

When Students Accept Their Corporate Overlords:

Privilege and Position in Our Information Society

Kate Hinnant and Robin Miller

“YOU DON’T KNOW HOW hard it can be to get to the public library,” one student’s emphatic voice rose above the din of her peers. The class, a lower level college course called “Living in an Information Society,” was discussing the digital divide in small groups, and distinctions were being drawn right and left. What did the divide mean in developing countries? What did it mean in America? And what did it mean in our students’ hometowns? It was the hometowns that our students felt most comfortable talking about: iPads or laptops in schools, public libraries, cheap family plans for smartphones. Most of our students felt that at least in the United States, the digital divide was more of a low hurdle than a barrier. One student, who had grown up financially insecure, began to testify about how distant an option the library can be in a town without public transportation. Her story got the other students rolling: they started to consider other limits to the library as a solution to digital inequality. After class, the two of us discussed how our student had pushed her peers past their own frames of reference—out of their hometowns, a step past their privilege, and toward a more complex understanding of our information landscape. However, we realized that our students’ subject positions and lived experiences were not our own pedagogical tools. We needed to build more support in the curriculum for students to critically engage with the ways that class,

race, ethnicity, gender, and disability affect access to and use of information. Finally, we needed to ask our students and ourselves to risk stepping out of our own lived experience, again and again.

At the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, we have co-taught “Living in an Information Society” as a three-credit honors course in 2015 and 2017. At our institution, librarians hold faculty status, but the library is not a department through which courses, degrees, or certificates are offered. Librarians have opportunities to teach courses through partnerships with campus departments, including the University Honors Program and the First-Year Experience Program. The students enrolled were primarily first- and second-year undergraduates, although a few upper-level students also enrolled. The course satisfies a general education requirement.

The course offers students and teaching librarians the opportunity to explore pressing issues presented by our information-based society, while also giving students experience finding and critically evaluating sources and media. It’s a discussion-oriented course in which students engage with information through several assignment and activity formats. Between the first and second iterations of the course, we developed a critical framework intended to “decenter” our students and ourselves as instructors. We selected readings and designed activities intended to help students examine their subject positions and, ultimately, step outside of unexamined and closely held perspectives that can bar critical analysis of information.

The Course and How It Changed

In the first iteration of our course, the information “problems” we introduced included information overload, journalism and objectivity, and privacy and surveillance. Mid-semester, we began a segment on the “digital divide,” during which we planned to spend a few class periods addressing access to information in global and domestic contexts. It’s not uncommon in any discipline for the enthusiasm of the faculty for their subject matter to be incommensurate with students. However, during our first iteration of the course, we found that our attentive and otherwise cooperative students were not fully engaging with the problems that our course raised. In class discussions and student writing, we saw that our students avoided thinking about the problems presented from the perspective of power and identity. In other words, they were reluctant to consider the role that sub-

ject position—the effect of identity and power or powerlessness—played in the information situations we discussed. Our course was designed to explicitly address the information experiences of people from a variety of social classes, races and ethnicities, geopolitical regions, and sexualities. However, our students often chose to approach the issues from the relatively privileged positions of American college students. For example, the first iteration of the course included discussion of the experience of using the internet for the first time. Students engaged with an interactive text about internet usability from the perspective of people who had never used the internet before, including footage of individuals using various devices to access the internet for the first time.¹ While we expected this content to be revelatory, the students interpreted the material by discussing the challenges their parents and grandparents experience in accessing the internet or commiserating about minor confusions experienced when switching between operating systems. When considering the challenge that non-English speakers face in accessing the internet, students resolved the problem by arguing for universal access to English education in order to best equip new internet users. In class and group discussions, broader social questions tended to resolve themselves into the more comfortable zone of personal experience or preference or vague proposals for “education.”

