Instructions

1. You must read the excerpts of <u>TWO</u> academic journal articles (Articles A and B) placed in the appendix.

2. FRT has been increasingly adopted in different public spaces, including schools. Different views about the adoption of FRT in elementary schools from researchers and other stakeholders have been seen in the research literature and media.

   Your task is to summarise, paraphrase and synthesise the main claims or arguments from the <u>TWO</u> excerpts on the adoption of FRT in schools in <u>no more than 300 words</u>.

   Do NOT include your own views in the summary. Do NOT directly copy sentences from the excerpts – you need to write them in your own words.

3. Use APA in-text citations (7th edition)* to acknowledge ideas from the article in your summary. However, the abstract should NOT be cited, as its purpose is to contextualise the excerpt. End-of-text citations or a reference list is NOT required.

   * **Examples:**

   > - **Author-prominent style**: [author's surname] + [a reporting verb]
   >   - E.g., "Andrejevic and Selwyn (2020) report that facial recognition technologies are widely adopted in schools."
   > - **Signal-phrase style:**
   >   - E.g., "According to Andrejevic and Selwyn (2020), facial recognition technologies are widely adopted in schools."
   >   - E.g., "According to some researchers, facial recognition technologies are widely adopted in schools (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020)."
   > - **Information-prominent style**: [cite the author's name after the information or at the end of the sentence]
   >   - E.g., "Facial recognition technologies are widely adopted in schools (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020)."

4. Write in **paragraph** form and adopt the following general **structure** for your summary:
   - **Introduction** (including *background* and a *thesis statement*)
   - **Body paragraph(s)** (including a *topic sentence* for each body paragraph)
   - **Conclusion**

5. You are NOT allowed to use any online or AI tools (including online dictionaries, paraphrasing or translation apps) during the test.

Note: A glossary is included at the end of the excerpts for your reference. It provides definitions of specialised terms and jargon that are underlined in the text, regardless of whether they represent main ideas. Please feel free to consult this glossary as needed for clarification. You are NOT required to include any definitions of these terms in your writing.

Supporting schools to use face recognition systems: a continuance intention perspective of elementary school parents in China

Jon-Chao Hong, Yushun Li, Shuo-Ying Kuo, Xin An
2022

Abstract

A great deal of attention has been focused on technological innovation, for example, face recognition, which has been used in some countries in various fields. Nonetheless, there has been little attention paid to parents' acceptance of the use of face recognition systems on campus. To address this gap in the literature, this study examined how different degrees of technological innovativeness[1] and dangerous beliefs in the virtual world (DBVW)[2] influence parents' perceived value[3] of using and intention to continue supporting schools' use of face recognition systems. This study adopted snowball sampling[4] to collect data through questionnaires, and received 380 valid responses from parents living in Xuzhou, China. Confirmatory factor analysis[5] and structural equation modelling[6] were used to analyse the data, with results indicating that: (1) DBVW was negatively related to perceived value; (2) technological innovativeness was positively related to perceived value; and (3) perceived value was positively related to continuance intention[7] to use face recognition systems. The results suggest that parents support the use of face recognition systems in elementary schools; thus, such systems can be adopted by other elementary schools in other areas.

Discussion

Although implicit and explicit attitudes are different, they can both affect behaviours, and individuals' attitude can promote the value perception before performing a behaviour (Kaiser et al., 2021). In line with this, the present study explored parents' DBVW and technological innovativeness in the value perception of the use of face-recognition systems, and continuous intention to use such systems as a research framework. The results indicate that the average score of parents' DBVW is 3.865, which is higher than the average level (3.000), indicating that the parents were worried about the disclosure of students' personal privacy, and generally had a cautious attitude towards new technologies (Perry & Sibley, 2010). The average score of parents' technological innovativeness is 3.796, which is higher than the average level (3.000), indicating that the parent respondents[8] tended to accept new technology (Wang & Lee, 2020). The average score of parents' perceived value is 3.919, which is much higher than the neutral level (3.000), indicating that the parents generally recognize the value of face recognition systems (Kim et al., 2007). The average score of CIU is 3.776, which is higher than the neutral level (3.000), indicating that the respondents generally preferred to continue using the face recognition system at the campus entrance. On the whole, although the parent respondents thought that the face recognition system had certain risks, they were willing to try technological innovation and they thought the system was valuable, so they intended to continue using it.

