MWAIS 2022 Proceedings   Midwest (MWAIS)

5-5-2022

Panel on Privacy in the Hyperconnected Digital Age

Gaurav Bansal
University of Wisconsin - Green Bay, bansalg@uwgb.edu

Fiona Nah
City University of Hong Kong, HK, fiona.nah@cityu.edu.hk

Matt Adamczyk
Microsoft, matad@microsoft.com

Damon Buono
Microsoft, dbuono@microsoft.com

Raman Mehta
Johnson Electric, raman.mehta@johnsonelectric.com

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://aisel.aisnet.org/mwais2022

Authors

Gaurav Bansal, Fiona Nah, Matt Adamczyk, Damon Buono, Raman Mehta, and Shivani Srivastava

Panel Proposal:
Privacy in the Hyperconnected Digital Age

Gaurav Bansal
University of Wisconsin – Green Bay
bansalg@uwgb.edu

Fiona Nah
City University of Hong Kong, HK
fiona.nah@cityu.edu.hk

Matt Adamczyk
Resident Technologist
Microsoft
matad@microsoft.com

Damon Buono
Sr Director, Enterprise Data Governance
Microsoft
dbuono@microsoft.com

Raman Mehta
SVP & CIO
Johnson Electric
raman.mehta@johnsonelectric.com

Shivani Srivastava
AVP, Marketing Technologies
Humana
shivani.srivastava1@gmail.com

OBJECTIVE

This panel is organized to discuss what is needed to understand the emerging privacy issues thrust upon by modern technologies, such as AI, and the data collection and usage practices of the companies and the government. The panel will explore possible solutions to ensure that these technologies' benefits outweigh their disadvantages. The panel will be held virtually.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Several aspects of the modern-day privacy paradigm have necessitated a meaningful dialogue within our community, engaging all stakeholders, including academia, business, and government. We list them below.

Privacy is a dynamic concept. Privacy is a complex and dynamic concept (Galanxhi and Nah, 2006). Privacy continues to evolve as people adjust to the new technological advances in data collection and concoction (Culnan, 1993; Hong and Thong, 2013; James, Warkentin and Collignon, 2015; Malhotra, Kim and Agarwal, 2004; Smith, Milberg and Burke, 1996; Stewart and Segars, 2002).

Too much data collection. Modern technological applications such as voice-enabled assistants (PriceWaterHouse Coopers, 2018), facial recognition (Martin, 2019), location-tracking devices, and social media networks (Newcomb, 2018) have allowed the collection of highly personal and sensitive data by corporations (Wired.com, 2004) and also by governments (Rainie, 2018). Combining this data with other information "dots" has heightened privacy, including surveillance concerns (Bansal and Nah, 2020).

Too little control. As data collection has increased, so have the concerns regarding decreased control over their usage (Auxier, Rainie, Anderson, Perrin, Kumar and Turner, 2019) and retraction of one's data (James et al., 2015).

Privacy and AI: While AI promises to create a smarter, autonomous world, it is not without its concerns. Perhaps most prevalent are consumer personal data privacy and protection (Humerick, 2017). The *mindless* (Swanson and Ramiller, 2004) use of AI raises privacy issues relating to implementation and data security (Murdoch, 2021). The collection and concoction of data have enabled companies to generate what is termed *online* DNA, and there is a concern if our online DNA should have the same rights as physical DNA (Priestley, 2020). In a similar vein, insurance customers are concerned that AI, by predicting future events, is driving usage-based insurance, which is against the original idea of spreading the risk (Vandenberg, 2020). Similar

concerns also apply to health insurance, where AI is increasingly used to predict health conditions. See this example of how Google's AI algorithm can predict heart conditions from scans of one's eye (Vincent, 2018), before they become "pre-existing" conditions.