As we reflected on the patterns we observed, we concluded that we had not done the necessary work to help students position themselves outside of their own lived experience. In making honest and open statements about threats to their privacy, our first-year college students had yet to experience, for example, identity theft or other breaches of personal information, financial or medical precarity, or harassment. There was little wonder, then, that they openly avowed their allegiance to convenience over privacy and voiced their conviction that privacy matters less for people who “have nothing to hide.” Some of our course content, when seen through the lens of the daily life of college students, can seem benign. Our students’ tacit and explicit acceptance of various forms of corporate, institutional, political, and judicial overreach could be understood as a reflection of their estimation of the risks and rewards posed by media and financial corporations, law enforcement, and other information stakeholders to their relative position. Trade-offs, such as privacy for convenience, could be seen as low-stakes or negligible when their social position was not under suspicion. Students who self-identified in the first class as gay, students

of color, or formerly homeless were more likely to push beyond questions of their own personal preference to discuss broader social implications of information issues. Isabell Lorey's work on precarity and governance sheds some light on our students' subject positions. Precarity, according to Lorey, "means living with the unforeseeable, with contingency."² Following the work of Judith Butler, Lorey argues that precariousness is an "existential state" shared by all people, but also separated or made unequal depending on the experiences being regulated (or dominated under the guise of state or corporate protection).³ This regulation occurs through legal, political, economic, and even consumer spheres, and through many apparatuses—for example, student loans, human resource rules, zoning laws, and social media. Because our precarity is not fixed throughout our life, our relative exposure to and experience with these systems necessarily changes our subject position over time. The challenge for us meant finding ways to help our students understand insecurities that they had yet to encounter. But we felt it was an important goal of the course to encourage all the students to adopt broader contextual critical thinking.

As we redeveloped the course, we also saw that our students lacked a sense of urgency about concepts like information overload, the "filter bubble" debate, piracy and intellectual property, or open access to scholarly information. We dropped information overload, the concept of the "filter bubble,"⁴ and piracy. Students in our first course viewed "information overload" as a normal condition with which one simply "copes," and they were unwilling to take up the ethical quandary of piracy, concluding that theft is wrong and "people shouldn't do it." We found that these concepts were better discussed in the context of larger problems, like the digital divide. In the second iteration of the course, we found that the students were more enthusiastic about examining "filter bubbles" in the context of intentional segments about news production, fake news, and social media. They found the "filter bubble" to be a convincing explanation of human behavior, but their assumptions shifted again when they considered the implications of "filter bubbles" for disenfranchised populations. Similarly, the second iteration of the course deemphasized academic publishing and open access. Instead, we raised issues of open access in the context of the digital divide and health informatics.

As white, middle class, cis women with advanced degrees and careers in academia, we knew we needed to be decentered in order to confront social

and political implications of various information problems and to accept our own role in those problems. “Decentering” is commonly described as a practice of considering another person or group’s subject position while remaining anchored in one’s own identity.⁵ Becoming decentered is not easy and we still consider ourselves learners in this area. We began to see that our students also needed to be decentered in order to fully grasp the social and political implications of these information problems and to actively consider solutions to the problems they discussed.

When we rewrote the course for 2017, we frontloaded the syllabus with readings and discussions that provided some shared vocabulary for the complex social systems of class, race, gender, and sexuality. In our early class discussions, we reinforced that we were going to ask students to acknowledge their own privileges and to question what role their positionality played throughout the semester.

Privilege and Positionality

In this discussion-based course, we observed that our students were enconced in several forms of privilege that may have been obstacles to considering information in the contexts we posed. As students enrolled at a university, they each possessed (though did not necessarily acknowledge) status that afforded them access to sophisticated infrastructure (like high-speed internet access on campus) and equipment they either owned or borrowed from the university and viewed as essential for educational and personal purposes. When considering problems like the digital divide or privacy, class discussions were often stymied by a reluctance to consider the experience of individuals who lack access to these tools. In discussions of internet access, students often commented on the relatively low price of mobile phone service, citing their own bills as evidence of the ease of accessing the internet from anywhere. Further, when grappling with information problems, our students often relied on the broad concept of “education” as a solution to a problem like privacy, drawing on democratic notions of public education as a solution to most social ills.

