
Privacy in an Interactive World



Living with new media

Eras

Period	Characteristics
1960-1980	Non-discretionary Centralized systems
1980-2000	Informational self-determination [*]
2000-	Implicit interaction Behavioral analysis

(*) *“The right of the individual to decide what information about himself should be communicated to others and under what circumstances”*
(Westin, Privacy and Freedom, New York: Atheneum, 1970.)

Privacy

- Motives for privacy protection
 - ❑ empowerment: control the dissemination of information about oneself (identity theft)
 - ❑ utility: protection against nuisance (spam)
 - ❑ dignity: freedom from unsubstantiated suspicion (surveillance of public spaces)
 - ❑ regulating agent: checks and balances on power (unauthorized wiretaps)

Undermining privacy

- Trespass of presumed “personal borders”
 - natural (walls, doors,...)
 - social (confidentiality within social groups)
 - spatial/temporal (isolation of activities in different places or times)
 - ephemeral: (expectation of forgetting/disposal)
- “the potential to create an invisible and comprehensive surveillance network”
- Privacy impacted by
 - ability to monitor
 - ability to search

Privacy Preferences

- Determined by social context
- Difficult to articulate
- Wide array of techniques (surveys, focus groups, interviews, formal experiments, cases studies, diaries, participatory design, observational,...)
- Westin's survey segmentations
 - classifications
 - Fundamentalists (15-25%)
 - Pragmatists (40-60%)
 - Unconcerned (15-25%)
 - Stable over time, similar trends in different countries
 - Difficult to relate to particular preferences to demographics
 - Cautions
 - Only probes use of personal information by companies
 - Questions changed over time
- Decomposing of privacy into specific concerns
 - Collection
 - Processing (errors)
 - Control
 - Improper access

WWW and e-commerce

- Attitude survey
 - GVU (1998)
 - Most people were concerned about privacy/security in e-commerce
 - Most favored FIPS-like requirements for notification and disclosure control
 - IBM (1999)
 - Executive underestimated consumers privacy concerns
 - Educational level and technical sophistication of user associated with higher level of privacy concern\
 - Baumer (2003)
 - Respondents more likely to share personal information with known brands
 - Privacy policies etc. provided only marginal effect

New media

- New media affords new communication possibilities and new privacy concerns
- IM/SMS
 - Teens showed varying privacy behaviors (caution against assumption of standard preferences)
 - Unobtrusive nature of text messaging supports “environmental privacy” (limited interruption of the activity in the physical space)
 - Sharing of information
 - Greater with closer acquaintances
 - Depends on purpose of disclosure
- Shared displays
 - Accidental disclosure
 - Concern is magnified by
 - Sensitivity of information
 - Relation to onlookers
 - Onlookers control of display

New media

- Media spaces

- Physical spaces (offices, work areas) enhanced with multimedia or video recording technology
 - Videoconferencing
 - Always-on audio/video between/among locations
- Important privacy design considerations
 - Symmetry
 - Opt-out control
 - Purposefulness: acceptance of privacy risks based on perceived value (a value proposition judgement)

New media

- Sensors, RFID
 - Concerns
 - Loss of control of collected data
 - Uncertainty of technologies utility
 - Trust (elderly interviewees regarding home-based monitoring)
 - Accept potential privacy invasion based on trust in those controlling the technology
 - Judgment of value proposition for increased safety
- Location disclosure
 - Effected more by *who* was asking more than the current location
 - Tracking/disclosure seen as more invasive than location-based configuration (e.g., ringtone volume control)
 - Concerns affected by
 - Trust in service provider
 - Oversight of regulatory agencies
 - Precision
 - “blurring” of current location less used than anticipated
 - Instead users either did not respond or provide information they believed was most useful to recipient

Smart objects

- Enabling technologies
 - low-power processors with integrated sensors and wireless communication
 - remote identification of objects
 - precise localization of objects
- Smart everyday objects
 - attached processing “introspection” capability
 - ability to respond in context-sensitive manner
 - creating “ambient intelligence” (smart without actually being intelligent)

Economic effects

- Improved inventory management
 - supply chain regulation
 - product quality monitoring
- “autonomous purchasing agents”
- “reducing information asymmetries”
 - more complete product disclosure
 - pay per use
 - utilities
 - insurance
- Risks
 - unanticipated feedback loops
 - unforeseen interrupts in supply chain
 - loss of control

Other risks

- **Reliability**

- manageability of such a scale of interacting devices; continue to meet requirements?
- predictability (unanticipated consequences?)
- dependability in the face of service interruptions

- **Delegation of control**

- content: who attests to the veracity of information conveyed by a smart object?
- system control: will our cars drive the way the insurance company prefers?
- accountability: who is responsible for economic or legally significant actions taken by a smart object?

Social factors

- Compatibility
 - transparency (how to check the validity of a multitude of small interactions; the micro charges of a fine-grain pay-per-use model)
 - sustainability (experiences become transient; lack of rootedness)
 - fairness (“social sorting” – reinforcing inequalities)
 - universal access (accessible to a broad cross section of society)
- Acceptability
 - feasibility/credibility (will it achieve promised goals?)
 - artifact autonomy (increased dependence on infrastructure to sustain artifact behavior)
 - health/environment (a landfill of smart objects?)
 - man-to-world relationship