Little or no regulation. While the data collection and generation of behavioral insights from the users' data have increased, few, if any, safeguards are introduced to protect individuals from any wrongful or unethical use of their data. Even though many privacy laws in the U.S. cover different types of data - e.g., HIPAA, FCRA, FERPA, GLBA, ECPA, COPPA, and VPPA, companies, for the most part, have lots of leeway in dealing with the users' data (Klosowski, 2021). Some states have taken the initiative to introduce privacy regulations, such as California and Virginia; a recent poll suggests that over 4 in 5 voters (from both major parties in the US) want the US congress to prioritize the protection of personal online data at the federal level (Sabin, 2021). State-driven laws may create a nightmare for companies and make compliance even more elusive (Thuma, 2020).

The 2022 survey polls released by The Future of Tech Commission (2022) reveal strong bipartisan support (77%) by the US citizens for government action to protect the citizens' privacy, society, and children. Reacting to the survey findings, The Future of Technology Commission co-chair and also the former Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings commented, "Federal policies made more than a generation ago have not kept up with the constantly changing technology marketplace. Our outdated regulatory structure has put our society and children at risk (The Future of Tech Commission, 2022)."

The new reality, the user is the product: If you are not paying for it, you're not the customer; you're the product being sold, posted by blue beetle at 1:41 PM on August 26, 2010 (Lewis, 2010). Others have echoed the same sentiments in the context of Google (Kepes, 2013); and also Facebook (Morrissey, 2018). Building upon a similar concept, in her book Surveillance Capitalism, Zuboff (2020) raises several questions: How far should companies be allowed to go *to manipulate human behavior? Who should know and who should decide? Who decides who decides?*"

Is privacy dead: Using the global warming analogy to the ongoing threat to information privacy, Hubaux and Juels (2016) argue that "[t]here is a scientific consensus that the threat justifies not just mitigation, but preparation." They further explain, "[c]onfidentiality may be melting away, perhaps inexorably: soon, a few companies and surveillance agencies could have access to most of the personal data of the world's population. Data provides information, and information is power. An information asymmetry of this degree and global scale is an absolute historical novelty." In the same vein, Daniel J. Solove, a prominent Law Professor at the George Washington University Law School, argues that an appropriate and "dominant metaphor for modern invasions of privacy is Big Brother, the ruthless totalitarian government in George Orwell's novel 1984" (Solove, 2004).

TENTATIVE QUESTIONS

- Has the notion of privacy changed over time?
- Is privacy a thing of the past?
- How are companies handling these evolving privacy perspectives, particularly from a global standpoint?
- Who is responsible for my privacy – me myself, companies, government?

PANELISTS

Matt Adamczyk, Microsoft Resident Technologist, TitletownTech, Green Bay, WI
As Microsoft's Technologist in Residence, Matt brings his robust knowledge to help startups at TitletownTech design, architect, and scale their technologies. Before moving back to Wisconsin and joining TitletownTech, Matt was a Program Manager at Microsoft in Redmond, WA. In his role, he engineered highly scalable solutions for Microsoft Office. His work on the Office team contributed to the business and technological transformation of successfully delivering Microsoft 365. Before joining Microsoft, Matt built innovative software for State Farm and was a researcher at the University of Iowa Computational Epidemiology Research Group. Matt graduated from the University of Iowa with a BS in computer science and Mathematics.

Gaurav Bansal, Professor, Univ of Wisconsin – Green Bay, WI
Dr. Gaurav Bansal is Frederick E. Baer Professor in Business and full professor of MIS/Statistics at the Austin E. Cofrin School of Business at UW-Green Bay. He is a Distinguished Member (Cum Laude) of the Association for Information Systems (AIS). He currently serves as editor-in-chief for the Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research. He earned his Ph.D. in Management Information Systems from the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee in 2008. He has published in several premier MIS journals such as the Journal of Management Information Systems, European Journal of Information Systems,

Decision Support Systems, and Information & Management. He has served as the Midwest Association for Information Systems president.

Damon Buono, **Sr Director of Enterprise Data Governance at Microsoft**
Damon is a Senior Director at Microsoft responsible for the enterprise implementation of Data Governance. Mr. Buono is a true data veteran with over 25yrs of experience in helping companies become more Data-Driven. At Microsoft, Mr. Buono has run some of the largest data programs across the company, including Data Privacy, Customer Data Management, Master Data Management, Business Intelligence, Data Analytics, Data Science, and Data Governance. Mr. Buono has also previously worked with MIT Sloan Center for Information Systems Research (CISR), researching the future of Self-Service Analytics.