University students also operate in a space in which expertise is abundant and, theoretically, valued. Instructors are positioned as experts, and depending on pedagogical orientation and general approachability, students may be aware that they can ask an instructor a question with relative-

ly low social, emotional, intellectual, or even financial risk. Our course was also offered through our institution's honors program. "Honors" programs often magnify student privilege by offering smaller class sizes, additional advising, and other enrichment opportunities through which students may develop relationships with faculty. In research meditation exercises, students frequently approached the question of "how would you learn more about this topic?" by saying they would ask a professor who might know more. As students engaged with the idea of "filter bubbles," they argued that filter bubbles were not inevitable because information from experts is widely available to people who "take initiative" to conduct research.

White privilege, cis privilege, and socioeconomic status each factored into our students' analysis of the information problems set forth in the first course. Assigned readings, media, and discussion about information problems experienced by non-Western people, by people of color, or by women were frequently met with complacency or resignation.

As we designed the second iteration of the course, we chose readings that strengthened the critical underpinnings of the course. The first readings of the semester were Lynn Weber's "Defining Contested Concepts"⁶ and Dill and Zambrana's "Thinking about Inequality."⁷ Weber's article introduced some students to the concept of intersectionality, a framework for talking about ways that power over ideological, political, and economic domains shapes the experiences of both dominant and oppressed groups. We paired these readings with an activity in which students considered how people experiencing poverty are characterized in public discourse and considering the "controlling images" associated with poverty.⁸ In thinking about who has the power to define or characterize poverty or "the poor," students discussed the emergence of the term "welfare queen" and its historic uses by politicians and the media, including former President Ronald Reagan.⁹ This was an intense introductory exercise; one student said, "This is hard to talk about because I don't like to be mean." She indicated that repeating the epithet "welfare queen" or discussing known stereotypes of the poor felt like inflicting injury, even if to an imagined party and under the auspices of critical analysis. However, the discussion established an early expectation that one's own personal experience or observation is insufficient as an answer to most complex questions. Later in the semester, students examined several case studies of "fake news," learning about an author of a false article about people using food assistance to purchase

marijuana in Colorado.¹⁰ In discussing the viral mechanisms of this article, students were quick to connect this viral fake news to popular narratives about women and families who live in poverty, like the “welfare queen.” They recognized that repetition of “controlling images” lent credibility to the fake news article.

We then examined the concept of redlining as a case study, considering it as an information problem in addition to its legal and economic implications. Students learned about the concept of “digital redlining” when they read a *Vox* article called “How the internet keeps poor people in poor neighborhoods,”¹¹ which explored the consequences of advertisers targeting and excluding customers based on race. To place digital redlining into a larger context, we also read the Pulitzer Prize-winning series from the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, “The color of money: Home mortgage lending practices discriminate against blacks.”¹² “Redlining” is a generic term first used for the practice of denying mortgage financing for property in “high risk” areas. Beginning in the 1930s, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), the Home Owners’ Loan Corporation, private mortgage lenders, insurers, and real estate agents, applied risk ratings to specific neighborhoods; these ratings prevented potential home buyers from obtaining financing and credit guarantees in “redlined” areas, compounding and perpetuating long-standing residential segregation. The presence of African American residents was a pretext for redlining.¹³ Redlining turned out to be an ideal “information problem.” Because few if any of our students had purchased real estate or sought a mortgage, they were able to examine this problem without reference to their own experience. While most of our students stated that their families lived in homes they owned, few if any had been involved in a real estate or financial transaction, or even rented a home independently, making it difficult to put their own experience front and center in the conversation about redlining. Instead, they considered examples from the text with a sense of discovery. Students examined how restricting the flow of information—in this case, the lending and insurance criteria used to issue financing to individual borrowers—can have a clear and deleterious effect on a whole group of people. Black homeowners and prospective home buyers’ financial choices were either circumscribed or completely cut off by a set of rules intended to keep them literally in place, unable to change neighborhoods. Financial institutions and federal agencies were not obliged to disclose the elements of their rating systems, and

