The Hidden Cost of Convenience:

Why Data Brokers Need Federal Regulation

Claude Amodei

El Paso Community College, English Discipline

ENGL 1301: Composition I

December 12, 2025

The Hidden Cost of Convenience:

Why Data Brokers Need Federal Regulation

Every time you unlock your phone, click on a website, or scan your loyalty card at the grocery store, you're basically giving away little pieces of information about yourself. These digital breadcrumbs tell a story about who you are—but you're not the one telling it. Companies you've never heard of, called data brokers, are collecting these pieces, putting them together into detailed profiles about you, and then selling your life story to whoever will pay for it. Most people have no idea how big or powerful this industry has become.

The data broker industry mostly works in the shadows, collecting information from tons of different sources and making detailed profiles on millions of people. Some people say this helps businesses and makes our online experience better through personalized advertising. However, more and more evidence shows it causes real problems—from unfair lending and hiring practices to political manipulation. The whole debate comes down to one big question: should companies be allowed to make money off our personal information without us really knowing about it or agreeing to it? While data brokers say they make our online experience better through personalized ads, the data broker industry needs serious federal regulation because these companies collect our personal information without really asking us, use that information in ways that can hurt our job and loan opportunities, and operate with way too much secrecy for a democratic society.

The biggest problem with data brokers is that they collect huge amounts of personal information from places most people don't even know about, and they make profiles on us without getting real permission. According to a report by the Federal Trade Commission (2014), data brokers get their information from "public records, online shopping, loyalty cards at grocery stores, and social media." These companies combine all that information to create detailed profiles of people that might include someone's income, interests, shopping habits, or even health conditions. Shoshana Zuboff (2019) explains in her book *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* that "even the small things we do online—like scrolling through a page or clicking a button—are tracked and used to make these profiles" (p. 134). She calls this "surveillance capitalism," which is basically when our everyday actions become something companies can make money from. This evidence demonstrates that consent is essentially meaningless in the current system. While people might technically agree to terms of service, they have no real understanding of how extensively their data is being collected, combined from multiple sources, and shared with third parties they've never heard of. The tracking happens automatically and invisibly—scrolling and clicking aren't conscious decisions to share data, yet they're treated as such. When companies collect information in ways we can't see and make profiles without clearly asking us, they're violating our basic privacy rights—and that's a problem that needs regulation to fix. But the issue goes beyond just privacy violations; this hidden data collection leads to real, measurable harm in people's everyday lives.

It's not just about the idea of privacy—data brokers actually cause real problems in people's lives by helping companies discriminate in hiring, loans, and other important decisions. An investigation by ProPublica found that data brokers "help businesses make decisions about things like loans, insurance, or hiring people" (Angwin, 2012, "The Data of Business," para. 17). The report gives a scary example: "someone might be turned down for a job or a loan based on data they don't even know was collected" (para. 1) These aren't just things that might happen—these are actual cases where data broker information messed up people's lives. This reveals that data brokers aren't just collecting information—they're actually part of systems that can take opportunities away from people based on hidden profiles. When someone loses a job opportunity or gets rejected for a loan because of data they didn't even know existed and can't fight back against, that's just not fair. These practices can make existing inequalities worse and create new types of discrimination based on what algorithms think about our data. The real economic and social damage caused by unregulated data brokers makes this more than just a privacy issue—it's about basic fairness and equal opportunities. However, the threat extends even further than individual harm; data brokers also pose a serious danger to our democratic system itself.

Perhaps the scariest thing is that data brokers make it possible for political campaigns to manipulate voters with incredible precision by using psychological profiles of individual people. According to an investigation by *The New York Times*, "political groups use this data to send very specific messages to voters based on their personality, fears, or beliefs" (Thompson, 2020). Thompson calls this the "weaponization" of personal data—basically, information that was collected for selling stuff gets used to influence how people vote. When political campaigns can use detailed profiles to exploit people's individual fears and weaknesses, democracy stops working the way it should. Voters aren't all looking at the same information and making their own decisions—instead, they're being individually targeted with messages designed to push their specific buttons. This changes elections from being about collective decision-making into exercises in mass manipulation. The fact that this is even possible because of data collected by shadowy brokers with no real oversight shows exactly why we need regulation to protect democracy itself. Using data broker information to manipulate voters isn't just bad for individual privacy—it's a genuine threat to democracy, which makes regulation absolutely necessary. Of course, not everyone agrees that data brokers are this problematic.