Raman Mehta, SVP & CIO at Johnson Electric
Raman is currently CIO & SVP of Johnson Electric, where he directs the enterprise technology vision and leads multiple divisions with 35,000+ employees in 23 countries. Under his leadership, the organization has jump-started the industry 4.0 journey with massive improvements in productivity & quality. Raman is adept at leading and delivering on transformation and shattering conventional norms – ushering in a new era of IT capabilities to bring Fortune 500 powerhouses to the cusp of innovation. Raman introduced time-tested, proven strategies and roadmaps that not only unified siloed teams to spark innovation and collaboration but also reimagined the entire enterprise technology strategy – winning the coveted CIO100 award with three consecutive companies. Raman is published in Forbes, MIT Tech Review, CIO.com, and numerous other prestigious publications and is a keynote speaker at marquee industry events. Raman holds an MBA from the University of Michigan and a Bachelor of Engineering degree from the Birla Institute of Technology and Science in India.

Fiona Nah, Professor, City Univ of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Dr. Fiona Fui-Hoon Nah is a Professor at the City University of Hong Kong. She is a Distinguished Member of the Association for Information Systems (AIS). She currently serves as editor-in-chief of the AIS Transactions on Human–Computer Interaction. She received her Ph.D. in Management Information Systems from the University of British Columbia. Her publications have appeared in journals such as MIS Quarterly, Journal of the Association for Information Systems, Journal of Strategic Information Systems, Journal of Information Technology, International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, and Computers in Human Behavior. She is a co-founder and former chair of the AIS Special Interest Group on Human–Computer Interaction.

Shivani Srivastava, **AVP Product Head of Marketing Technology at Humana**
Shivani brings 20+ years of experience in consumer marketing in various leadership roles. She's passionate about improving consumer experiences and has been instrumental in growing marketing technology practice to enable personalization at scale within the financial services and healthcare industry. Shivani is a graduate of Johns Hopkins University and is currently AVP, Marketing Technology at Humana.

Note: The panelists shall discuss their opinions that do not necessarily represent those of their organizations.

REFERENCES

1. Auxier, B., Rainie, L., Anderson, M., Perrin, A., Kumar, M. and Turner, E. (2019) Americans and Privacy: Concerned, Confused and Feeling Lack of Control Over Their Personal Information, from https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2019/11/15/americans-and-privacy-concerned-confused-and-feeling-lack-of-control-over-their-personal-information/ (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).
2. Bansal, G. and Nah, F. F.-H. (2020). Measuring privacy concerns with government surveillance and right-to-be-forgotten in nomological net of trust and willingness-to-share, *26th Americas Conference on Information Systems (AMCIS 2020)*: Association for Information Systems.
3. Culnan, M. J. (1993) How did they get my name: An exploratory investigation of customer attitudes toward secondary information use, *MIS Quarterly* 17, 3, 341-361.
4. Galanxhi, H. and Nah, F. F.-H. (2006) Privacy issues in the era of ubiquitous commerce, *Electronic Markets* 16, 3, 222-232.
5. Hong, W. and Thong, J. Y. (2013) Internet privacy concerns: An integrated conceptualization and four empirical studies, *MIS Quarterly* 37, 1, 275-298.
6. Hubaux, J.-P. and Juels, A. (2016) Privacy is dead, long live privacy, *Communications of the ACM* 59, 6, 39-41.
7. Humerick, M. (2017) Taking AI personally: how the EU must learn to balance the interests of personal data privacy & artificial intelligence, *Santa Clara High Tech. LJ* 34, 393.

8.   James, T. L., Warkentin, M. and Collignon, S. E. (2015) A dual privacy decision model for online social networks, *Information & Management* 52, 8, 893-908.