the longer those systems remained in place, the more their criteria became encoded in practice than documented as procedure. The case of redlining also illustrated implicit, unwritten, coordination among both cities and industries. While some students may have heard of the concept of institutional racism, redlining exposed a case of institutional racism and they were able to articulate both its obviousness and its invisibility. We talked about how many of us grew up believing that segregated neighborhoods just happened that way—they seemed natural and inherent. But the *Journal-Constitution* series about redlining demonstrated that neighborhood composition is policed and maintained by institutions whose practices reaffirm discrimination in a systemic and almost undetectable way. Comparing the historical case of redlining with the “digital redlining” concept introduced in the more contemporary *Vox* piece, students pinpointed institutional racism in tools that they had previously perceived as “neutral.”

Although our changed approach and new content helped students to confront positionality, we often saw them retreat to the comfort of their own lived experience or to convenient generalizations based on personal relationships. The November 2016 presidential election immediately preceded the second iteration of this course. As a result, we planned a substantial segment on the topic of “fake news.” Although we expected students to feel fatigued by the election, we felt that ignoring the fake news phenomenon would be a missed opportunity. In order to examine fake news, we also felt we needed to integrate an intentional discussion of social media as both a tool for dissemination and as a creator of media content. In discussions of Pew Research Center studies about news consumption,¹⁴ students saw themselves in the demographics of people who receive news and information through social media. They compared their own practices with parents, grandparents, teachers, and other “older” adults. They were reluctant to draw conclusions about the socioeconomic status of news consumers, though Pew data demonstrate that education and income are strong factors in social media practices and news consumption. In applying a generational lens to the discussion of fake news, our students returned to an analysis reliant on lived experiences and the practices of people they know. To move the class out of this familiar cycle, we turned fake news into a problem-solving activity in which groups of students developed solutions to fake news based on reading and research. In a jigsaw activity, students were divided into five groups, each of which evaluated

one proposed “solution” to fake news. The groups were then reconstituted, and each student was responsible for teaching their new group members about the “solution” their previous group had considered. The new groups then developed their own proposed solutions to fake news, typically taking a hybrid approach reliant on public policy, corporate responsibility, and individual initiative to learn.

In our courses, we try to create low-stakes opportunities for students to initiate the process of inquiry and confront the limitations of their own knowledge. We ask students to complete “research meditations” in which they select and interrogate a news article, deciding what interests them about the topic, what questions the article raises, and how they might go about answering the questions they identify. Adding an element of peer review, students read and comment on each other’s meditations, offering additional questions and supplying alternative plans for discovery. For some research meditations, students selected articles linked to their interests or majors. Students who selected topics that were unfamiliar to them, such as anti-Semitism after the presidential election or the lack of due process for ICE detainees, often displayed a predictable naiveté, but they also went on to identify what they needed to know in order to critically and thoughtfully engage with the issue before them. These meditations often seemed less sophisticated than those by their peers who had written about subjects more familiar to them, but the students were performing an important task: recognizing and inventorying what they didn’t know. When students lacked background knowledge, their research meditations featured explicitly personal statements about the limitations of their own understanding. Their rhetorical gestures signaled an important step in bridging the gap between their uninformed but often empathetic reading of the articles they were meditating, and through the power of peer review, these gestures began to appear even with topics that were more comfortably familiar. This seemed to us like a variation on decentering. Instead of evaluating their topics based on their own limited experience and the information in their short article, they acknowledged that the answers lay outside them.

The Limits of “Individualization of Responsibility”

In general, our students preferred personal or consumer-level solutions to

problems like fake news or privacy over collective or social ones. Examples in the first iteration of our class, from “manifestos” they wrote, emphasized the responsibility of the individual to be informed, to exert control over personal information they share in public or quasi-public spaces, to read and follow terms and conditions, and to trust scientific evidence. There are two main reasons for this tendency: our current social and cultural emphasis on individual choice and the relative inexperience students have with the processes of enacting policy at local, national, and international levels.

Michael Maniates, a social scientist specializing in environmental studies, offers an important critique of the current emphasis on individual consumer choice as the site of “serious work,” in which saving the environment falls prey to the “individualization of responsibility.” For Maniates, the focus on individual action, such as pondering energy efficient stickers on new appliances, shifts attention away from developing systemic or institutional responses. The emphasis on individual consumer action keeps us busy, he says, and keeps us from imagining ourselves “as citizens who might come together and develop political muscle sufficient to alter institutional arrangements that drive a pervasive consumerism.”¹⁵ This critique plays out in other areas, too, like health, food, education, and security. In 2017, Facebook came out with a “tool” for “How to Spot Fake News.”¹⁶ Displayed at the top of every user’s newsfeed, the banner linked to a ten-item checklist asking users to do such things as “consider the photos” and “inspect the dates.” Facebook, as a corporation, had been wrestling with various solutions to the fake news problem since stories started breaking in the fall of 2016. And while the checklist is ostensibly only part of their response to the problem, it was a good example for our students of how even institutions, such as corporations and governments, often also deploy solutions that rely on individual rather than collective actions.

In both semesters, when students did consider a collective or institutional response to the problems we discussed, their ideas were more gestures than articulated plans. For example, when considering the digital divide, one student called for “some program” to bridge the gap between those with the access and know-how to use technology and those without. Another student called for more computers in schools, while yet a third called for the “redistribution” of technology. Similarly, when addressing the issue of privacy, one student suggested that it was Congress’s responsibility to protect our privacy without articulating how. Our students strug-

gle to imagine these broader institutional solutions can be at least in part attributed to a lack of familiarity with the processes of creating and implementing policies, laws, and other forms of social change. Their faith in institutions like the government and major corporations is more based on the systems that underpin them—democracy or the marketplace—than it is on their understanding of those systems.

During the second iteration of our course, while we did not see a shift from solutions that invoked individual responsibility over collective responses, we did notice that our students were more critical of the “individualization of responsibility.” They recognized that the success of the individual in navigating the problems posed by an information-oriented society was predicated on privileges and resources not available to all, including education, time available, income, and what students referred to as the “level playing field.” Students seemed to recognize by the end of the course that solutions relying on individual choice were uneven and incomplete, at best, and discriminatory, at worst.

But our students’ faith in individual responsibility was never as apparent as when discussing harassment and the internet. With the expectation that recent high school graduates would be steeped in anti-bullying messaging, we introduced Adriane LaFrance’s “When Will the Internet Be Safe for Women?”¹⁷ LaFrance’s perspective on the issue both heightens the reader’s awareness of internet harassment as a personal safety issue and places harassment in contexts far outside of adolescent social situations. Our students expressed strong feelings and even disgust about the challenges of prosecuting internet harassment. Students were clearly moved by powerful individual stories of harassment, including stalking. However, they struggled to think beyond their own experiences with internet use when trying to identify solutions to the problem. One student expressed sympathy for victims of harassment and suggested they consider “leaving Facebook” or limiting personal conversations to applications like Signal or SnapChat because they are “not as public.” A prevalent assumption here is that all internet users access the internet in the same way, using similar devices, and at relatively the same cost.

Our students argued that companies like Facebook and Twitter have a vested interest in maintaining user safety because consumers would abandon a service if they perceived it to be unsafe. Barring an exit from the service, students also suggested that victims look to the terms and condi-

tions of internet services and attempt to report, ban, or otherwise block harassers from contacting them through internet platforms. From this perspective, harassment seems like an easily regulated problem because it is “against the rules.” Key to this view of corporate responsibility, besides a belief in the efficacy of competition to weed out the bad apples, was a notion of the internet as a “work in progress.” Later in the course, we would read “Missed Connections: What search engines say about women,”¹⁸ in which Safiya Noble identified the way purportedly neutral algorithms do not operate neutrally at all, but actually distort the representation of many results, primarily weighted by advertising dollars. In her famous example, the query “black girls” returned a bevy of pornographic sites. In class, we watched Noble discuss the evolving result set of this query¹⁹—which began to include links like “Black girls RUN” and “Black girls code”—and Google’s responses to Noble’s research. Rather than raise suspicion about the nature of search results for other queries, our students saw this example as a sign that the neutrality of Google’s algorithm was a work in progress.

While these solutions sound like common sense approaches, they put considerable faith in the privacy mechanisms established by companies like Facebook, which the students were aware commodifies every member for the purpose of advertising revenue while rhetorically positioning itself as balancing members’ needs for privacy and connection. Students acknowledged that extricating oneself from social media and other internet services can be difficult, and they also expressed that they didn’t want to leave these products and services, which they used for personal and educational purposes. However, our students struggled to acknowledge that the “personal responsibility” argument obliges the victim to avoid inevitable harassment.

Our students’ faith in terms and conditions was shaken later in the semester when they read Bruce Schneier’s *Data and Goliath: The Hidden Battles to Collect Your Data and Control Your World*.²⁰ We chose to assign *Data and Goliath* in the second iteration of the course because we found that students in our first course were blasé about privacy and surveillance, consistently arguing that surveillance is not a problem if one has “nothing to hide.” Thinking about internet harassment primed students for *Data and Goliath*, bringing into focus problems that an individual may have when interacting with others on the internet. Moving beyond the experience of the individual, Schneier’s book introduced systematic surveillance con-

ducted by institutions. In contrast to internet harassment, a problem with which none of our students identified, Schneier's book quickly revealed that internet use amounts to relinquishing elements of personal privacy.

While our students indicated they had been "somewhat aware" of the privacy protections they forgo when they opt into many internet services, they were surprised that they had "agreed" to submitting so much personal information to so many companies. While our students did not possess a great deal of personal financial experience, they reported they would protect their financial information zealously after reading Schneier's book. Harkening back to previous discussions about Facebook and "digital redlining," some students realized that some consumers may have more difficulty both separating their financial and personal interests from the internet, for reasons including cost, mandates from employers, and certainly convenience. Further, some financial products and services may afford consumers different protections depending on personal information like credit history, account type, location, and even education or marital status.

Schneier's work inspired suspicion on the part of some students, who began to consider the surveillance practices beyond the commercial space—for example, the university at which they are enrolled as well as institutions to which they had applied for admission. For a classroom activity, one student researched the data retention and disclosure policies of several universities, finding that many institutions are not transparent about the extent to which they protect student data and information. This example raised a tension between students' desire to complete a baccalaureate degree and the desire to protect one's personal data. Students acknowledged that they had probably signed release forms that entitled the university to collect their personal data, for example, when they swiped their ID cards at dining services or when they logged into the campus courseware system, D2L. However, they questioned whether they had truly consented or whether they were being coerced because those are essential methods of participating in the campus community—and often services for which they had paid. Our students began to see themselves as commodified not just by companies but by institutions, fearing that the entities to which they had submitted information did not have their safety in mind.

As the students considered the implications of *Data and Goliath* for their own lived experience, some began to recognize the impossibility of consent from everyone. For example, they drew connections between sur-

veillance and their own privilege, articulating that some people are subject to more surveillance by the government, corporations, or other institutions, acknowledging that these experiences are not benign for all people and can even be life-threatening. This investigation of privacy and surveillance advanced our students' understanding of a complex information issue. As first-year college students, our students were making a large developmental leap. Our primary goal was to help students consider contemporary information problems from a perspective other than their own and to consider the risks of being complacent.

