alike open to observation.

### **Research Question:**

How can a disability justice framework interrogate the expansion of surveillance technologies vis-à-vis learning analytics when these technologies have been understood as opportunities to build accessible technology?

### **Methodology:**

The study utilized a systematic literature review approach to examine the connections between the LIS literature concerning surveillance and library- or education-related technologies and the disability studies literature concerning extractive technological practices and surveillance as they relate to disability. Google Scholar was used to locate relevant literature. The inclusion criteria included:

- 1) studies that examined the data analytics and/or data extractive properties of educational and library technologies
- 2) studies published from 2008-2022, with a focus on recent studies from 2012 onward
- 3) studies that discuss disability as it relates to extractive technological processes and/or surveillance
- 4) peer-reviewed journal articles. Publications outside of the LIS, education, and disability studies literature were excluded from the review.

### **Expected Results and Conclusion:**

We predict several gaps within the literature. This paper responds to the conference theme of “social Justice and information equity; human rights”. Much of the disability studies literature ignores the systems of power such as racism and classism that adversely affect members of the community. There is especially a lack of research on antiracist work within disability studies. This is particularly disconcerting because already people of color are especially vulnerable to surveillance. LIS as a discipline has not examined surveillance and the disabled experience. We plan to fill some of these gaps in the future related work through a qualitative research study that will include interviews with disabled librarians to gain their perspectives on the implications of learning technologies and data analytics.

## REFERENCES

- Avila, C., Baldiris, S., Fabregat, R., & Graf, S. (2020). Evaluation of a learning analytics tool for supporting teachers in the creation and evaluation of accessible and quality open educational resources. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(4), 1019–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12940>
- Baek, C., & Aguilar, S. J. (2022). Past, present, and future directions of learning analytics research for students with disabilities. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 0(0), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2022.2067796>
- Berne, P. (2017). Disability Justice – A Working Draft. In *Skin, Tooth, and Bone – The Basis of Movement is Our People: A Disability Justice Primer* (pp. 9–15). <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09688080.2017.1335999>
- Berne, P., Morales, A. L., Langstaff, D., & Invalid, S. (2018). Ten Principles of Disability Justice. *WSQ: Women’s Studies Quarterly*, 46(1), 227–230. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wsqa.2018.0003>
- Cano, A. R., Fernández-Manjón, B., & García-Tejedor, Á. J. (2018). Using game learning analytics for validating the design of a learning game for adults with intellectual

disabilities. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(4), 659–672.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12632>

Cheney-Lippold, J. (2011). A New Algorithmic Identity: Soft Biopolitics and the Modulation of Control. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 28(6), 164–181.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276411424420>

Cooper, M., Ferguson, R., & Wolff, A. (2016). What can analytics contribute to accessibility in e-learning systems and to disabled students' learning? *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*, 99–103.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/2883851.2883946>

Ferguson, R., & Clow, D. (2017). Where is the evidence? A call to action for learning analytics. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics & Knowledge Conference*, 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3027385.3027396>

Fujiura, G. T., & Rutkowski-Kmitta, V. (2001). Counting disability. *Handbook of Disability Studies*, 69–96.

Jones, K. M. L. (2019a). “Just Because You Can Doesn’t Mean You Should”: Practitioner Perceptions of Learning Analytics Ethics. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 19(3), 407–428. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0025>

Jones, K. M. L. (2019b). Learning analytics and higher education: A proposed model for establishing informed consent mechanisms to promote student privacy and autonomy. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 24.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0155-0>

Jones, K. M. L., & Salo, D. (2017). *Learning Analytics and the Academic Library: Professional Ethics Commitments at a Crossroads* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 2955779). <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2955779>

Lambert, A. D., Parker, M., & Bashir, M. (2015). Library patron privacy in jeopardy an analysis of the privacy policies of digital content vendors. *Proceedings of the*

*Association for Information Science and Technology*, 52(1), 1–9.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/pr2.2015.145052010044>

Lamdan, S. (2019). Librarianship at the Crossroads of ICE Surveillance. *The Library with the Lead Pipe*, 13.

Lawson, C., Beer, C., Rossi, D., Moore, T., & Fleming, J. (2016). Identification of 'at risk' students using learning analytics: The ethical dilemmas of intervention strategies in a higher education institution. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64(5), 957–968. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9459-0>

Mills, M. (2010). Deaf Jam: From Inscription to Reproduction to Information. *Social Text*, 28(1 (102)), 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-2009-059>

Nagy, J. (2022). Autism and the making of emotion AI: Disability as resource for surveillance capitalism. *New Media & Society*, 14614448221109550.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221109550>

Nguyen, A., Gardner, L. A., & Sheridan, D. (2018). A framework for applying learning analytics in serious games for people with intellectual disabilities. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(4), 673–689. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12625>

Nichols Hess, A., LaPorte-Fiori, R., & Engwall, K. (2015). Preserving Patron Privacy in the 21st Century Academic Library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(1), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.10.010>

Paris, B., Reynolds, R., & McGowan, C. (2022). Sins of omission: Critical informatics perspectives on privacy in e-learning systems in higher education. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 73(5), 708–725.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24575>

Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2016). Student Vulnerability, Agency, and Learning Analytics: An Exploration. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 3(1), Article 1.

Saltes, N. (2013). 'Abnormal' Bodies on the Borders of Inclusion: Biopolitics and the Paradox of Disability Surveillance. *Surveillance & Society*, 11(1/2), 55–73.

<https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v11i1/2.4460>

Zimmer, M. (2014). Librarians' Attitudes Regarding Information and Internet Privacy. *The Library Quarterly*, 84(2), 123–151. <https://doi.org/10.1086/675329>