According to the results of the path analysis coefficient test, the DBVW was negatively correlated with perceived value, supporting H1(DBVW is negatively related to perceived value), which is consistent with previous studies (Dhaggara et al., 2020). The results of this study indicate that there was a significant negative correlation between users' anxiety about face recognition technology and their perceived usefulness. When users could trust that they had information security on the Internet, they would have lower information leakage anxiety and higher use intention (Singh & Sinha, 2020). Therefore, this study suggests that the higher the parents' DBVW, the lower the value they perceived.

The results of the path analysis coefficient test revealed that technological innovativeness has a positive correlation with perceived value, supporting H2(Technological innovativeness was positively related to perceived value). The results are consistent with previous studies (Albertsen et al., 2020; Lee, 2013), which proved that personal innovation had a positive relationship with perceived usefulness which accounts for the relationship between parents' technological innovativeness and perceived value in this research. This study found that the higher the technological innovativeness, the higher the perceived value.

Glossary

	Vocabulary	Definition
1	Technological innovativeness	The degree to which an individual is willing to try new technologies.
2	Dangerous beliefs in the virtual world (DBVW)	Anxiety that individuals have about potential dangers while using technologies
3	Perceived value	Value that users believe a technology or service has for themselves
4	Snowball sampling	Gathering research participants where existing participants recruit future subjects from their friends
5	Confirmatory factor analysis	A statistical technique used to test if measurements of variables fit a certain expected structure or model
6	Structural equation modelling	A statistical method that models complex relationships among multiple variables
7	Continuance intention	The intention to keep using a particular technology
8	Respondents	People who answer questions in a survey or study

(End of Article A)

Facial recognition technology in schools: critical questions and concerns
Mark Andrejevic & Neil Selwyn
2020

Abstract

Facial recognition technology is now being introduced across various aspects of public life. This includes the burgeoning[1] integration of facial recognition and facial detection into compulsory[2] schooling to address issues such as campus security, automated registration and student emotion detection. So far, these technologies have largely been seen as routine additions to school systems with already extensive cultures of monitoring and surveillance[3]. While critical commentators are beginning to question the pedagogical[4] limitations of facially driven[5] learning, this article contends that school-based facial recognition presents a number of other social challenges and concerns that merit specific attention. This includes the likelihood of facial recognition technology altering the nature of schools and schooling along divisive[6], authoritarian[7] and oppressive lines. Against this background, the article considers whether or not a valid case can ever be made for allowing this form of technology in schools

Discussion

Challenging the take-up of facial recognition in schools

These questions over diminished notions of pedagogy and consent[8] are important. Yet, at this point, we would like to argue that there are a number of additional issues and concerns that cast further serious doubt upon the implementation of facial recognition technologies in schools. In brief, the following points of contention[9] might be raised:

The inescapable nature of school-based facial recognition

Another point of concern is the inescapability[10] of facial monitoring within school contexts. Unlike other forms of personal data (i.e., any piece of data connected to an individual's name), facial data lends itself to constant and permanent surveillance. In short, people are always connected to their faces. Thus, unlike social media posts or interactions with school learning management systems, there is no option for students to self-curate and restrict what data they 'share'. While students might be able to opt-out[11] from facial detection elements of their school's learning systems (for example, the use of eye-tracking or facial thermal imaging for learning analytics), there is no right to decline to participate in 'non-cooperative' facial recognition systems (indeed, any opt-out effectively renders campus facial recognition systems ineffective). While such coercion[12] applies to the use of

facial recognition in all public spaces, it is especially acute in schools. For example, most schools enforce dress codes that preclude students' faces being covered by hair, hoods or other <u>obtrusions</u>[13]. This makes it difficult for students to obscure their faces from surveillance cameras. This also raises the inadequacy of any promise of '<u>informed consent</u>[14]' regarding school facial recognition systems. The systems being deployed in schools for security and attendance purposes rely on complete sweeps of classrooms and corridors in order to operate. This renders '<u>opt-in</u>[15]' and 'out-out' approaches counter-productive from the point of view of the system provider. Even if opt-out <u>protocols</u>[16] are in place, the system has to scan a student's face before it can recognise that they have opted out.