Conclusion

As we developed this course, we identified the need to contextualize information problems and push students beyond shrugging their shoulders and positing observations from a relatively privileged position. Our students were most successful at critically examining the challenges of living in an information society when discussions were tied to specific case studies or when we asked them to interrogate or defend positions or solutions that were not their own. This makes intuitive sense: we know from reading fiction that it is the details, the thoughts, and feelings that allow us to identify with characters that are not ourselves. The more our students could envision the contexts and constraints of the problems we presented, the better they could imagine themselves confronting those problems. Pairing theoretical concepts like “controlling images” with discussion of public portrayals of poverty helped the first- and second-year students in our courses to grapple with the unfamiliar. When we revise this course further or incorporate some of the lessons into other future credit classes, we will include even more fully contextualized examples. Finding case studies or examples that are both authentic and adequately fleshed once seemed like a challenge. The theoretical or analytic texts we assigned frequently contained brief examples, but it was other sources, like long-form newspaper reportage, documentary film, actual case studies from the Society for Professional Journalists, and even our personal anecdotes that students found most compelling. Now that we know to look for cases that challenge our own subject positions, we find potentially engaging material everywhere.

Endnotes

1. Hassan Baig, “Peering into the Minds of the 4.3 Billion Unconnected,” *TechCrunch*, November 29, 2014, <https://techcrunch.com/2014/11/29/peering-into-the-minds-of-the-4-3-billion-unconnected/>.
2. Isabell Lorey, *State of Insecurity: Government of the Precarious*, trans. Aileen Derieg (London: Verso, 2015), 1–15.
3. Lorey, *State of Insecurity*, 17–22.
4. Eli Pariser, *The Filter Bubble: How the New Personalized Web Is Changing What We Read and How We Think* (New York: Penguin, 2012).
5. Amit Bernstein et al., “Decentering and Related Constructs: A Critical Review and Metacognitive Processes Model,” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10, no. 5 (2015): 599, <https://doi-org/10.1177/1745691615594577>.
6. Lynn Weber, “Defining Contested Concepts,” in *Race, Gender, Sexuality & Social Class: Dimension of Inequality*, ed. Susan J. Ferguson (Los Angeles: Sage, 2012), 7–19.
7. Thornton Dill and Ruth Enid Zambrana, “Critical Thinking about Inequality: An Emerging Lens,” in *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice*, eds. Bonnie Thornton Dill and Ruth Enid Zambrana (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2009), 1–21.
8. Weber. “Defining Contested Concepts,” 15.
9. An artifact that marks the emergence of the term “welfare queen” is: New York Times, “‘Welfare queen’ becomes issue in Reagan campaign,” *New York Times*, February 15, 1976, 51.
10. Laura Sydell, “We Tracked Down a Fake-News Creator in the Suburbs. Here’s What We Learned,” *All Things Considered*, November 23, 2016, <https://www.npr.org/sections/alltechconsidered/2016/11/23/503146770/npr-finds-the-head-of-a-covert-fake-news-operation-in-the-suburbs>.
11. Alvin Chang, “How the internet keeps poor people in poor neighborhoods,” *Vox*, December 12, 2016, <https://www.vox.com/2016/12/12/13867692/poor-neighborhoods-targeted-ads-internet-cartoon>.
12. Bill Dedman, “The Color of Money: Home Mortgage Lending Practices Discriminate Against Blacks,” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, May 1–4, 1988, <http://powerreporting.com/color/>.
13. For additional history about redlining, see: Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Ta-Nehisi Coats, “The Case for Reparations,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, May 21, 2014, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/06/the-case-for-reparations/361631/>; and Mark Pearcy. “‘Redlining’: Teaching About Racial Residential Segregation,” *Virginia Social Science Journal* 50 (2015).

