Ethics

Matthew J. Salganik
Department of Sociology
Princeton University

Summer Institute in Computational Social Science June 17, 2019

The Summer Institutes in Computational Social Science is supported by grants from the Russell Sage Foundation and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.





► fear-based reasons

- ► fear-based reasons
- ▶ hope-based reasons

- ► fear-based reasons
- hope-based reasons
- we have no choice

In the past, what we **could** do has been the limitation, increasingly what we **should** do will be the limitation.

Research ethics will become increasingly central; it will become harder and harder to avoid.

I want you to be able to:

- design ethically thoughtful research
- explain your decisions to others

A note on lectures and readings:

For today, I'm going to repeat some of what is in my book, but going forward, I will assume that you've read the chapter.

Three approaches:

► Rules-based approach

Three approaches:

- ► Rules-based approach
- ► Ad hoc approach

Three approaches:

- ► Rules-based approach
- ► Ad hoc approach
- Principles-based approach

► Emotional contagion

- ► Emotional contagion
- ► Tastes, Ties, and Time

- ► Emotional contagion
- ► Tastes, Ties, and Time
- ► Encore


- ► Emotional contagion
- ► Tastes, Ties, and Time
- Encore
- ► Think-pair-share other examples?

What's the problem?

increasing power

What's the problem?

- increasing power
- inconsistent and overlapping rules, norms, and expectations



► Respect for persons

Respect for persons: Participants decide not you

- ► Respect for persons
- Beneficence

Beneficence:

Minimize risk, maximize benefits, then decide

- ► Respect for persons
- Beneficence
- Justice

Justice: distribution of burdens and benefits of research

Justice:

distribution of burdens and benefits of research

- poorly educated and disenfranchised citizens
- prisoners
- institutionalized and mentally disabled children
- old and debilitated hospital patients

Justice:

distribution of burdens and benefits of research

- poorly educated and disenfranchised citizens
- prisoners
- institutionalized and mentally disabled children
- old and debilitated hospital patients

Also includes access to benefits of research

- Respect for persons
- Beneficence
- Justice
- Respect for Law and Public Interest

Respect for Law and Public Interest:

- compliance
- transparency-based accountability

Terms-of-service agreements

MapWatch: Detecting and Monitoring International Border Personalization on Online Maps

Gary Soeller Northeastern University soelgary@ccs.neu.edu Karrie Karahalios University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign kkarahal@illinois.edu

Christo Wilson Northeastern University cbw@ccs.neu.edu Christian Sandvig University of Michigan csandvig@umich.edu

http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883016

Abstract:

"Maps have long played a crucial role in enabling people to conceptualize and navigate the world around them. However, maps also encode the world-views of their creators. Disputed international borders are one example of this: governments may mandate that cartographers produce maps that conform to their view of a territorial dispute. Today, online maps maintained by private corporations have become the norm. However, these new maps are still subject to old debates. Companies like Google and Bing resolve these disputes by localizing their maps to meet government requirements and user preferences, i.e., users in different locations are shown maps with different international boundaries. We argue that this non-transparent personalization of maps may exacerbate nationalistic disputes by promoting divergent views of geopolitical realities."

Abstract, part 2:

"To address this problem, we present MapWatch, our system for detecting and cataloging personalization of international borders in online maps. Our system continuously crawls all map tiles from Google and Bing maps, and leverages crowdworkers to identify border personalization. In this paper, we present the architecture of MapWatch, and analyze the instances of border personalization on Google and Bing, including one border change that MapWatch identified live, as Google was rolling out the update."



Figure 5: Border changes separating the Crimean Peninsula from Ukraine on Google Maps. Map Data @2014 AutoNavi Google.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883016


Ethics. Many Web platforms discourage all automated crawling outside the API, and even within the API a platform may prohibit "research" in its online Terms of Service document (usually for competitive reasons). We agree with [57] that non-commercial research for the public good that deals with issues of societal importance must be able to access public Web resources for research purposes as long as automated processes do not produce an unreasonable load. This was our guiding philosophy in this research design.


http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883016

Researchers (with the support of the ACLU) have filed a case challenging the CFAA, Sandivg v Lynch: https://www.aclu.org/cases/

 $\label{lem:https://www.aclu.org/cases/sandvig-v-lynch-challenge-cfaa-prohibition-uncovering-racial-discrimination-online} and vig-v-lynch-challenge-cfaa-prohibition-uncovering-racial-discrimination-online and vig-v-lynch-challenge-cfaa-prohibition-online and vig-v-lynch-challenge-c$


Even if this is legal should we do it?






If you go "off the grid":


▶ you might lose access during your research



- you might lose access during your research
- you might struggle to have your research funded, talk about it, and publish it



- you might lose access during your research
- you might struggle to have your research funded, talk about it, and publish it
- you might not be able to share your data with other researchers



- you might lose access during your research
- you might struggle to have your research funded, talk about it, and publish it
- you might not be able to share your data with other researchers
- you might make it harder to other academics in the future

- Respect for persons
- ▶ Beneficence
- Justice
- Respect for Law and Public Interest

How do you balance these four principles?

- ► Consequentialism
- Deontology


Quick question

In arguing against the Emotional Contagion experiment (Kleinsman and Buckley, 2015) wrote:

"Even if it is true that the risks for the Facebook experiment were low and even if, in hindsight, the results are judged to be useful, there is an important principle at stake here that must be upheld. In the same way that stealing is stealing no matter what amounts are involved, so we all have a right not to be experimented on without our knowledge and consent, whatever the nature of the research."

This argument is rooted in which ethical framework?

- 1. Consequentialism
- 2. Deontology



Applying these ideas can be tricky, and there are 4 areas of particular difficulty

Questions?