Glossary

	Vocabulary	Definition
1	Burgeoning	Growing or increasing quickly
2	Compulsory	Required by law or rules
3	Surveillance	Careful watching for security
4	Pedagogical	Teaching methods
5	Facially driven	Controlled by facial features
6	Divisive	Causing disagreement or split
7	Authoritarian	Strict, controlling power
8	Consent	Permission or agreement
9	Contention	Disagreements or arguments
10	Inescapability	Impossible to avoid
11	Opt-out	Choosing not to participate
12	Coercion	Forcing by threat or pressure
13	Obtrusions	Things blocking view
14	Informed consent	Agreement with full knowledge
15	Opt-in	Choosing to participate
16	Protocols	Official rules or procedures

(End of Article B)

Task 1: Summarise, paraphrase and synthesise the main claims or arguments from the TWO excerpts on the adoption of FRT in schools in no more than 300 words.

Task 2: Evaluate the following two sample Academic Writing Scripts using the rubric provided on the following page.

Sample Academic Writing Quiz Script – Student A

	Your Comments
Facial recognition technology (FRT) is increasingly incorporated in schools, aiming to improve functions like security. This summary reports key arguments for and against the adoption of FRT in schools, from the perspectives of parents' perceptions on the technology and privacy concerns about students. The debate surrounding facial recognition in schools is fundamentally a conflict over its potential benefits brought to schools in the areas of safety versus its potential to infringe upon privacy and normalise surveillance (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020; Hong et al., 2022). On one hand, scholars like Hong et al. (2022) point out that, despite awareness of privacy issues, parents still support the continued use of FRT in schools as they prioritise its practical value and innovative features over potential risks. Conversely, others like Andrejevic and Selwyn (2020) caution that the same technology poses serious social and ethical risks by potentially shifting schools toward authoritarian environments. They contend that it creates constant, inescapable surveillance that students cannot avoid, violating students' consent. This makes a loss of privacy seem normal and can lead to pressure and control. While facial recognition is perceived as worthwhile by certain stakeholders, concerns about surveillance without students' consent highlight its controversial nature in educational settings. (201 words)	

Sample Academic Writing Quiz Script – Student B

	Your Comments
Facial recognition technology is used more and more in schools all over the world. It helps with things like school security and checking students in automatically. In China, parents have different opinions about this technology. Some support it, but others worry about its effects. These articles talk about facial recognition in schools and show some of the good and bad sides of it (Hong et al., 2022; Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020). Article A says that many parents support facial recognition technology in elementary schools because they think it is useful and trustworthy. According to the research findings, the average score of parents' perceived value is 3.919, which is much higher than the neutral level (3.000). The study shows parents gave high scores for how much value they see in the system and want to keep using it. Even though some parents worry about privacy, they still accept the technology, maybe because they believe it will make schools safer or easier to manage (Hong et al., 2022). Article B says facial recognition is bad because there is no option for students to self-curate and restrict what data they share. Students don't have freedom to choose to opt out. Maybe students don't care, or it is not a big problem. The technology might just help schools be more organized (Andrejevic & Selwyn). So, I think that Article A says parents like facial recognition because of its value, but Article B warns about problems and control, showing it is a debated issue (Hong et al., 2022; Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020). (257 words)	

Rubric for Academic Writing Quiz

Summary Accuracy (20%) (Coverage of Main Ideas, Precision and Avoidance of Misinterpretation)

