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ABSTRACT
This paper establishes a need for software agents in an Information Age where even competent computer users suffer information overload. The social consequences of agent use is examined, that to this time have not been adequately addressed by developers or governing bodies. Thus, there is a need for the establishment of a universally accepted, effective code of ethical agent practice in order to avoid agent misuse and threats to individual privacy. Consequently the code would protect users and ensure the future of the technology itself, as people become increasingly informed and suspicious of these intrusions such as spyware agents. The author proposes an Agent Ethical Code of Conduct, noting the possible future developments of such a Code should further research be undertaken in this area.

INTRODUCTION TO AGENT TECHNOLOGY: ESTABLISHING A NEED FOR AUTONOMY
The Internet, the most complete representation of information in western society, has fundamentally changed the way society utilises and interacts with computers. Business and individuals find themselves in transition to a networked, information society. The continued digitisation of content and networking of business and private computer users forms the basis of this information society where the computer is becoming increasingly ubiquitous now we are all connected through electronic networks. Consequently, the amount of data and software applications is continually increasing and growing in complexity. Users now have an abundance of information at their fingertips, yet the consequential diversity and complexity of how this data is represented can overwhelm even competent computer users finding it difficult to productively search through the abundance of information to find relevant material.

Western society’s current technology related dilemma seems to be ‘information overload’ and the resulting stress and orientation loss. Thus, there is a need for assistance in this highly complex, digital environment from autonomous software agents where new methods of information dissemination and filtering are required to manage this overload of information. However, due to agents’ autonomous nature, there are potential hazards with their use. Because of this, agent developments must involve not only attention to technical details, but also to the ethical concerns relating to their resulting impact. In the excitement of new and emergent technology such as agents, Information Technology (IT) developers often forget to examine the impact new technology will have on users. In fact the social dimension of all technology is the driving force and the most important consideration of technology itself (Rieder, 2003).

This paper encompasses analysis of the technical aspects of agent development evolving from fields of computer science, together with ethical issues deriving from the humanities and social science fields of IT. The technical analysis of agent software is necessary to form a basis for critical evaluation of the social ramifications of agent implementation, determining whether agents are a viable solution to the well documented problems of information overload, along with how current agent development techniques will affect the way users interact with computers in the future.

EVOLUTION OF AGENT TECHNOLOGY: CURRENT APPLICATION OF AGENTS
Software agents are one of the fastest growing areas of information technology, however, they are not a new idea. They are developments stemming from research in artificial intelligence (AI) which flourished in the 1980’s and 1990’s. AI is a field of computer science and engineering concerned with the computational understanding of what is commonly called ‘intelligent’ behaviour. To this extent, software agents are currently being developed with the expectation they will one day possess the same level of intelligence as humans, to actively learn from and assist computer users. However, to this point researchers have not been successful in creating an ‘intelligent’ agent, as they still do not know exactly how the human brain functions, yet many authors still wrongly label this category of software as intelligent agents. It is also inappropriate to regard agents as intelligent as measuring and defining intelligence is considered especially subjective due to our own expectations, therefore it is almost impossible to label software as ‘intelligent’. Bradshaw’s (1997, p.16) argument that “one person’s ‘intelligent agent’ is another person’s ‘smart object’; and today’s ‘smart object’ is tomorrow’s ‘dumb program’” emphasises this subjectivity where intelligence is only reflected by the activity or role that it plays in assisting users. Without a direct application or use, software intelligence is meaningless.

To date the only software agents in operation use pattern recognition algorithms to assist people performing routine, or personal tasks. These agents can be seen in operation through such electronic commerce sites as amazon.com or Barnes & Noble’s online bookstores (http://www.bn.com) where user demographics are analysed to give personalised service to users. Pattern recognition agents are also used for e-mail prioritisation, in education and also to aid Internet users in searching for information such as news articles. Microsoft has recently (July, 2004) launched an agent-based news filtering application they call ‘Newsbot’. The agent scours 4,800 news outlets to find the most relevant news headlines that would be of interest to the user (AustralianIT, 2004a). From these applications the author identifies that there is a fundamental difference between software agents currently used over the Internet, compared to the agents which are being developed to replicate human intelligence.

SOFTWARE AGENT CHARACTERISTICS: APPLYING A UNIVERSAL DEFINITION
It has not yet been possible to agree on a universally acknowledged, comprehensive definition of a software agent, as their developments are influenced by criteria from various research fields, notably artificial intelligence and information communications. Ultimately the name ‘agent’ is an umbrella term which covers many different applications. Other aliases often utilised include personal assistant agents, autonomous agents, information agents, intelligents, chatterbots, databases, knowbots, softbots, userbots, taskbots, personal assistants, avatars, personal agents and network agents. The reason these different labels exist is that agents promise such diverse applications and therefore authors have been hesitant to restrict research by applying a universal
definition. At present, there is every indication that there are more
definitions than there are working examples of systems that are said to
be agent-based. With no definitive description, Wooldridge and Jennings
(1995) fear agents are in danger of becoming a simple buzz term for new
software applications, due to the term’s overuse.