9.   Kepes, B. (2013) Google Users - You're The Product, Not The Customer, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/benkepes/2013/12/04/google-users-youre-the-product-not-the-customer/?sh=50d48e6a76d6 (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

10.   Klosowski, T. (2021) The State of Consumer Data Privacy Laws in the US (And Why It Matters), from https://www.nytimes.com/wirecutter/blog/state-of-privacy-laws-in-us/ (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

11.   Lewis, A. (2010) If you are not paying for it, you're not the customer; you're the product being sold, from https://www.metafilter.com/95152/Userdriven-discontent#3256046 (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

12.   Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S. and Agarwal, J. (2004) Internet users' Internet information privacy concerns (IUIPC): The construct, the scale, and a causal model, *Information Systems Research* 15, 4, 336-355.

13.   Martin, N. (2019) The Major Concerns Around Facial Recognition Technology, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/nicolemartin1/2019/09/25/the-major-concerns-around-facial-recognition-technology/#6a3682174fe3 (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

14.   Morrissey, E. (2018) You're not Facebook's customer. You're Facebook's product, from https://theweek.com/articles/761830/youre-not-facebooks-customer-youre-facebooks-product (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

15.   Murdoch, B. (2021) Privacy and artificial intelligence: challenges for protecting health information in a new era, *BMC Medical Ethics* 22, 1, 1-5.

16.   Newcomb, A. (2018) A timeline of Facebook's privacy issues — and its responses, from https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/social-media/timeline-facebook-s-privacy-issues-its-responses-n859651 (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

17.   PriceWaterHouse Coopers. (2018) Consumer Intelligence Series: Prepare for the voice revolution, from https://www.pwc.com/us/en/advisory-services/publications/consumer-intelligence-series/voice-assistants.pdf (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

18.   Priestley, J. L. 2020. Should data have rights?, in *97 Things About Ethics Everyone in Data Science Should Know,* B. Franks (ed.). O'Reilly Media.

19.   Rainie, L. (2018) Americans' complicated feelings about social media in an era of privacy concerns, from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/27/americans-complicated-feelings-about-social-media-in-an-era-of-privacy-concerns (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

20.   Sabin, S. (2021) States Are Moving on Privacy Bills. Over 4 in 5 Voters Want Congress to Prioritize Protection of Online Data, from https://morningconsult.com/2021/04/27/state-privacy-congress-priority-poll/ (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

21.   Smith, H. J., Milberg, S. J. and Burke, S. J. (1996) Information privacy: Measuring individuals' concerns about organizational practices, *MIS Quarterly* 20, 2, 167-196.

22.   Solove, D. J. (2004). *The digital person: Technology and privacy in the information age*. NyU Press.

23.   Stewart, K. A. and Segars, A. H. (2002) An empirical examination of the concern for information privacy instrument, *Information Systems Research* 13, 1, 36-49.

24.   Swanson, E. B. and Ramiller, N. C. (2004) Innovating mindfully with information technology, *MIS Quarterly* 28, 4, 553-583.

25.   The Future of Tech Commission. (2022) Poll: 78% of voters support requiring companies to allow consumers the right to "opt-in" before sharing any of their personal data, from https://www.futureoftechcommission.org/press-release-launch-2ndpoll (last accessed Feb 16, 2022).

26.   Thuma, J. 2020. Spam. Are you going to miss it?, in *97 Things About Ethics Everyone in Data Science Should Know,* B. Franks (ed.). O'Reilly Media.

27.   Vandenberg, E. 2020. Auto insurance: When data science and the business model intersect, in *97 Things About Ethics Everyone in Data Science Should Know,* B. Franks (ed.). O'Reilly Media.

28.   Vincent, J. (2018) Google's new AI algorithm predicts heart disease by looking at your eyes, from https://www.theverge.com/2018/2/19/17027902/google-verily-ai-algorithm-eye-scan-heart-disease-cardiovascular-risk (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

29.   Wired.com. (2004) Big Business Becoming Big Brother, from https://www.wired.com/2004/08/big-business-becoming-big-brother/ (last accessed Feb 9, 2022).

30.   Zuboff, S. (2020). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs.