Security and Privacy Advice 2

INFR11158/11230 Usable Security and Privacy

Dr. Jingjie Li

01/03/2024



Overview

- Recap
- Security and privacy advice: why challenging?
- Framework & advice
- Take-home

NEAT

- Necessary Can you change the architecture to eliminate or defer this user decision? Interrupt users only when necessary.
- Explained Does your user experience present all the information the user needs to make this decision? Explain the decision users need to make with information (See SPRUCE)
- Actionable Have you determined a set of steps the user will realistically be able to take to make the decision correctly? Give steps in all scenarios (e.g., benign vs malicious)
- Tested Have you checked that your user experience is NEAT for all scenarios, both benign and malicious? Have you tested it on a human who is not a member of your team? Do usability testing.

SPRUCE

- Source State who or what is asking the user to make a decision
- Process Give the user actionable steps to follow to make a good decision
- **R**isk Explain what bad thing could happen if they user makes the wrong decision
- Unique Knowledge the user has Tell the user what information they bring to the decision regarding the context
- Choices List available options and clearly recommend one
- Evidence Highlight information the user should factor in or exclude in making a decision



A Comprehensive Quality Evaluation of Security and Privacy Advice on the Web

Elissa M. Redmiles, Noel Warford, Amritha Jayanti, and Aravind Koneru, University of Maryland; Sean Kross, University of California, San Diego; Miraida Morales, Rutgers University; Rock Stevens and Michelle L. Mazurek, University of Maryland

https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/redmiles

This paper is included in the Proceedings of the 29th USENIX Security Symposium.

August 12–14, 2020

978-1-939133-17-5

Contribution

- Taxonomy of security and privacy advice
- Quality evaluation of security and privacy advice

Contribution and method

- Taxonomy of security and privacy advice
 - Online scraping of 2780 pieces of advice; human annotation and analysis
- Quality evaluation of security and privacy advice
 - Survey and evaluation with 1586 User and 41 experts

Identifying advice

- How do people get advice online -> crowdsourcing search queries for security and privacy advice
- Where experts find and recommend advice? -> asking security experts
- Result: 1264 out of 1896 documents after cleaning

Topics of advice



Qualitative coding and analysis

Evaluating advice: metrics

- Perceived actionability
 - **Confidence**: how confident users can implement it
 - Time consumption: how time consuming people think it would take to implement
 - **Disruption:** how disruptive people think when implementing it
 - **Difficulty:** how difficult people think it is to implement
- Scale: 4-point Likert from "Not at All" to "Very"
- Framework: building on Protection Motivation Theory and Human in the Loop model

Evaluating advice: metrics

- Perceived efficacy: whether the experts believe that a typical user would experience an improvement or not
- **Comprehensibility:** multiple measures for evaluating text comprehension, e.g., "How easy is this document to read?"

Results



Figure 3: Advice actionability by topic across 374 unique advice imperatives.

Results

Advice	Not	Very Time	Very	Very	Efficacy	Risk
	Confident	Consuming	Disruptive	Difficult		Reduced
Apply the highest level of security that's practical	×	×		×	All Accurate	50%
Be wary of emails from trusted institutions	×				All Accurate	25%
Beware of free VPN programs		X		×	All Accurate	30%
Change your MAC address	×				Majority Accurate	32.5%
Change your username regularly		×	×	×	Majority Useless	NA
Consider opening a credit card for online use only	×				All Useless	NA
Cover your camera			×		Majority Accurate	30%
Create a network demilitarization zone (DMZ)	×				Majority Accurate	27.5%
Create keyboard patterns to help remember passwords		X	×	X	Majority Useless	NA
Create separate networks for devices	×	×	×	×	Majority Accurate	40%
Disable automatic download of email attachments		X			All Accurate	40%
Disable Autorun to prevent malicious code from running	X	X			All Accurate	50%
Disconnect from the Internet	×				All Accurate	25%
Do online banking on a separate computer				×	All Accurate	32.5%
Encourage others to use Tor			×	×	Majority Accurate	25%
Encrypt cloud data	×			×	Majority Accurate	45%
Encrypt your hard drive	×		×	×	All Accurate	5%
Isolate IoT devices on their own network	×	X	×	×	Majority Accurate	20%
Keep sensitive information on removable storage media		×			Majority Accurate	22.5%
Leave unsafe websites		×	X		Majority Accurate	22.5%
Limit personal info being collected about you online	X				Majority Accurate	15%
Lock your SIM card in your smartphone	×	X	×	×	No Consensus	NA
Not blindly trust HTTPS	X				Majority Accurate	20%
Not change passwords unless they become compromised	×				All Harmful	-30%
Not identify yourself to websites	X				Majority Accurate	30%
Not let computers or browsers remember passwords	X				Majority Accurate	45%
Not overwrite SSDs	×	×	×	X	All Accurate	45%
Not send executable programs with macros			×	X	All Accurate	20%
Not store data if you don't need to			050	X	All Accurate	40%

Results



Figure 6: Correlation between security advice adoption, actionability, and priority rankings.

Previously we talked about phishing and we talked about advice.

Start thinking about what advice we give people, how we give it, and how to deliver it effectively.



In the next few slides I want to make three points:

1. People give other people piles of advice all the time

2. The advice being given out can tell you a lot about what people think is important or what is broken about a situation

3. Warnings are a type of advice





Human in the Loop: Communication Impediments

- Environmental stimuli (either related or unrelated) may divert users' attention away
- Interference prevents communication from being received as intended (can be malicious)

Communication Impediment

If you want to find usability problems, look for signs.



Human in the Loop: Human Receiver

- Communication delivery: should pay attention long enough to process it
- Communication processing: comprehend and acquire knowledge
- Application: retent the knowledge and knows when it's applicable and to apply it

First reaction: Pull

Sign says: Push



Human in the Loop: Human Receiver

- Personal variables, e.g., demographics, personal characteristics, knowledge, etc. – ability to comprehend and apply communications
- Intentions like attitudes, impacting the decision of whether to pay attention on a communication
- Capabilities to take proper actions

Knowledge and Experience

Maybe something is not obvious



Knowledge Acquisition & Retention

Maybe the tool is too confusing to use without explanation



Maybe people have an attitude that certain warnings don't apply to them or are not actually relevant



Signs highlight common problems people in a space are experiencing.



Intention – tradeoff happens here, but not always in a very rational way

"It's up to the Consumer to be Smart": Understanding the Security and Privacy Attitudes of Smart Home Users on Reddit

Jingjie Li¹, Kaiwen Sun², Brittany Skye Huff¹, Anna Marie Bierley¹, Younghyun Kim¹, Florian Schaub², and Kassem Fawaz¹ ¹University of Wisconsin–Madison, {*jingjie.li, bshuff, bierley, younghyun.kim, kfawaz*}@wisc.edu ²University of Michigan, {*kwsun, fschaub*}@umich.edu

Abstract-Smart home technologies offer many benefits to users. Yet, they also carry complex security and privacy implications that users often struggle to assess and account for during adoption. To better understand users' considerations and attitudes regarding smart home security and privacy, in particular how users develop them progressively, we conducted a qualitative content analysis of 4,957 Reddit comments in 180 security- and privacy-related discussion threads from /r/homeautomation, a major Reddit smart home forum. Our analysis reveals that users' security and privacy attitudes, manifested in the levels of concern and degree to which they incorporate protective strategies, are shaped by multidimensional considerations. Users' attitudes evolve according to changing contextual factors, such as adoption phases, and how they become aware of these factors. Further, we describe how online discourse about security and privacy risks and protections contributes to individual and collective attitude development. Based on our findings, we provide recommendations to improve smart home designs, support users' attitude development, facilitate information exchange, and guide future research regarding smart home security and privacy.

varying S&P attitudes and concerns [25], [44]. While existing studies on users' S&P perceptions of smart home have primarily focused on singular timepoints in the adoption journey and are often conducted in controlled contexts using methods such as interviews and surveys [28], [33], [85], [88]; these studies may miss the rich dynamics when users develop their S&P considerations and attitudes over time. Meanwhile, little research has investigated and holistically understood how users organically develop varying S&P considerations and attitudes throughout their adoption journey.

Recently, researchers have started leveraging online communities to study users' attitudes, including those on S&P-related topics, in vivo [48], [73], [74]. Online communities provide venues for many smart home users to seek product information and exchange S&P ideas. Members of such online communities collectively drive the topics and discussions based on their interests. As such, we choose a smart home-related online discussion forum to investigate how smart home users develop S&P considerations, which shape their S&P attitudes during the adoption of smart home products. We investigate our main research objective through three research questions:

DO4 10 11 1 3 99 9 1 0 0 0 0



How do users develop security and privacy attitudes organically?

Qualitative Data Analysis



- Our team with broad knowledge (S&P, computer science and engineering, information science, psychology, and legal studies) performed qualitative coding and thematic analysis
- Inter-rater reliability = 0.74 (substantial)





Findings: Contextual Factors Related to S&P



Users' understanding and requirements differ and are constraint by diverse contextual factors

Findings: S&P Attitudes

But I **don't really care about people** eavesdropping me.

Low

Dismissiveness (44/255 users)

7 7

Incorporating protective strategies I'd definitely like to hear what other people have to say. Exploration (111/255 users) People are walking around with a cellphone 24/7! Resignation (13/255 users)

I value convenience over complete privacy Positive pragmatism (71/255 users) Personally I would and have layered the devices in 3 layers for security...

High

Devotion (65/255 users)

Concern

Users' attitudes are contextual and evolve, despite preconception

Intentions

Just wandering around with your eyes open will tell you a lot about the culture, norms, and problems of a space.

https://www.grahamcluley.com/trai n-control-centre-passwordsrevealed/



Intentions

SYSTEM LINK OPP gum cour [hus]/42-0/ gert CLIGHT ID 103785 USER NAME 1066 (Hundrom Hand) FRSS HORD Survey (March Chik song kadar taky all Copy and all the sk taxang Texang for ong recently Sympoly contain and not maly he had all all all Records is too to

- Strong John

2 - Seen Chier

3- UNI-1-2

Sa Mart Strate

Photo shared by Owen Smith's own social media team

https://www.grahamcluley.com/owen-smith-forgets-wipe-whiteboard-reveals-

Notice the passwords behind him?



Why do we involve users in decisions?


Because they have contextual knowledge the computer doesn't have.



Think: when do we need to involve users in decision?

"Easy" to dismiss by hitting X...

Except that hitting X means "I accept" **Review our cookie policy**

What do we use cookies for?

We use cookies and similar technologies to **recognize your repeat visits and preferences**, as well as to **measure the effectiveness of campaigns and analyze traffic**. To learn more about cookies, including how to disable them, view our <u>Cookie Policy</u>.

By clicking "I Accept" or "X" on this banner, or using our site, you consent to the use of cookies unless you have disabled them.

I ACCEPT



My Point:

Good security decisions are contextual and require balancing risks with benefits. Good advice/warnings help users to do that.

The elements in the framework interplay with each other

All sorts of things need to be communicated to users

- Questions "did you log in from this location?"
- Warnings "the website has malicious software"
- UI passive indicators the lock icon on the browser
- **UI active indicators** "You need to generate a key"
- Task-relevant information "Passwords should be 8 characters long and must have a capital letter."
- Educational "10 security behaviors you should do to protect yourself online"
- Awareness "This phishing email has been going around, don't fall for it."

The goal of today's lecture is teach you to create useful communications with users on security topics.

NEAT

- Necessary Can you change the architecture to eliminate or defer this user decision? Interrupt users only when necessary.
- Explained Does your user experience present all the information the user needs to make this decision? Explain the decision users need to make with information (See SPRUCE)
- Actionable Have you determined a set of steps the user will realistically be able to take to make the decision correctly? Give steps in all scenarios (e.g., benign vs malicious)
- Tested Have you checked that your user experience is NEAT for all scenarios, both benign and malicious? Have you tested it on a human who is not a member of your team? Do usability testing.

Necessary

Explained

Actionable

Tested



0 UNIVERSITY 0 ORDINANCES REQUIRE BICYCLES & MOPEDS BE PROPERLY REGISTERED. LOCKED & PLACED ONLY IN BICYCLE RACKS TO AVOID IMPOUNDMENT MOTORCYCLE PARKING 0 PROHIBITED 3



Questions

Take-home

- (Blog) Gabriele, S. and Chiasson, S., 2020, April. <u>Understanding</u> <u>fitness tracker users' security and privacy knowledge, attitudes</u> <u>and behaviours</u>. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-12).
- (Blog) Guardian <u>The privacy paradox: why do people keep</u> using tech firms that abuse their data?