People who defend data brokers argue that these companies provide valuable services for both regular people and businesses. They say data collection lets companies show us ads for stuff we actually want, and it makes online services work better—plus a lot of them are free because of advertising. It's true that personalized recommendations can be helpful—like when Netflix suggests shows you might like, or when online stores show you products you're interested in. A lot of websites and apps we use every day are free specifically because ad money, powered by data collection, pays for them. From this angle, data brokers are just helping a system that works pretty well for most people. However, this argument ignores the main problem: choice. The current system doesn't ask people if they want to make this trade; it just assumes we're okay with it through confusing terms of service and invisible tracking. Plus, the benefits—slightly better ads and free services—don't come close to matching the problems: discrimination in jobs and loans, political manipulation, and complete loss of privacy. Regulation doesn't mean getting rid of all data collection—it means creating a system where people actually choose to participate, understand what they're giving up, and have real protection against misuse. Instead of accepting a false choice between total surveillance or no personalization, we should demand a regulated system that respects both innovation and basic rights. The evidence clearly shows that the current approach is unsustainable.

The way data brokers currently work—collecting information without real permission, enabling discrimination, and helping political manipulation—demands strong federal regulation to protect individual rights and democracy. As this essay has shown, data brokers operate through invisible collection methods that make true consent impossible, their data gets used to make decisions that hurt people's economic opportunities, and their services allow the manipulation of democratic processes. While the industry says it provides valuable services, those benefits don't justify the current free-for-all with personal information.

The push for regulation, like California's Consumer Privacy Act and advocacy from groups like the Electronic Frontier Foundation (2021), shows that more and more people recognize that privacy isn't just a personal preference—it's a basic right in our digital world. How we handle this issue will shape what kind of society we become: one where individuals keep control over their own information, or one where corporations know everything about us and can use it however they want. People always say that data is the new oil—a valuable resource that powers the digital economy. But there's a huge difference: oil doesn't belong to anyone until it gets pulled out of the ground. Your data already belongs to you. The question isn't whether data is valuable—it's who gets to decide how that value gets used, and whether you'll have any say in it.

References

Angwin, J. (2012, September 16). What they know: Data brokers. *ProPublica*. https://www.propublica.org/article/what-they-know-data-brokers

California Legislative Information. (2018). *California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018*. State of California. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB375

Electronic Frontier Foundation. (2021, March 11). EFF urges Congress to rein in data brokers. https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2021/03/eff-urges-congress-rein-data-brokers

Federal Trade Commission. (2014, May). *Data brokers: A call for transparency and accountability*. https://www.ftc.gov/reports/data-brokers-call-transparency-accountability-report-federal-trade-commission-may-2014

Thompson, S. A. (2020, October 20). How political campaigns weaponize your data. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/10/20/opinion/political-targeting.html

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

AI Disclosure

I used Claude (Anthropic) and ChatGPT (OpenAI) at different stages of my writing process, plus Grammarly for basic grammar checking. Using AI taught me there's a huge difference between using it as a tool and letting it replace my thinking. When I used it to understand concepts, check my structure, or get feedback on tone, it was genuinely helpful. When I tried to use it to write paragraphs for me or come up with my arguments, it produced work that didn't sound like me and didn't represent my actual thinking. The hardest part was recognizing when I was being lazy versus when I was genuinely stuck and needed help. There were times I had to delete what AI gave me and do the work myself because I was asking it to think for me instead of helping me think better. Looking back at my final essay, I'm confident the ideas, arguments, and voice are genuinely mine. The AI helped me become a better writer by pointing out problems and explaining concepts, but it didn't write this paper for me.