For the purposes of this paper, the author has constructed the following
definition derived from descriptions given by several researchers. It is
broadly recognised that agents are interactive entities that exist as part
of an environment shared by other agents. They are conceptual entities
that are autonomous, operating without direct intervention of humans
or others (Russel, 1995) in a proactive or reactive manner (Wooldridge
& Jennings, 1995) in pursuit of one or more objectives (Jennings et al.,
1996), within an environment where other agents exist and interact with
each other (Shoham, 1997) based on shared knowledge of communica-
tion and representation (Finin, Labrou & Mayfield, 1997). When a new
task is delegated by the user, an agent should determine precisely what
its goal is, evaluate how the goal can be reached in an effective manner,
and perform the necessary actions by learning from past experience and
responding to unforeseen situations with its adaptive and continuous
reasoning strategies. It is important to add to this definition that agents
are not self-motivating and therefore are restricted to operate on behalf
of users.

SOCIAL & ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS: PLACING OUR
TRUST IN AGENTS, AND THEIR DEVELOPERS

From a philosophical point of view, technology itself is created by
human beings, for human beings, thus any implementation should
contribute to improving society’s quality of life. However, the wide-
spread implementation of agent software raises a number of issues that
have clear ethical, even moral dimensions, including the balance between
autonomy and control, as well as questions relating to trust, responsi-
bility and privacy. While the value of agents performing certain tasks
is undeniable, this utility perhaps comes at a certain cost that users may
or may not consider acceptable. With agents acting on behalf of the user,
many questions are raised as to whether the agent will always act in the
correct manner in accordance with the user’s objectives. These issues
(outlined below) need to be addressed if agents are to have a beneficial
contribution towards our networked, digital society.

Agent Trust
User-agent trust must be built through the user’s confidence with using
the technology. Agents are useful only to the degree which users can trust
them to perform a task autonomously, without repeated, direct instruc-
tion and constant supervision. It is imperative users understand that in
delegating tasks to an agent, as the metaphor suggests, the agent may
not perform the tasks exactly the same way the user would have
completed it, had they accomplished the task themselves. Also, the user
must understand that an agent might at different points in time react
differently in an identical situation. Trust between the agent and the user
is an evolving state that should grow gradually as agents demonstrate
themselves to be more capable (just as with people). Developers must
also respect individual user differences and capabilities when creating
agents, as acceptance rates will vary between users.

Delegation of Control
Trust and control are interrelated issues, in extending trust to an agent
the user will be willing to give up some amount of control. What is
important is that control not be taken from users involuntarily. The
delegation of control could thus make the user feel intimidated by their
computer as it starts making decisions on their behalf. Loeffler (1996)
notes that the unpredictability resulting from significant autonomy
might well result in agents who are less helpful to us than we might hope
or indeed expect. Further, Reider (2003) highlights that more than in
the case of any other technology before, the agent’s functioning
disappears into the black box, where their functions and motivations are
unknown. If the user does not know the structure of the agent - the
underlying algorithms, which are too complex for even an expert to
adequately evaluate - users are forced to place agents in a position of
authority, ultimately making them vulnerable to the agent’s actions.

Ethical Responsibility
With agents possessing the characteristic to act autonomously, there is
a distinct need to address the moral responsibilities of software agent
programmers, as their role in our online society becomes increasing
more important. Hypothetically, if an agent participates in a scheme
found to defraud or deceive, questions are certain to be raised as to
whether the issue of responsibility belongs to the developer of the agent,
or the user who may have configured the agent for the specific
application, or both. The agent developer or programmer is the easier
option to place blame, as they essentially created the agent’s framework
and features. They can decide what, if any, safeguards to include. Also,
they are in the best position to understand the problems the agent may
cause and have the most significant potential to minimise this harm
(Heckman & Wobbrock, 2000).

Currently, many programmers are developing agents that are not
generally in the best interests of society, yet they do not come under
any scrutiny predominantly due to the fact that computer programming
is not considered as a profession, consequently programmers are not held
to the same standards of liability that professionals are. The legal system
has been reluctant to give programming a professional status. In the Fair
Labour Standards Act of 1938 it states that programmers are analogous
to drafters in that both perform mechanical functions (Murch &
Johnson, 1999). The author believes that software programmers should
be considered professionals as they possess a technical skill that should
be used with great care and thought, therefore it would give them a higher
duty of care to sustain the purity of society. It seems inevitable that
outcomes resulting from agent decisions, which are out of user’s control,
prefers the speed for renewed examination, both of community, and
legal understandings of liability. At present, it comes down to a moral
obligation from the agent programmers to ensure that the agent-enabled
applications of tomorrow act in the best interests of our networked
information society.