A / A-	B+ / B / B-	C+ / C / C-	D or below
• Includes all the main ideas from the original text without omission • Free from personal bias or unsupported claims • No distortion, exaggeration, or oversimplification of the original meaning of main ideas	• Captures most of the main ideas • No personal views are included • May include some unnecessary details • May contain minor inaccuracies only in wording or emphasis but no major misinterpretation of main ideas	• Omits multiple main ideas • May occasionally include personal views • Includes some unnecessary details • Includes irrelevant details or unsupported claims • Contains some inaccuracies resulting in misinterpretation or distortion of the original meaning of main ideas	• Makes significant omissions or misinterprets main ideas • Includes irrelevant details • May fabricate claims not present in the source

Synthesis (20%) (Connection of Main Ideas and Relationships Among Ideas)

A / A-	B+ / B / B-	C+ / C / C-	D or below
• Effectively integrates main ideas from both excerpts to address the topic • Shows a clear logical relationship between ideas (e.g. comparison, contrast)	• Integrates main ideas from both excerpts but with some minor gaps or oversights in addressing the topic • Shows a basic logical relationship (e.g., comparison/contrast) but may be mechanical	• Attempts to integrate main ideas but unable to do so meaningfully • May overly focus on one excerpt • Identifies a relationship (e.g., similarity/difference) but it lacks clarity or a logical development of ideas	• Little to no meaningful connection drawn between excerpts • Fails to establish a discernible relationship among ideas • May ignore one source or present ideas disjointedly • Ideas are listed without analysis or comparison

Paraphrasing (20%) (Originality of Wording and Preservation of Meaning)

A / A-	B+ / B / B-	C+ / C / C-	D or below
• Fully reworded in the student's own voice, with no direct copying of phrases or sentence structures • Accurately conveys the original idea without distortion or oversimplification of meaning	• Mostly students' own original phrasing • Meaning is generally correct • May contain near-identical sentence structures from the source • May lose nuance or include minor inaccuracies in meaning	• Relies on the source's phrasing and sentence structures • May distort or oversimplify the original ideas	• Direct copying of phrases, sentences, or entire passages with no meaningful rewording • Meaning may or may not be preserved

Academic Tone & Clarity (20%) (Formality, Clarity, Flow of Ideas and Cohesion)

A / A-	B+ / B / B-	C+ / C / C-	D or below
• Formal tone with no informal language (e.g., contractions, colloquialisms, or conversational phrasing) • Sentences are clear, logically structured, and free of ambiguity • Smooth transitions between ideas with no awkward phrasing • Provides a well-structured summary with a clear thesis statement in the introduction, an effective topic sentence for each body paragraph, and a relevant conclusion	• Predominantly formal but may include some lapses (e.g., a contraction, slightly informal word choice) • Sentences are generally logically structured • Some transitions may be abrupt or mechanical • Thesis statement is present but may be imprecise • Topic sentences are clear but may not fully align with the thesis or lack development • Conclusion summarises a few points only	• Frequent use of informal phrasing (e.g. conversational language, slang, or overuse of first-person pronouns) • Ideas may be hard to follow as sentences lack logical connections • Awkward or disjointed transitions are evident • Thesis statement is vague or off-topic • Topic sentences are weak or disconnected from the thesis • Conclusion is repetitive or does not summarise key points	• Overly casual, inappropriate for academic writing (e.g. text-message style, excessive slang) • Ideas are consistently unclear or confusing due to absence of logical structure • Ideas are disjointed due to absence of transitions • Thesis statement is missing or incoherent • Topic sentences are absent or unrelated to the excerpts • Conclusion is missing or does not address the topic

In-text Citations (20%) (APA Referencing Style)

A / A-	B+ / B / B-	C+ / C / C-	D or below
• Correct use of signal phrases and quotations • No missing or misplaced citations • All secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited • Fully follows the APA referencing style	• May occasionally forget page numbers, or quotation marks for direct quotes • Most sources are correctly cited • Some secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited • Minor errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing parentheses, incorrect punctuation)	• No citations for direct quotations • Citations are missing in most cited sources • Secondary citations, if any, are missing or incorrectly cited • Frequent errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing years, incorrect author order)	• No citations for direct quotations • Citations are rarely seen or absent • Citations, if any, do not follow the APA referencing style or may be fabricated