14. Amy Mitchell et al., “The Modern News Consumer: News Attitudes and Practices in the Digital Era,” Pew Research Center, <http://www.journalism.org/2016/07/07/pathways-to-news>.
15. Michael Maniates, “Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?,” *Global Environmental Politics* 1, no. 3 (2001): 31–52, doi:10.1162/152638001316881395.
16. “Tips to Spot False News,” Facebook, accessed June 28, 2017, <https://www.facebook.com/help/188118808357379>.
17. Adrienne LaFrance, “When Will the Internet Be Safe for Women? The fight to make law enforcement take online threats seriously,” *The Atlantic*, May 20, 2016, <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/05/when-will-the-internet-be-safe-for-women/483473/>.
18. Safiya Umoja Noble, “Missed Connections: What Search Engines Say About Women,” *Bitch* no. 54 (Spring, 2012): 36–41.
19. Safiya Umoja Noble, “Social influences on technology,” filmed April 6, 2014 at TedxUIUC, Champaign, IL, video, 16:48, <https://youtu.be/UXuJ8yQf6dI>.
20. Bruce Schneier, *Data and Goliath: The Hidden Battles to Collect Your Data and Control Your World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2015), 1–425.

Bibliography

- Baig, Hassan. “Peering into the Minds of the 4.3 Billion Unconnected.” *TechCrunch*, November 29, 2014. Accessed June 27, 2017. <https://techcrunch.com/2014/11/29/peering-into-the-minds-of-the-4-3-billion-unconnected/>.
- Bernstein, Amit, et al. “Decentering and Related Constructs: A Critical Review and Metacognitive Processes Model.” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10 (2015): 599.
- Chang, Alvin. “How the internet keeps poor people in poor neighborhoods.” *Vox*, December 12, 2016. Accessed January 17, 2017. <https://www.vox.com/2016/12/12/13867692/poor-neighborhoods-targeted-ads-internet-cartoon>.
- Dedman, Bill. “The Color of Money: Home Mortgage Lending Practices Discriminate Against Blacks.” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, May 1–4, 1988. Accessed June 27, 2017. <http://powerreporting.com/color/>.
- Dill, Bonnie Thornton, and Ruth Enid Zambrana. “Critical Thinking about Inequality: An Emerging Lens.” In *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice*, edited by Bonnie Thornton Dill and Ruth Enid Zambrana, 1–21. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2009.
- Facebook. “Tips to Spot False News.” Facebook, n.d. Accessed June 28, 2017. <https://www.facebook.com/help/188118808357379>.

- LaFrance, Adrienne. "When Will the Internet Be Safe for Women? The fight to make law enforcement take online threats seriously." *The Atlantic*, May 20, 2016. Accessed June 28, 2017. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/05/when-will-the-internet-be-safe-for-women/483473/>.
- Lorey, Isabell. *State of Insecurity: Government of the Precarious*. Translated by Aileen Derieg. London: Verso, 2015.
- Maniates, Michael. "Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?" *Global Environmental Politics* 1, no. 3 (2001): 31–52. Accessed June 27, 2017.
- Mitchell, Amy, Jeffrey Gottfried, Michael Barthel, and Elisa Shearer. "The Modern News Consumer: New Attitudes and Practices in the Digital Era." Accessed June 28, 2017. <http://www.journalism.org/2016/07/07/pathways-to-news/>.
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. "Missed Connections: What Search Engines Say About Women." *Bitch*, Spring 2012.
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. "Social Influences on Technology." Filmed April 2014 at Tedx-UIUC, Champaign, IL. Video, 16:48. <https://youtu.be/UXuJ8yQf6dI>.
- Schneier, Bruce. *Data and Goliath: The Hidden Battles to Collect Your Data and Control Your World*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2015.
- Sydell, Laura. "We Tracked Down a Fake-News Creator in the Suburbs. Here's What We Learned." *All Things Considered*. November 23, 2016. Accessed June 27, 2017. <http://www.npr.org/sections/alltechconsidered/2016/11/23/503146770/npr-finds-the-head-of-a-covert-fake-news-operation-in-the-suburbs>.
- Weber, Lynn. "Defining Contested Concepts." In *Race, Gender, Sexuality & Social Class: Dimension of Inequality*, edited by Susan J. Ferguson, 7–19. Los Angeles: Sage, 2012.