Information Privacy
As previously described, users can delegate tasks, responsibilities, and
competence to agents. Therefore, agents may need to capture specific,
sensitive, personal data about their respective users so they can com-
plete a delegated task. To protect the privacy of the persons involved,
it is important that this personal data is used with care, that the
information collected is totally necessary and is captured for a legitimate
purpose. The user must also know that the data will not be disclosed to
other sources, and it is also imperative that personal data is not processed
without the knowledge of the persons concerned (Borking, Van Eck &
Sieler, 1999). The idea that agents could have access to personal records
and financial activities is disturbing to all computer users, no matter how
helpful the agents may be.

Computer Monitoring
Currently, there are several applications on the market that utilise agent
technology to enable users to monitor who is using their computer.
There are differing opinions about the ethics of this type of monitoring,
as an organisation could realistically monitor their employees’ actions,
which could be seen as a violation of employee privacy. Further, with
the recent introduction of spyware agents (programs unintentionally
downloaded onto a computer to monitor browsing habits, profiling
shopping preferences, collect keystroke and password information,
without the users knowledge) there is growing concern that agents will
be increasingly implemented by companies and individuals with mali-
cious, unethical intent.

To combat this, a privacy Standard, known as the Open Profiling
Standard (OPS) was developed by internet technology leaders, Netscape
and Microsoft among others, and was accepted by the World Wide Web

550 2005 IRMA International Conference
Copyright © 2005, Idea Group Inc. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of Idea Group Inc. is prohibited.
Elements of the Agent Ethical Code of Conduct (AECC)

- **Agent Disclosure** Once installed and operational, the agent software must present a simple, accessible, concise explanation of the software’s purpose, intent and use of the user’s information.

- **Vendor Interaction** Agent software developers can in no way interact with the user’s computer to gather information without notice or consent other than for the purpose of determining whether a user is an authorised user of the agent software, or to perform software updates.

- **No Unnecessary Information Gathering** No information other than what is required for achieving the purpose of the delegated task may be communicated. After collection, information may not be retargeted or reused for any other purposes other than those specified by the user.

- **Formal Online Privacy Statement** The developer of any agent technology must provide a comprehensive privacy statement, completely and clearly specifying all issues in regard to the ability of the agent to capture information and how that information will be used. This statement must detail the limitations of the agent along with the potential dangers of agent use (if any).

- **Pre-emptive Request for Consent** Agent entities must ask the user for permission to transmit sensitive data over the Internet to other agents or third-party organisations, specifying exactly what information is to be passed over the network.

- **Complete Control** Users must have complete control over the software agents installed on their computer and over the use of their Internet connection. Users must have the ability to remove agent software such as spyware from their systems for any reason and at any point in time. This would eliminate the current problems where users are unable to locate and delete invasive software agents from their computers.

- **Ability to Trace Steps** Users must be able to access the path taken by agents to complete their delegated task. This may include information retrieval techniques, or automated processes such as conducting financial transactions. The way agents operate cannot be perceived as a black box by users, therefore they must be able to see the methods used by their respective agent in order for them to gain trust in giving control to the agent to perform further tasks.

With continued research the AECC would ideally be further expanded and specialised to target specific aspects of agent development, particularly concerning spyware agents. Further expansion of this Code through contribution and review from IT experts, ethicists and consumer advocates would give this proposal further credibility ensuring it reflects the current digital climate. Ultimately, after rigorous review and approval from third parties including software developers themselves, the author intends to issue the Code to the W3 Consortium for consideration for inclusion to the P3P, possibly expanding upon, or replacing the Open Profiling Standard.

**CONCLUSION**

While agent technology has the potential to be useful, many fundamental problems, both technical and social or ethical, remain to be solved. It is imperative these issues be addressed so that computer users do not continue to be unsuspectingly exploited. This agent technology is designed to automate computer processes for users, making it easier to gather desired information, yet at present, with the introduction of spyware, it is making users extremely exposed and vulnerable as a networked, information society.

To combat the continued infiltration of spyware and other malicious agents, the author has proposed a new branch of applied computer ethics, in the form of an Agent Ethical Code of Conduct be employed which addresses the profound implications of the prospect of agents roaming our networks. The proposed Code reflects the motivations in agent design and attempts to combat many of the underlying ethical issues relating to agent application. Agent developers should evaluate the features of the agent applications in terms of user welfare, where users...
should be treated as an end and not as a means to profit or information. It is obvious that the technology has made significant progress but has much further to go before it should be accepted as a tool that improves the quality of people’s experiences when interacting with computers.
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