PbD at GTY

CRA/CCC

May 8, 2015

Georgia Tech | Ernest Scheller Jr. College of Business

For A Research Agenda

- Mental models (6): In this context, one of the most important issues. Interesting to study generational, cultural differences; across tech (wearable IoT), different populations (at risk, sensitive), different levels of exposure to technology. Help us either correct mis-conceptions or designing to match their mental model.

2d table

- Privacy context really matters, and must go into PbD.
- Necessary to understand the fundamental role of privacy in peoples lives and the ways context culture fit
- How to take mental models and translate ways that the engineering system can do it; how formalize for previous two; Interesting space like early 70s on FIPs, where energy in law, reg, and tech for increasing privacy – how build on that; how get NSF $ for integration of design w. this

3d Table

- 6, 2, 7: Rewrite 2: people act with an understood audience; research in PbD focus on who the person thinks they are explicitly or implicitly comm with, who they think benefits from sharing, and who threat to privacy
- 13: a bit of time, academics have some canonical papers on heuristics; practitioner not applying those same papers; maybe home-grown in practice, but not an agreed set so useful to have input from academics and practitioners on this

4th table

- Similar list of questions: 6,2; should be looking at people's mental models, of audience, ask Qs such as what they think the audience compositiion is, technical, business, other social entities like selves; what is goal for audience in place; appropriate audience; how then determine the characteristics of actual services; demographics, familiarity with tech/service, how familiar is the product/service itself; subject matter probably makes a difference, so difference between music and health service and expectations shift

5th table

- Similar on 6, 2, and 7 together; infrastructure connection to mental models; infrastructure effects or obstructs how individual mental models would play out on privacy; infrastructure is distributed and hard to control (DNT example)
- Infrastructure and 10 (teams/timing): who is responsible for the infrastructure; within org have a structure that might conflict with best privacy structure; orgs without a privacy program and transition to software and design with privacy not yet included; what right composition of teams, legal, designers; avoid designers getting involved once all decision already made

6th table

- What's missing from yesterday's list
- Multi-sided privacy or multi-audience privacy; how design systems/visualizations so people understand the various audiences of what they are revealing;
- Design differ by generations
- Liked alternative suggestion – separate devices where users have no control (people are intentionally revealing (FB/Tw) vs. IoT and others where not clear what is gathered)

7th table

- 6: not only the audience; also understand the rewards and implications that users have in long term by sharing the data; how to get toward more comprehensive understanding of mental models at moment they decide to share; optimize the burden on the users given that
- 2: clarify who will have access to the information; one way anthropomorphic; users know real world, get to concrete examples in virtual setting and understand the sharing and why;
- 10: if know what we want to collect and for what, and get designers involved sooner so more clear to users

8th table

- 9 and alternatives: a higher-level tension between compliance and creativity in design; more work on helping creativity or question current assumptions on privacy vs. enabling current assumptions/paradigms
- 6: beyond mental models, how leverage other methods in research, human behavior in context with tech and privacy